

## **History**

Advanced GCE **A2 7835**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3835**

# **Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Units**

---

**June 2005**

**3835/7835/MS/R/05**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Advanced GCE History (7835)

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3873)

#### MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Marking Instructions	1
2580	Document Studies 871 – 1099	23
2581	Document Studies 1450 – 1693	31
2582	Document Studies 1774 – 1945	43
2583	English History 1042 – 1660	65
2584	English History 1780 – 1964	91
2585	European History 1046 – 1718	111
2586	European and World History 1789 - 1989	141
2587	Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	165
2588	Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	173
2589	Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	189
2590	Themes in History 1066 – 1796	211
2591	Themes in History 1763 – 1996	245
2592 & 2593	Independent Investigation (Coursework & Open Book Examination)	279

## REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	
*	Chief Examiner's Report	288
*	Grade Thresholds	297
2580 - 2582	Document Studies	300
2583 – 2584	English History	330
2585 – 2586	European and World History	341
2587 – 2589	Historical Investigations	350
2590 – 2591	Themes in History	367
2592 – 2593	Independent Investigation	378
	Coursework Question Proposal Form exemplars	394
	Royal Historical Society Frampton Prize (Curriculum 2000 winners)	405

# **Marking Instructions**

## **June 2005**

## AS/A2 HISTORY SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Examiners should refer to OCR's *Instructions for Examiners* for more detailed guidance.

### 1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

All candidates must meet the Assessment Objectives set for History by the QCA. Although these Objectives are expressed and weighted separately, the assessment seeks to secure coherence and unity in the candidates' understanding and interpretation of History as a discipline. The Objectives are thus not disaggregated when marking, and AO1 pervades AO2.

### 2 THE ASSESSMENT OF SCRIPTS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BANDS

Every answer should be marked bearing in mind the AOs and the following explanatory criteria:

- (a) the **relevance**, accuracy and quantity of factual knowledge;
- (b) evidence of the exercise of **informed historical judgement** and **awareness of historical context**;
- (c) **effectiveness of presentation**: the ability to communicate arguments and knowledge in a clear, orderly fashion with maximum relevance to the question set. All Units require responses in continuous prose, and therefore include the assessment of quality of written communication (including clarity of expression, structure of arguments, presentation of ideas, grammar, punctuation and spelling). Candidates' quality of written communication is not assessed separately but pervades AO1.

The proper application of the AOs and the explanatory criteria will mean, for example, that a long answer crammed with detailed knowledge will not be rewarded highly if the knowledge is not effectively applied and the answer shows a lack of historical judgement. Conversely a convincingly argued, highly relevant and perceptive answer may be well rewarded although based on less overtly expressed knowledge.

**Examiners should seek the advice of Team Leaders about unusual approaches to a question.**

### 3 GENERIC MARK BANDS

**The generic Bands are the most important guide for examiners and apply to all answers. Examiners assess which Band best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify for a Band. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'.**

**Units 2580-2582:** For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.

**Units 2583-2586:** Provisionally award the middle mark and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

**Units 2587-2589:** For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.

**Units 2590-2591:** Provisionally award the top mark and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

**Units 2592-2593:** Provisionally award the middle mark of the Band and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Mark each answer individually. Do not be swayed by impressions gained from marking other answers in the script or other candidates from the same or scripts from another Centre.

#### Units 2580-2586

**Examiners will remember that they are assessing AS Level (not A Level), usually the work of 17 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably four other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.**

#### Units 2587-2593

**Examiners will remember that they are assessing A2 Level, usually the work of 18 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably two other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.**

Units 2592 & 2593 are coursework. Candidates have considerably more time in which to prepare, with constant access to resources. For Unit 2592, they also have considerably more time in which to write.

#### 4 QUESTION-SPECIFIC MARK SCHEMES

Question-specific mark schemes are secondary, supporting the Generics. They do not specify the 'correct' answer required for individual questions. Rather, they indicate possible points that candidates might make. They offer a broad guide to what may be encountered and are therefore the guide for moderating the actual generic mark up or down within the appropriate Band or (if the history is particularly strong or weak) into the next generic Band up or down. When appropriate, suggestions are made about Bands for different approaches; in some cases, limits are indicated. Examiners must use their judgement but, **if in doubt about a particular answer, they must consult their TL. The most important principle for examiners is the primacy of the Generics.**

Answers need not be long to merit high marks. Reward answers that are direct but concise. Reward selection of relevant material and appropriate comment rather than paraphrases. Quotations should only be rewarded if used to substantiate relevant points made in the candidate's own words.

#### 5 ASSESSING STRUCTURED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS GIVEN IN NOTE-FORM

Answers are marked individually. Questions in Units 2580-82 & 2587-89 have sub-parts; each must be marked individually, without reference to the others.

Answers which are very largely in continuous prose but which are completed by significant notes may be awarded marks in one Band lower than that normally awarded. Purely note-form answers which show sound relevance, structure, understanding and sufficient knowledge can be awarded marks up to the top of Band III. In every case, examiners must make a note both at the end of the answer and on the front page of the script.

#### 6 POSITIVE MARKING

Examiners must be positive in marking what is written, without being influenced too much by omissions. Marks must represent what a candidate has accomplished, not what her/she has failed to do. Even the most successful answers may have omissions which could have been rectified had more time been allowed. **Examiners must not 'penalise'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (e.g. for accuracy and relevance).

**Question-specific mark schemes alone indicate any omissions that will affect marks awarded or any ceilings to be applied.** Mark positively by rewarding what has been written. When things go wrong, it is usually because an undue severity creeps in when omissions and errors are looked for (marking negatively).

#### 7 USE OF THE FULL RAW MARK RANGE

Examiners use the full mark range to reward work appropriately, to enable candidates to be ranked in order of merit and avoid bunching, and to ensure that raw marks convert appropriately to UMS after grading. This is an invitation neither to be generous at the top nor to under-mark at the bottom.

#### 8 MARKING SCRIPTS

All mark must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'Re!' written in the margin indicates there is some significant irrelevance;
- 'N' or 'D' in the margin indicates an excessively narrative or descriptive section;
- Occasional brief notes in the margin should indicate sound points or knowledge;
- Ticks are of little value, and can seriously mislead. They should be avoided.

**Each page should indicate that it has been read. Good practice will avoid a sequence of pages with nothing but ticks (or crosses).**

**A brief comment summarising the main qualities of an answer should be written at the end, together with the Band and the mark. The best way to do that is to quote briefly from the appropriate Band.**

The Mark Band and the appropriate numerical mark should be recorded at the end of each answer (eg. Band IV – 45). The total marks for answers should be ringed in the right-hand margin at the end of each question. All marks for sub-questions should be recorded un-ringed in the right-hand margin. They should be repeated at the end and the total shown as a ringed mark in the right-hand margin at the end of the question (eg. 5 + 15 + 45 = 65, with 65 in a circle).

**Do not alter a mark other than by crossing it out, inserting the correct mark and initialling it.**

### **Comments on scripts**

The comment at the end of an answer should reflect its qualities as defined by the Mark Bands so quote from it. Comments help you to arrive at a fair mark and indicate to senior examiners how your mind has been working. Marks and comments must be substantiated unequivocally from scripts.

Examiners should use a professional, business-like and straightforward style. Always use:

- reference to the assessment objectives and/or Mark Bands;
- reference to creditable points and major gaps which affect assessment;
- reference to 'the answer' or the third person, not 'You...'

Always avoid:

- derogatory terms eg. 'rubbish', 'shoddy', even though examiners may consider such terms to be justified;
- humour, interjections or jokes;

Ignore poor handwriting. If it is illegible, send the script to your TL. Candidates must not be marked down.

It may be appropriate to make general comments about matters such as:

- use of time and/or length of answers;
- presentation and use of language;
- rubric infringements;

Do **not** make:

- comments on how you perceive teaching may have been carried out;
- reference to answers by other candidates, eg. 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg. 'should have revised more fully';

## **9 RUBRIC INFRINGEMENTS AND INCLUSIONS FROM CENTRES**

If a candidate answers more questions than the specified number, all answers must be marked. The highest marks for the number of questions allowed must be used to constitute the script's total mark. The marks of the surplus answers should then be reduced to 0 and an explanation written on the script's front page.

If a candidate fails to answer sufficient questions, write an explanatory note on the front of the script. If several candidates from one Centre infringe rubrics, the PE and Subject Officer should be informed.

Centres are responsible for requesting special consideration for individual candidates. Such cases are dealt with directly between the Centre and OCR. Requests for special treatment sent with scripts must be ignored in your marking and forwarded directly to OCR.

Notes such as 'Out of time' written on scripts (by invigilators or candidates) must be ignored.

## **10 OVERALL**

**Mark consistently, periodically refreshing yourself via the standardisation scripts and the Generics.**

**Pace your marking, follow a regular timetable and avoiding the need to mark many scripts in limited time or when fatigued.** If difficulties arise, inform your TL at once so alternative arrangements can be made.

**Return mark sheets and scripts promptly.** Failure to do so will jeopardise the issuing of results.

Contact OCR with admin problems and your TL on marking issues. Examiners must never contact a Centre.

**Our secondary educational system is built around external assessment.  
Students, parents, teachers, FE and employers all depend on volunteers to mark the exams.**

**Thank you very much for being an examiner.**



## Units 2580-2582: GENERIC MARK BANDS

## AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

with Glosses & Revised Mark Allocations used Summer 2005 onwards

- For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
  - for answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see Marking Instructions #5].
  - Remember that you are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see Marking Instructions #5].
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin all their answers directly **without an introduction**.
  - The quality of the English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to put an answer in a lower Band.
  - Glosses in [ ] have been added to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme” (*Code of Practice 2005, #4.17*).

### Question (a)

#### BAND/20: Explanation

- I (18-20) There is a convincing and relevant explanation of the key issues relating to the reference, with some clear linkage to the Source from where it comes. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[‘clear linkage’ means that the key issue is linked to the Source via context and/or tone and/or contribution to the argument. Without an attempt to discuss this, an answer would not be placed in Bands I–III]*

- II (15-17) The response contains some valid explanatory comments but the points are not fully supported or else linkage to the Source from where the reference comes will be limited. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (12-14) The response attempts to analyse the internal aspects of the reference but the comments miss some explanatory points and it makes little linkage to the Source. The organisation of the answer is uneven but there is sustained commentary. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- IV (9-11) The response offers some comments on the reference but does not offer appropriate contextual support and misses key aspects of explanation. The answer may well be descriptive. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (6-8) The response provides a very basic answer to the question. There are comments about what the reference says, but explanatory points are brief or very general, not fully integrated, coherent or supported by the candidate’s own knowledge. The writing shows some frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VI (3-5) The response is a simplistic paraphrase or commentary without a genuine attempt to explain the reference. The answer may be marred by considerable irrelevance. The writing shows significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-2) The response is a simplistic paraphrase or commentary without any attempt to explain the reference. The answer is irrelevant. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Question (b)**  
**BAND/40: Comparison**

**NB Contextual knowledge is NOT required for (b), but credit should be given for any which is used relevantly and effectively.**

- I (36-40)** The response provides a genuine comparison and/or contrast about most of the qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. Areas of agreement and/or disagreement are discussed. The argument shows judgement. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*['genuine comparison and/or contrast' means both content (area of agreement and/or disagreement) and provenance. The list of qualities is not exhaustive & they do not all need to be discussed. A judgment 'as evidence' or on the relative extent of support is expected]*

- II (30-35)** The response provides an effective comparison and/or contrast. The judgements are supported by appropriate references to internal evidence. The answer is relevant but the answer lacks completeness and the full range of the available comparative criteria. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*['internal evidence' means appropriate references to both content and provenance (the introductions and/or attributions)]*

- III (24-29)** The response provides a comparison and/or contrast but makes limited links with the Sources. The answer is relevant, but the organisation of the answer is uneven. The quality of the answer is satisfactory rather than sound. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*['limited links with the Sources' means either too much focus on content or on provenance so the comparison is uneven. Where 'the organization' is uneven, the comparison will be confined to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph]*

- IV (17-23)** The response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comments are largely sequential and with few points of internal analysis or discussion of similarities and/or differences. The answer is largely relevant. The organisation of the answer is limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

*[Sequencing prevents comparison. Band IV is to be used if there is some element of sequencing but there are a few points of internal analysis (comparative provenance) and/or a few comments on the similarity/difference of content]*

- V (11-16)** The response provides a very basic answer to the question and can identify some points of agreement and/or disagreement. The comparison and/or contrast is mostly implicit. There may perhaps be significant irrelevance. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain frequent errors.

*['very basic answer' means sequencing is especially prevalent. The answer will, however, identify one or more very basic points of comparative content or provenance, even if only implicitly]*

- VI (6-10)** The response is very limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There may be very basic paraphrase which lacks a genuine attempt to provide a comparison

and/or contrast. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- VII (0-5)** The response is extremely limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There is no attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The answer is irrelevant. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Question (c)**  
**BAND/60: Context**

- **Answers which use the Sources but no own knowledge may not be put in Bands I and II.**
- **Answers which use own knowledge but make no use of the Sources may not be put in Bands I or II or III.**

**I (53-60)** The answer contains a good balance between analysis of all four Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge which is used appropriately and effectively in relation to the question. (This independent knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.) There is a clear judgement on the question. There may be some indication about the limitations of the Sources or what may be required to add to their completeness and explanatory power. The strongest answers **may** offer views on the general consistency and completeness of the Sources as a set, as well as individually, but this is **not** a pre-requisite for Band I.

*[Band I answers are likely to use their own knowledge to extend and enrich the quality of source evaluation]*

**II (45-52)** The answer contains a fair balance between analysis of at least three of the Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge, although the comment may not be complete or fully developed, and the judgement on the question may not be entirely convincing. There may be some imbalance between discussion of the Sources and use of external analysis. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*['own' knowledge should be focused on the key issue of the question]*

**III (37-44)** The response attempts to address the Sources and deploy independent ('own') knowledge, although the balance between them may be uneven. The argument is fairly clear, but the comments may not be fully sustained and the overall judgement may be incomplete. The organisation of the answer is uneven. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*['attempts to address the Sources' means Sources are largely used for reference and illustration of an argument rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument (the characteristics of Bands I and II)]*

**IV (29-36)** The response shows a clear imbalance between source analysis and use of independent ('own') knowledge. These aspects are not linked effectively into an argument. The Sources are discussed sequentially; a basic argument is provided, but overall judgement on the question is very limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

*['clear imbalance' does **not** mean completely unbalanced between use of Sources and own knowledge. It means **more** imbalance than in Band III. Sources discussed sequentially are unlikely to establish a sense of different views, but 'grouping' might coincide with Source order (A and B v. C and D) - examiners are to watch if this is the case]*

**V (20-28)** The response provides little comment on the context of the key issue. There is some evidence of knowledge of the key issue, but the relevance is implicit with a limited attempt to analyse the Sources. The argument lacks a coherent structure. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some frequent errors.

*[There is likely to be a clear imbalance here between Sources and own knowledge. Although there will be little comment on the context of the key issue there will be **some**, just as there will be some awareness and evidence of the key issue. Sources will largely be used for reference and illustration of an argument (i.e. rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument). Judgement will be skeletal if present at all]*

- VI (11-19)** The response shows serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent ('own') knowledge. The attempt to address the question will be very limited, and the argument may be fragmentary, and there may be serious irrelevance and frequent errors of fact and understanding. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-10)** The response shows extremely serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent ('own') knowledge. There is no attempt to address the question. There is no argument. The answer is irrelevant. At least most of the fact and understanding are wrong. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Examiners are reminded that

- for answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer;
- for answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer;
- they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5];
- they are marking out of 45. OCR's computer will double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.
- The quality of the English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- If a candidate discusses the wrong topic (eg. evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II instead of William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award to the top of Band VI.

## ESSAY

### Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation

Perspective means an understanding of the variety of history involved in the question (e.g. political, religious, social).

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (e.g. analysis, assessment, comparison).

Time is limited so candidates may begin their answer directly, without an introduction.

I (36-45) The response evaluates the key issues and deals with the perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

At the higher level (40-45), responses will effectively justify why one factor is the most important or the main factor and will also explain why other factors are less important. There will be a sense of judgement in relation to the factors shown by discrimination between them in terms of type and nature of the factor. How factors are linked to each other will also be addressed.

At a lower level (36-39), responses will justify why one factor is the most important but the explanation of why others are less so will be less effective. There will be some attempt to classify and draw links between factors.

II (32-35) The response is mostly successful in evaluating the key issues in the question convincingly and relevantly. It develops most of the relevant aspects of the perspectives(s) in the question. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The answer will deal with several factors will come to a judgement as to which was most important (i.e. 'How far...?' or 'To what extent...?' will be addressed). However, the reasoning will often be patchy and may be confined to a lengthy conclusion. Similarly the establishment of links between factors and their classification may not be extensive and, at the bottom of the Band, hardly present at all.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**III (27-31)** The response is reasonably successful in evaluating key issues and in dealing with perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is reasonably successful in showing a good level of understanding. The answer tends to be descriptive or narrative in approach but the argument depends on some analysis. The quality of recall, selection and accuracy of historical knowledge, applied relevantly, is mostly sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The organisation is uneven but there is a sustained argument.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The response will recognise the need to deal with a number of factors *and where the question demands it* may well provide some very limited argument why one factor was more important than others. A list of factors will be dealt with and explained effectively but the linkages *and any necessary* explanation of most important will be slight and undeveloped. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**IV (23-26)** The response has some success in discussing some key issues and in dealing with some of perspective(s) in the question. The answer is descriptive or narrative in approach but there is some implicit analysis. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The organisation is uneven but the answer pursues an argument. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

**V (18-22)** The response discusses some key issues in the question but only at a very basic level. The answer shows some adequacy in its level of understanding and is descriptive or narrative in approach. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is limited but is mostly communicated in a competent manner. The organisation is uneven. There is some irrelevance but most of the answer focuses on the question. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some frequent errors.

**VI (10-17)** The response does not discuss the key issues in the question and shows little understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is inadequate in its level of understanding with poor description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge is thin or significantly inaccurate. There is significant irrelevance. The answer is communicated in an incompetent manner. The organisation of the answer is very poor. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**VII (0-9)** The response fails to discuss the key issues in the question and shows no understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is completely inadequate in its level of understanding. Historical knowledge is either absent or completely inaccurate or irrelevant. There is no organisation to the answer. The writing shows very major weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Examiners are reminded that

- in Bands I-III they should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- in Bands IV-VII they should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see General Marking Instructions #5];
- are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5].

The questions, especially the document question, allow candidates to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material, primarily from historians. Sub-question (ii) and the essays encourage candidates to address and evaluate historical debate. **Answers require some broad understanding of historical debate, but never depend on any reference to the views of particular historians** (pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit - as in any AS/A2 Unit). **Demonstration of a broad understanding of historical debate does not involve anything very sophisticated: even hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the top Bands.**

The required study of Passages and of historical debate is reflected in the weight given to AO2.

The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is never to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

## DOCUMENT QUESTION (i)

### NB

- 'Own knowledge' is not required, but if material extraneous to the Passages is used pertinently to clarify points of comparison made about the views expressed it is to be given credit.

### **BANDS I-VII/15: Comparison of Content of Two Passages**

- I (12–15) The response correctly identifies the substance of the comparison between the two Passages in a direct point by point comparison, and shows **clear understanding** of the different interpretations offered. The answer is **successful in establishing a full and complete comparison** between the interpretations in the two Passages referring to both similarities and differences where appropriate. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (11) The response correctly identifies the substance of the comparison between the two Passages in a direct point by point comparison, and shows **a reasonable understanding** of the different interpretations of historical events offered. The answer is **mostly successful in establishing a thorough comparison** between the arguments or ideas in the two Passages. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (9–10) The response correctly identifies most of the substance of the comparison between the two Passages, and shows **a fairly reasonable understanding** of the different interpretations of historical events offered. The answer is **fairly successful in establishing a comparison** between the arguments or ideas in the two Passages but is not entirely full. There may be a tendency **to list points** from each Passage separately **without making an explicit comparison** or to confine comparison to a sentence or sentences only at the end. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.



- IV (8)** The response correctly identifies some of the substance of the comparison between the two Passages, and shows **a limited understanding** of the different interpretations offered. The comparison may, in places, be of the Passages in general and/or of their provenances and **not of the interpretations** the Passages offer so that the answer misses some points and **tends to list** them rather than compare them. There may be excessive use of extraneous material at the expense of the Passages. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (6–7)** The response provides a **very basic answer** to the question. It identifies only some of the substance of the comparison between the two Passages, and shows only **the most basic understanding** of the different interpretations offered. However, **it misses major items** of the comparison and may compare the factual material in the Passages and not the interpretations the Passages offer. **There may be paraphrase** of the Passages and of the introductory steers to them. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (4–5)** The response may be a **simplistic reference** to the two Passages with no attempt to compare them or the answer **may well be uncertain what the substance of the comparison is**. The answer may be marred by **considerable irrelevance**. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-3)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to understand the Passages. There is **no attempt to answer the question**. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## DOCUMENT QUESTION (ii)

### NB

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge may not be put in Band I.
- Answers which use own knowledge but make no use of the Passages may not be put in Bands I or II.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

### BANDS I-VII/30: Contextual Evaluation

- I (24–30) The response **focuses very sharply on the key issue** in the question, using good and very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. Contextual knowledge is used **very appropriately and effectively** in relation to the question. (This contextual knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.). The answer **contains a very good balance** between Passage and contextual evaluation in **reaching a judgement** about the issue. There is **clear and substantial evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved by comments on the validity of the arguments in the Passages using the other Passages or own knowledge (**not** all the Passages need to be evaluated). The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (21–23) The response **focuses on the key issue** in the question, using very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. The quality of the contextual comments and some aspects of the internal analysis of the Passages, whilst sound, will be **less rigorous** than in Band I. There is a **fairly clear and fairly full evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved and a **judgement is reached**. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (18–20) The response **considers the interpretations** in the Passages and deploys some contextual knowledge. The argument is clear, but comments will be **thinner** and overall **judgements less effective** than in Band II. The organisation of the answer is **uneven**. There is a **reasonable degree of evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing is generally fluent and historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.
- IV (15–17) The response shows **considerable imbalance between** Passage evaluation and contextual knowledge. A **basic argument** is provided. The Passages may be largely used to **illustrate the argument** put forward and not as the focus of the answer. There is **some attempt at evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (12–14) The response shows **some evidence of knowledge** of the key issue, but may make **little use** of the Passages. The answer **lacks coherent structure** but the direction of the attempted argument is **mostly relevant**. There is **little evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer contains frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VI (7–11) The response shows **serious weaknesses in knowledge** and ability to handle contextual questions. The argument may be **fragmentary**. There may be **serious**

**irrelevance.** The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- VII (0-6)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding. There is no attempt to answer the question. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## ESSAY

### NB

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- Some topics by their very nature are less strongly focused around historical debate. Question-specific mark schemes will provide the necessary guidance on this.
- Answers require some understanding of broad schools of historical debate, but NEVER depend on any reference to the views of particular historians; pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit, as in any AS/A2 Unit.
- Demonstration of an understanding of broad schools of historical debate need NOT involve anything very sophisticated: hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet in full the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the high Bands.

### BANDS I-VII/45

- I (36–45) The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions. The response is **focused clearly** on the demands of the question, even if there is **some unevenness**. The approach is clearly **analytical rather than descriptive** or narrative and, in particular, there is a **clear and evident** (but not necessarily totally full) **evaluation** of the historical debate bearing upon the topic which is **carefully integrated** into the overall approach. The answer is fully relevant. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material - the degree of that support will help to distinguish between answers higher and lower in the Band. The impression is that a **good solid answer** has been provided. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (31–35) The response is **focused clearly** on the question but there is **some unevenness in content**. The approach is **mostly analytical and relevant**. The answer is generally structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. However, the answer will **not be equally thorough throughout**, for example evaluating the relevant debate less well. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (27–30) The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt** to provide an appropriate argument and factual knowledge. The approach contains **analysis or explanation but it may be inadequately supported**. There is a reasonable grasp of the elements of the debate which bears upon the topic, and this is to a degree integrated into the overall approach. The answer is mostly relevant. The answer may **lack balance and depth** in factual knowledge. Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.
- IV (22–26) The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly**. The approach may depend more on **some heavily descriptive or narrative sections** than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. There is **some knowledge of the historical debate** which bears upon the topic, but this may be **'bolted-on'** to the other material. Alternatively, the answer may consist largely of **description of schools of thought** that is not well directed at the specific question and is not well supported factually. Factual material may be used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly** the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack

fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

- V (18–21)** The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer** but there is little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of a question. The approach **lacks analysis and explanation** and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, **is not linked effectively to the answer**. There may be **some hints of the historical debate** which bear upon the topic, but it will probably be poorly understood. Alternatively, there may **be extensive description of schools of thought** that is only slightly directed at the specific question. The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (10–17)** The response is not **properly focused on the requirements** of the question. There may be many **unsupported assertions**. The argument may be of very **limited relevance** and there may be **confusion about the implications** of the question. There will be **no sense of the historical debate** on the topic. The answer may be largely **fragmentary and incoherent**, perhaps only in brief note form. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding of the general topic and of the historical debate on it. There is **no attempt to answer** the question. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## NB

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Generic Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- For all answers, examiners should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down according to the particular qualities of the answer [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- Candidates who do not address most of the 100 or so-year period required may not be given a mark in Band I for that essay, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The quality of English is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

The topics are based on Themes covering an extended period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period) with the emphasis on continuity, development and change over time (ie. on breadth of understanding rather than on depth of knowledge). The emphasis is on links and comparisons between different aspects of the topics studied, rather than on detailed analysis.

To support the emphasis on breadth and over-view (rather than depth), candidates are given in the exam a factual chronology for their Theme.

**BANDS I-VII/60: Essay**

- I (48–60) The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions. **There may be some unevenness, but the demands of the question (e.g. causation, evaluation, change and/or continuity over time) are fully addressed.** The answer demonstrates a **high level of ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. The approach is **consistently analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. The **argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. Ideas are expressed fluently and clearly. At the lower end of the Band, there *may be some weaker sections but* the overall quality nonetheless shows **the candidate is in control of the argument.** The answer is fully relevant. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (42–47) The answer demonstrates clearly the **ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **good awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question, but** there is **some unevenness.** The approach is **mostly analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. **Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. The answer is fully relevant. *The impression is that a good solid answer has been provided.* Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (36–41) The answer demonstrates clearly an **attempt to synthesise some elements** to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **reasonable awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an**

**appropriate argument supported** by appropriate factual material. The approach **mostly contains analysis or explanation but may lack balance and** there may be **some** heavily **descriptive/narrative** passages **and/or** the answer may be **somewhat lacking in appropriate supporting factual material**. The answer is mostly relevant. The writing is generally fluent and usually uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

- IV (30–35)** The answer demonstrates an **uneven attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is an **adequate awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly, but the structure of the argument is poor**. The approach **depends more on heavily descriptive or narrative** passages than on analysis or explanation (which may be limited to introductions and conclusions). Factual material, sometimes very full, is used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly the requirements of the question**. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (24–29)** The answer demonstrates a **limited attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **limited awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer but the approach lacks analysis or explanation and** there is **little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question**. The structure of the answer shows **weaknesses in organisation** and the treatment of topics is **seriously unbalanced**. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (12–23)** The answer demonstrates an **unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails to reflect the synoptic nature of the Module. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The **answer is not focused** on the requirements of the question and may be of **very limited relevance**. Any **argument** offered may be **fragmentary and incoherent**, and any **assertions** made may be **unsupported** by factual material. There may be serious irrelevance and/or serious weaknesses in knowledge. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-11)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails completely to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. There is **no attempt to answer the question**. There is **no argument** and **no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## UNITS 2592 & 2593: GENERIC MARK BANDS      INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

### NB

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best-fit', not a 'perfect fit' [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Examiners should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Candidates must either use and evaluate primary and/or secondary source material relevant to their question, and/or must explain and evaluate interpretations of the topic(s) studied. The importance of this is reflected in the weight given to AO2. Investigations which offer no interpretation or evaluation of sources and/or historical interpretations (ie. they fail completely to address AO2) may not be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The Investigation does not require high-level research or specialist resources (such cannot be expected at Advanced GCE).
- The quality of the English (grammar, punctuation and spelling) is never to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

### NOTES (Unit 2592)

1. **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on an historical period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
2. **WORD LIMIT:** The target length is 2,500 words. **The maximum permitted is 3,000 words (excluding only the footnotes & bibliography).** If that limit is exceeded, examiners must stop reading at 3,000 words and base their entire assessment on the first 3,000 words offered. Watch for footnotes that evaluate sources &/or carry on the argument of the Investigation and, intentionally or not, thus circumvent the limit. **If any such footnote text takes the Investigation's total length beyond 3000 words then it must be included in the word-count after all and the excess material must be excluded from the assessment.** In such cases, please write an explanatory note on the front of the script [Do not check the actual length unless you are suspicious].
3. **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Candidates **must use footnotes and provide a bibliography.** No set form or location for either is prescribed; a list at the end is fine. The absence of either or both, or the inadequacy of either or both, must never be the sole criterion to pull an answer into a lower Band, but will be taken into account within the examiner's overall judgement.
4. **HANDWRITTEN INVESTIGATIONS** are valid.

### NOTES (UNIT 2593 Open Book Exam)

- 1 Candidates have less time to write-up their Investigation than those who enter Unit 2592, so the following points of difference will be applied:
  - (a) Unit 2593 Investigations will be **shorter** and contain **less supporting detail/fewer examples.** The range of evidence marshalled to support arguments **will be narrower.** That said,
  - (b) **The qualities of evaluation and analysis required will be just the same.**
- 2 **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on an period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
- 3 **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY:** **Footnotes are optional. A bibliography is required.** This may be pre-prepared (typed or hand-written), taken into the exam and attached to the script with a tag.



## **Bands I-VII/90: Essay**

**I (72-90)** The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve in A Level.

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.

**The Investigation uses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic which is integrated into the overall approach.** The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question** (eg. causation, change over time, evaluation). The Investigation reflects a very high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach is consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative.** The argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material. **The answer is fully relevant.** The impression is that a good solid answer has been provided.

At the lower end of the Band, **there may be some weaker sections, but the overall quality still shows that the candidate is in control of the argument.** The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**II (63-71)** **The Investigation uses critically a reasonable range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically a range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic.** The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question but there is more unevenness than in Band I answers.**

The Investigation generally reflects a high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. **The approach is mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer is fully relevant.** Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**III (54-62)** **The Investigation uses a range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, but with some significant gaps and possibly with a limited critical sense.** The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument** and factual knowledge. The Investigation reflects a competent level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach contains analysis or explanation, but there may be some purely descriptive or narrative passages that are not linked directly to analysis or explanation. The answer achieves a genuine argument, but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge.** Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily, but some parts may lack full coherence. **The answer is mostly relevant.** The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

*Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.*

**IV (45-53)** **The Investigation uses largely uncritically a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, and this may be 'bolted-on' to the other material.** The response indicates **an attempt to argue relevantly.** The Investigation reflects an adequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach depends more on descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions.** The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate

historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains some careless errors.

- V (36–44)** **The Investigation refers to a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. These may be poorly understood and used uncritically, and may be 'bolted-on' to the other material. The responses offers some elements of an appropriate answer, but there is little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question.** The Investigation reflects a very basic level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach lacks analysis and explanation and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, is not linked effectively to the argument.** The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is seriously unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
- VI (19–35)** **The Investigation refers only occasionally, and without any critical evaluation, to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations.** The response is **not properly focused on the requirements of the question.** The Investigation reflects an inadequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The argument will be of very limited relevance and there may well be confusion about the implications of the question.** There may be many unsupported assertions or a commentary which lacks sufficient factual support. **The answer may lack coherence as an extended essay, being largely fragmentary** and perhaps incoherent. The Investigation may rely heavily on a 'scissors and paste' approach. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-18)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt to meet any of the demands** of the Unit. There is **no reference to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations.** There is **no attempt to discuss any of the key issues in the question.** There is **no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions.** The answer is **irrelevant** and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Mark Scheme 2580**  
**June 2005**

**1 The Reign of Alfred the Great 871–899****(a) Study Source A**

**From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the Viking army went to London and spent the winter there (line 2). [20]**

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of Alfred’s reign.

Candidates can explain the rôle, the activities, the power of a Viking army and the reference to wintering in a secure location, hence emphasising that the army was there to stay. They can explain the importance of London as an administrative and commercial centre and they might point out the future importance of its recovery by Alfred in 886, when he handed its control to Ealdorman Aethelred of Mercia (mentioned in Source C). Answers might refer to the Mercian treaty whereby they became a Viking puppet state.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

**(b) Study Sources B and C**

**How far do these Sources support each other as evidence for English methods against the Vikings? [40]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Source B focuses upon the decisive battle of 878, a key moment in Alfred’s reign and in the defence and survival of Wessex. A fierce battle, hard fought, with the use (e.g.) of shield wall, a siege of a stronghold, much violence and boldness on Alfred’s side, all feature. Source C comes from later, the second phase of major Viking attacks, with resistance stronger and tougher; ealdormen and their forces are mentioned; Mercian prominence is of note; Alfred was able to galvanise his forces and oversee an element of combined operations. Alliances were important. Candidates can make something of the tone of the Sources and the dates are significant, given the reforms of the 880s and their outcomes. Indeed, the contrast in timescale is important here. Though the Sources are similar on the scale and nature of English military methods, answers may point to a more robust stance and a wider range of methods in Source C as compared to Source B in which hardship is more strongly emphasised.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred's long-term success against the Vikings depended primarily upon 'the defensive measures' of the 880s (Source D, lines 25-26). [60]**

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Source D offers a valuable overview, focusing upon the impact and importance of the military reforms of the 880s, not least the burghal system created, so responsible for Wessex success against further Viking attacks in 892-6. Source A focuses upon the early setbacks in the first major wave of Viking attacks between 871 and 878 when other kingdoms collapsed and when Wessex was threatened massively; its isolation was felt keenly. Source B focuses upon the vital success of 878 when Alfred rallied his forces and displayed considerable courage and leadership skills; this was a turning point. Source C suggests both political and military operations, with Alfred able to call upon a range of support. Successes were achieved. The dates of the events and features of Sources A, B and C are important. Source D draws out the contrasts across the reign (871-8, 892-6). Own knowledge can supply much and candidates will need to be selective. The features of the two phases of Viking attacks (871-8, 892-6) are important; the military reforms of the 880s, based around the system of burhs and the reorganised fyrd; the need of and delivery of firm leadership, both political and military; the rallying of West Saxon and Mercian support. In addition, candidates could, for example, make use of knowledge of Alfred's diplomatic contacts (including with Welsh leaders) and/or of his educational, religious and literary activities since these had some bearing upon the all-round programme of defence and strengthening undertaken. Good answers will have a focus on 'primarily' in the question. Candidates can group Sources A with B and C with D – although Source D does serve a valuable overview purpose.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**2 The Normans in England 1066-87****(a) Study Source D**

**From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'he laid waste to the countryside' (line 25). [20]**

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the reign.

The reference is to the famous and violent 'Harrying of the North' undertaken by William I in 1069-70 in response to the major unrest there, based around native English and Danish operations. This became a famous (or infamous) feature of the reign, leaving a lasting impression in the North (and strong reflection in the Domesday Book entries on 'waste' in the area). The level of ferocity ('scorched earth') was great. Candidates can say something about the context and the nature of the terror tactics employed. Did they represent a new ferocity or continuity (see post-Hastings)?

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

**(b) Study Sources A and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the Norman treatment of the native English. [40]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Source A emphasises the use of terror, ravaging of lands and forced submission of the people, above all the native leaders. Its tone merits some comment. Here we see William's ruthlessness and yet pragmatism. Source C and its language tone may well be commented on: e.g. 'groaning ... heavy Norman yoke', 'additional oppressions', 'swollen with pride'; a strong sense of self-interest is present and justice was self-interested in turn, the native English being denied what they had been promised. The two Sources together reflect a harshness of method and style and denote some of the core features of William's rule and of Norman treatment of an effectively subjugated people. Provenance is worthy of comment. Both Sources have sympathy with the native English, particularly pertinent in Source C's account where the tone reserved for the barons indicates disapproval. Source C refers to William's absence (absolved from the harsh policy?) whereas Source A focuses on William himself as the source of harsh treatment. Yet both refer to different time periods.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) **Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the harshness of Norman rule provoked serious English resistance in the period 1066-70.** [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Answers need to consider whether harshness alone was responsible for the unrest that arose. Source A reflects the enforced submission of the English leaders in the face of terror tactics. Source B mentions unrest, 'regional conspiracies', 'messages to the Danes', 'into exile ... return to fight'. Source C focuses upon oppressive rule and so reasons for unrest; 'reasonable' pleas of the English are ignored and there is a strong sense of harshness. Source D mentions English and Danish operations in the North, violent attacks on the Normans and William's harsh response. Clearly, the Sources do stress aspects of harshness. Source A dwells on submission; Source B has harshness; Source C presents something of a counter view; Source D shows native resistance allied to foreign intervention. Own knowledge can reinforce the above by reference to features of the unrest of the period 1066-70, and especially 1068-70; that unrest was disparate, dispersed but serious in extent, prompting tough responses. Norman rule was harsh and examples can be adduced. Then again, it is possible to argue that there were other factors that generated English resistance, such as: dashed hopes, unfulfilled promises, unfulfilled ambitions, a wish for freedoms, fears of losing lands and status. Candidates may group the Sources into A and C which provide a clear indication of harshness whereas Sources B and D focus on the response – Source B claims the English were naturally unruly whereas Source D introduces the external Danish threat as a possible reason for English resistance. Both Sources B and D suggest that Norman harshness was not the only reason.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**3 The First Crusade and its Origins 1073-99****(a) Study Source C**

**From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'thousands of martyrs died a blessed death' (line 16).**

**[20]**

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the Crusade.

This is quite a vivid phrase and some comment upon the nature and tone of the language could be very effective. The sense of martyrdom in the cause of the Crusade is important; there is a clear link with the attainment of salvation, penitence, the remission of sins, the crusader vow, crusader commitment, the rôle of pilgrimage, plenary indulgence, fighting an acknowledged holy war. The explanation can be developed in various ways, e.g. the papal aim in launching the Crusade and the context where such martyrdom is welcomed as a Christian inspiration to encourage others.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while

**Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

**(b) Study Sources B and D**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems that the Crusaders had to overcome.**

**[40]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Source B focuses upon internal dissent, 'princely quarrel', the necessity of the rank and file to galvanise their leaders into action and so put an end to squabbling. Here we find a notable example of such squabbling as of divided leadership involving two strong personalities. Source D mentions 'holy wars', the rôle of knights, the attainment of salvation and the nature of the (polyglot) army with at least an allusion to the problems of trying to unite and lead such a disparate force. Together, the Sources represent something of the challenges faced by the crusaders, e.g.: leadership problems; divisions; military operations; the need for unifying forces and strengths. Both are Frankish Sources, written after the event, but Source B has a narrower focus on the problems of a divided leadership, referring to them quite openly, whereas Source D's focus is on a wider range of problems, including leadership (for those who went without feudal leaders) but also language, culture and dress.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.



**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) **Study all the Sources**

**Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the First Crusade succeeded more through popular enthusiasm than through decisive leadership.** [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Candidates need to focus well on both popular enthusiasm and on decisive leadership, arguing as they choose. Popular enthusiasm, religiously based, is evidenced in all four Sources, and especially in Sources B and D. Decisive leadership is absent in the comments in Source B, where the rank and file protest and call for united leadership; it is implicit in Sources A; while Source D suggests achievements without leadership. The balance lies in favour of popular enthusiasm, willpower and endeavour and zeal, though candidates may well argue that leadership did play its part, albeit unevenly. Popular enthusiasm can be supported from own knowledge by reference to (e.g.) the high levels of uptake to go on the Crusade, the presence of many ordinary men and women, the People's Crusade, the rôle of ordinary soldiers, the sense of religious motivation. Leadership did exist (e.g. Bohemond, Raymond, Godfrey and others, with their retinues of knights) and clearly formed a core element. In addition, answers might refer to crusader strategy, to crusader tactics, to the importance of the disunity and division of their Muslim opponents; the latter was an important factor.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.



**Mark Scheme 2581**  
**June 2005**

## 1 The Wars of the Roses 1450-85

### (a) Study Source A

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the end of foreign war in 1453’ (line 1). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

The reference is to the end of the Hundred Years War in 1453, with the Battle of Castillon, the fall of Bordeaux and the loss of Gascony. It has often been argued, as in this Source, that deprived of the opportunity to fight the French, the nobility turned to fighting among themselves in England. Defeat in France was certainly seen by the English (not just the nobility) as a great humiliation, discrediting the government of Henry VI and fuelling a bitter feud between the Dukes of York and Somerset.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources B and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to Richard of York’s claim to the throne. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources differ above all in their view of the validity of his claim: Source B denies it while Source D accepts it. Discussion of provenance is important in explaining this: Source D was written after the accession of Edward IV, while Source B was part of the charge of treason laid against Richard two years earlier when Henry VI was still king. Another difference is that Source B, while asserting that ‘God has ordained’ the Lancastrian succession, notes that the Cade rebels wished to make Richard king. It does not actually say that Richard claimed the throne in 1450, but it claims that the Cade rebels ‘acted on his behalf’, implying that he was involved behind the scenes. This is almost certainly untrue, but is not surprising in an indictment of leading Yorkists for treason by the pro-Lancastrian ‘Parliament of Devils’.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the restless ambition of Richard of York was the main reason for civil strife from 1450 to 1460.

[60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

As a set, the Sources support the claim made in the question. Source B implies that Richard was behind Cade's rebellion. Source C says that one explanation of the outbreak of strife in 1459 was Richard's ambition to be king. But it also suggests a different explanation - that he and his fellow-conspirators were provoked by their enemies in the council. Source D stresses the legitimacy of Richard's claim to the throne but also suggests that he was provoked into asserting his claim because of 'great wrongs'. Source A places the blame for 'all this stir' firmly on Richard. None of these Sources, however, can be regarded as totally trustworthy – an aspect which the best answers should explore. There are many other possible explanations for the civil strife and candidates will deploy their own knowledge to consider alternatives, e.g. the weakness of Henry VI, the role of Margaret of Anjou, the overmighty nobility.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

## 2 The German Reformation 1517-30

### (a) Study Source B

**From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘He has many powerful supporters among the princes’ (lines 11-12). [20]**

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

Candidates are invited to discuss Luther’s support from the princes at the Diet of Worms in 1521. Venetian ambassadors are usually thought to be highly reliable and there is no reason to doubt Contarini’s claim. Some answers might point up the role of Elector Frederick of Saxony (the Wise). Although he believed in many traditional practices and ideas, e.g. the veneration of relics, he protected Luther as his subject and as a star lecturer at the university he had founded drawing in students and reputation. The attempts of Leo X to persuade Frederick to give up Luther both before and after his excommunication failed. Some may refer to Philipp pf Hesse. Some might question the assertion, pointing out that Luther in 1521 actually had few if any German princes on his side for religious reasons at this time – many more supported him (or used him) to assert political and/or nationalist independence in their on-going struggles with the Emperor and/or the Pope. Many German princes did not act to implement the papal excommunication or the Imperial Ban (Edict of Worms in 1521).

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources A and C

**Compare Sources A and C as evidence of Luther’s willingness to make peace with his critics in the Catholic Church. [40]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources were written by Luther and, in each case, he was trying to defend himself from criticism. Candidates might note the different dates. A similarity is that Luther sees himself as the peace-maker but in Source A he goes further. He criticises Cajetan as being responsible for making worse a problem that might otherwise have been settled. The Pope is not criticised. Nor does Luther in this extract of 1520 demonstrate the stubbornness that he was to display at the Diet of Worms in 1521. Source C shows a high level of agreement. Luther asserts he is the Emperor’s ‘loyal servant’ and he is willing to abide by the decisions of Charles V - or anybody else. However, this compliant stance in 1521 is limited by the conditions that Luther sets down, especially the superior authority of the Bible. Candidates might note that this was not a minor issue but went to the heart of the quarrel between Luther and his Catholic opponents. This therefore shows a major difference between the Sources.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Luther's critics in the Catholic Church were mostly responsible for the failure to reach a settlement by 1521.** [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Sources A and C would support the claim. Luther pleads innocence in both extracts. Source A directly attacks Cajetan, but not the Pope. Source C claims that Luther was willing to settle the quarrel. Source D goes some way to supporting the claim. Erasmus pleads for toleration and blames unwise papal policies for the failure to reach a settlement. But he does not condemn the Church authorities wholesale ('out of character for Leo X) and does not openly defend Luther. Source B directly contradicts the claim. Contarini describes an implacable Luther who could rely on princely and popular support. Higher credit should go to answers that see the limitations of the Sources. Source B is written by a Venetian Ambassador; it might be factually correct but it is one-sided. Luther's conciliatory attitude in Source C is limited by his firm reliance on the authority on the Bible alone: a challenge to Catholic authorities. (Note: Source C was written only a few days later than Source B but seems to give a very different view of Luther.) The date of Source D should not be regarded as a limitation of the value of the extract; Erasmus was writing quite close to the developments that he is describing. Candidates might be expected to support the Sources by a variety of factors and events from their own knowledge, such as the immediate aftermath of the publication of the 95 Theses (1517); Luther burned the papal condemnation of his teachings *Exsurge Domine* (1520); at the Diet of Worms (1521) he resisted the pressure to withdraw his writings and refused to accept the higher authority of the Catholic Church.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.



### 3 Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58

#### (a) Study Source D

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'a notable victory in 1549 outside Norwich against the peasants' (lines 21-22). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

The reference is to the defeat of Kett's rebellion near Mousehold Heath on 27 August 1549. Warwick had an army of some 13000 men, including foreign mercenaries, and so the result was hardly in doubt. It was 'notable', though, since it ended a serious challenge to the established order, and the restoration of peace allowed Protector Somerset, blamed for this and other disturbances, to be removed. Kett's men were not in fact all 'peasants', but the introduction to the Source tells us that the author was a local gentleman – hence perhaps the assertion that peasant rebels had been 'stirred up against the better sort by idle men.'

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

#### (b) Study Sources A and B

Compare the attacks on Somerset in these two Sources. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources suggest that Somerset was to blame for his handling of the causes and course of the revolts of 1549, including his enclosure commissions which helped to precipitate unrest (which, in Source B, 'sowed sedition' between landlords and commoners). Both also indicate the estrangement between Somerset and other councillors, who in Source A can only wish his policies 'were otherwise'. But the Sources also have different points to make: Source A criticises Somerset's cultivation of the image of the 'good duke' (which may be intimated in the attack on his search for 'glory' in Source B, but that might be too subtle for AS candidates), and the destabilising impact of religious reform. Source B, in contrast, condemns Somerset's ambition and his malice. Answers should refer to the different context of Sources A and B.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the boundless ambition of first Somerset and then Northumberland was the main reason for political instability in 1547-53. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Ambition itself is evident in Sources B, C and D, but how 'boundless' it is needs discussion: Northumberland's attempt to change the succession to preserve his position is not a bad working example of it! On the other hand, Source A points to incompetence or mismanagement causing political instability (though Somerset may have been ambitious to burnish his reputation as the 'good duke'); Sources B and C highlight faction (Somerset, for example, finds allies against Northumberland in Source C); while Source D suggests that one public motive for the Device was the desire to protect protestantism. Wingfield's view (Source D) is that that Edward VI was mere wax in the hands of crafty Northumberland, but some answers may validly argue that Edward was himself one of the authors of the Device. Source A also implies that the introduction of protestantism had caused political difficulties. Clearly, economic problems, particularly enclosures, were a factor in political instability.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

#### 4 The English Civil War 1637-49

##### (a) Study Source B

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'the House of Commons should declare and publish King Charles's wickedness and so proclaim him an enemy' (lines 7-8). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

In the context of July 1646 this is a radical demand: the vast majority of MPs were looking for an accommodation with the King, but Overton is proposing that they charge him with treason and bring him to account. The King's 'wickedness' needs some comment (chiefly his role in causing and sustaining a Civil War); so too does his status as 'an enemy' to the people, whom MPs represent. Candidates may note that though Overton's demand was ignored, in effect it was belatedly followed in the trial and execution of the King in January 1649.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

##### (b) Study Sources A and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for Charles I's outlook and tactics in 1646-47. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources are written by the King and show him reacting to the Newcastle Propositions for peace which Parliament presented him with on 13 July 1646. Though Source A is a private communication, Source C a public one. The first helps us understand the tactics deployed by Charles I in the second. In particular, using a move to London as a delaying tactic is present in both. Source C is a good example of the King's aim to avoid a 'complete rejection' of the Newcastle Propositions, since he accepts parts of them and proposes further negotiations on others. The best insight into Charles' thinking is his statement in Source A that to accept the Propositions would cross his 'conscience, crown and honour'.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that religious division was the main reason for the failure to achieve a political settlement in 1646-47. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

There is much for candidates to consider – rival viewpoints abound. Religious disagreements appear in Source A ('my conscience'), Source C and Source D, not merely between King and Parliament, but between Parliament and the army. The nature and significance of these divisions need some spelling out. On the other hand, the emergence of the Levellers (with secular as well as religious grievances: Source B), and the army as a political force, opposed to setting up 'the King on his own terms' (Source D), split the king's opponents and gave him room for manoeuvre in 1646-47. At the same time, Charles I's determination to reject the 1646 Newcastle Propositions is clear enough in Source A. From their own knowledge, candidates can deploy plenty of additional material to consider reasons for failure to reach a political settlement, e.g. Charles' Engagement with the Scots (December 1647) which brought the Scottish army back into play (but now on the other side); problems between Parliament and the army (eg. Parliament voting to disband the New Model Army in May 1647); on-going problems with the army as sections of it became politicised (e.g. the Putney Debates of October-November 1647, the mutiny at Corkbush Field that Cromwell suppressed in November 1647).

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

## 5 Louis XIV's France 1661-1693

### (a) Study Source C

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'The King imagines that he is pious' (line 16). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

Louis XIV certainly did believe that he was pious, a good catholic, and he was most careful to observe religious practices regularly. He was moral, by the standards of the age, and his various mistresses did not destroy this impression. The chapel at Versailles was a centre of court life and he attended services and mass very regularly. It is true that priests, calculating or otherwise, did have an influence on him; for example, the Jesuits were important at his court. As for 'old women', Louis married Madame de Maintenon (1684), his former mistress, and she persuaded the King to adopt a more sober/pious life-style, which was resented by many at court. Liselotte might have been bored by Versailles, but she expressed an opinion that was widely shared. Some answers might note that the Source dates from only two years after the Edict of Fontainebleau, in which Louis, "the new Constantine" asserted (or was seen to assert) his catholic credentials by revoking the Edict of Nantes.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources A and B

How far does Source B contradict Source A as evidence of life at Versailles? [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both writers knew Versailles well enough to make informed comments. Madame de Sévigné writes a gushing letter to a friend as Source A, recording each fond detail. There is no need to doubt the veracity of her description, but she depicts only glamorous life on the surface. Source B shows another side - Visconti highlights the undesirable realities beneath the glossy surface of the life in palace. The two Sources thus offer considerable contrasts, but both are reliable because each contains an element of the truth and both writers are in full agreement that Louis XIV himself was central to life at Versailles.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the claim that Versailles failed to reflect Louis XIV's sense of his own glory.** [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Sources B, C and D can be used in different ways to support the claim. Source B is directly critical of Louis and Versailles. Source C is almost as direct, although the tone is different. Source D is apparently meant to be complimentary but actually shows Louis as 'God-centred' of Versailles. Only Source A is wholeheartedly enthusiastic about the palace, its monarch and its life. Many candidates may well use their own knowledge to support the claim, but some answers may consider an alternative explanation: that Versailles was necessary to Louis's monarchy and was greatly admired throughout Europe. It was also the centre of government and secured the King against the threat of restless French nobles (Louis is said never to have forgotten the Fronde). However, this did not mean the absence of criticism of Versailles, for example of the shallowness of the court or of the vast expense of creating the palace which drained resources over many years. Some answers may consider the contemporary idea that kingship was an art. Louis took this very seriously indeed, dedicating himself to the *métier du roi*. Some answers may consider a conundrum: royal authority might radiate from Versailles, the grandest in Europe, the seat of the most feared monarch in Europe, but did (or even could) that live up to Louis' concept of his monarchy – a monarchy that some (e.g. the Duc de Saint-Simon and Cardinal de Retz) saw as a dangerous tyranny?

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2582  
June 2005**

## Origins of the French Revolution 1774-92

### 1 (a) Study Source D

**From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the threat to Paris in the Duke of Brunswick’s manifesto’ (line 21). [20]**

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

This manifesto was published in Paris on 1 August 1792, but issued on 25 July. Brunswick was the Prussian commander of the allied Austro-Prussian army of some 42,000 troops. The manifesto stated the aims of the invasion to be to end anarchy and restore the legitimate power of the crown and the church. There were threats to treat as rebels any who resisted the invading armies. Paris was threatened with ‘military execution’ if the royal family were harmed, clearly the context for this reference. This caused panic and anger and is often thought of as a major cause of the fall of the Monarchy, turning waverers against the King and strengthening the hand of an increasingly radical movement in Paris, buttressed by the arrival of the provincial *fédérés*. It has also to be seen in the light of military peril. The frontier with the Austrian Netherlands lay open and there was a real fear that without severe counter-measures a bloody counter-revolution would come about. In September, the French stopped the allied advance and there were brutal massacres in the Paris prisons, so the Manifesto contributed not only to the massacre of the Swiss Guards in August but to the increasing violence of the Revolution. [NB *franc-tireurs*’ = rebels]

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources B and C

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the motives of those who supported the attack on the Tuileries on 10 August 1792. [40]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Source B sees solemnity; Source C sees also a cool and deliberate act but also uncontrolled mob violence. Source B sees openness, Source C sees calculation. Source B sees legitimate action in favour of liberty; Source C sees unjustified tragedy. Source C refers specifically to the revenge motive – for the desertion of Lafayette, which Source B does not; for Source B it is a more general matter of ‘exercising rights’. For Source C there are no rights, just cowardly bloodshed. Robespierre was a leading player in the alliance between the provincial *fédérés* and the radical sections. His aim was to justify the violence of 10 August and to glorify the motives of those who took part. The Times correspondent was a deeply hostile onlooker anxious to alert conservative foreign opinion to the horrors of revolutionary violence. The killing of over 600 of the King’s Swiss Guard, the treachery of those ‘protecting the king’ and the somewhat ignominious behaviour of the King himself were all traumatizing events and provoked emotional language. Both of these accounts are subjective and from those caught up in the emotion and excitement of events – so both are very useful evidence.



**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

### (c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that popular unrest was the main cause of the fall of the monarchy in August 1792. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The view that popular unrest was the main cause can be set against alternative explanations, such as those more focused on the King's failure to cooperate with more moderate reformers and the strains imposed by war. In Source A, the people have invaded the Tuileries and forced the King to wear the cap of liberty. The source seems to indicate a residual loyalty to the King. The issues here are the use of the veto by the King (e.g. of proposals to confiscate émigré lands) and his dismissal of the radical 'patriot ministers' (Roland and other Girondins on 15 June). There is the feeling that the King is not working within the Constitution and the threat of deposition is evident. From the flight to Varennes in 1791 (the 20 June was the anniversary of this flight) to the reluctant acceptance of the Constitution there was a sense of mistrust, but the *journée* of June 1792 is against a background of failure in war and resentment of émigrés allied to the Austrian and Prussian forces. In Source B, the explanation is not based on war, but on the people exercising rights and the power of the sections of Paris. The power of the 48 sections of Paris had been growing, but the explanation for this is linked to war – with the state of emergency of 11 June and the links between the Paris radicals and the provincial National Guard units coming into the capital with more radical officers. Source C refers to the desertion of Lafayette and the presence of National Guards, but the sans-culottes and the Paris mob are the central protagonists. However, 'uncontrolled patriotism' was a result of war. Both Sources B and C would, for different reasons, like to see popular outrage as the key feature rather than fears and strains brought about by war. Source D refers to the Brunswick manifesto, a direct result of war and war is made a central explanation – the fall of the monarchy being 'an unfortunate necessity' forced on the people by war. The reference to the *émigrés* could be linked to the alliance of *émigrés* with the invading foreign forces. Comment could be made about the supposed encouragement of invasion by the King, but this could lead to the view that the King's failure to work with the Constitution (as in Source A) rather than popular unrest itself was the main cause. This Source does not stress popular anger.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

## The Condition of England 1832-53

### 2(a) Study Source D

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'The permissive 1848 Act'. (line 27) [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of topic.

The reference is to the Public Health Act of 1848, the first major piece of government legislation on this issue following the build-up of pressure in the 1840s. It set up an administrative framework (a General Board and local boards) with a remit to manage sewers and refuse, wells, baths and parks. Candidates need to pick-up on the word 'permissive', explaining it as not applicable everywhere, only where certain conditions were met and local authorities wanted to act, e.g. it did not apply to London or Scotland. There is no need to go into further detail on the precise conditions to be met provided the general limitations, as above, are referred to. The Source, a textbook, clearly puts the Act into a limited context ('uneasy compromise'), downplaying its immediate impact.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences). Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes and responses to disease in the 1830s. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources are referring to cholera, the headline disease that helped to spur an interest in public health. However, they differ markedly in their approach, despite their similar religious origins, Source A, a religious pamphlet, Source B something similar by an Oxford clergyman. The implication of the leaflet (Source A) is to leave well alone, interpreting disease in a traditional and providential way as a warning from God to abandon sin and greed. Contextually this was an important aspect of the Condition of England debate (industrialisation, greed and the extent to which one should encourage or resist it). In contrast, Vaughan Thomas' *Memorials* (Source B) wishes to take preventative action via a cleanliness campaign (of body rather than soul). An improver, he is convinced of the ability of man to do something, rather than just accept it. The differences may be explained using the provenance. The context of Source A is the great cholera outbreak of 1832, explaining a situation which a religious pamphlet can exploit. It clearly strikes a chord but is probably not linked with the established church. In contrast, at a slightly later date, an established Oxford clergyman is clearly active in considering practical solutions, albeit ones based on what proved later to be an inaccurate miasmatic theory of disease ('foul smells coming off stagnant filth'). As evidence one takes a more populist yet traditional view of disease, the other a minority and progressive attitude that was increasingly important. Both are useful and reliable; both seek a wide audience for their views.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that issues of principle (religion and individual liberty) were more important than practical issues (medical, financial and engineering) in delaying effective health reform. [60]**

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

As a group, the Sources have much to say on issues delaying health reform and are divided in their emphasis on principle or practicality. Candidates are likely to take different stances and need to examine the sources with care. Issues of religious principle are raised directly by the 1832 leaflet (Source A) and by Chadwick (Source C) who refers to the sanctity of private property and enterprise all of which override practical solutions that could be taken at the time. The textbook (Source D) broadens the discussion of principles by raising the vexed question of local v central power and to what extent power should be exercised locally. Source B firmly believes in individual action to cleanse person and premises. Own knowledge could extend this by developing the hint in Source D that 'who pays' was another issue of principle, whilst the history of health legislation in the 1840s was of constant deference to local vested interests, weak centralisation and low costs. Opponents of health reform hid very successfully behind such entrenched principles. However, Source D also mentions many practical issues that would take time to be addressed and would inevitably delay effective reform, especially lack of knowledge (who was to judge if Chadwick's pipes were suitable or not?), the sheer size of cities, costs and the distasteful nature of the subject, well attested by reference to the Leicester Chronicle. Vaughan Thomas in Source B clearly demonstrates the lack of accurate medical knowledge (that cholera was caused by foul smells rather than as a water-borne disease). Chadwick in Source C has an active administrative vision but local government was, in practice, still limited, corrupt and ignorant, as Source D points out. Given weak structures, lack of an agreed medical view, the problem finding sufficient clean water, and a public issue which came and went with the epidemics, it could be argued that practical issues overwhelmed any positive response. Whether these issues, or those of principle, prevailed often depended on local circumstances, the particular date of a cholera outbreak or the political situation at the time. Of the four Sources, only C has an extensive vision of reform. Of the other two contemporary Sources, one sees the hand of God, the other purely a personal cleanliness.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

### 3 Italian Unification 1848-70

#### (a) Study Source C

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘A peace has been agreed at Villafranca’ (line 8). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

It would be relevant to mention the background to Villafranca, referring to the war which had started earlier in 1859 and that the ‘peace’ was between France and Austria only: Piedmont was not present at the talks. Some answers might stress the point that Villafranca was more a truce which was preliminary to more substantial talks that led to a formal treaty of peace at Zurich later. Some candidates might comment on the reasons for the peace which enables them to link to the source. Napoleon claims that his ‘principal object’ had been attained, in that Austria had been defeated, and that it was ‘no longer in the interests of France’ to continue the war, partly because Prussia was threatening to mobilise. Particular details about the terms of the peace can also be identified from the Source and elaborated upon, e.g. Lombardy was liberated and it was agreed that France would take responsibility for transferring it to Piedmont. Also, Venice remained under Austrian control, unsurprisingly given that the war was confined to Lombardy and Austrian forces remained supreme in Venetia. In addition, some might mention that the Central Duchies were to be restored to their former rulers (and indicate that this is a point omitted from the Source). Given that only Lombard land was gained the claim that ‘Italy was now a nation’ is misleading which some might comment on. Candidates who are well informed may explain that the reference to a confederacy under the Pope may have been agreed but while never adopted nonetheless highlights Napoleon’s concerns for the integrity of the Papal States, in part for French domestic political reasons.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences). Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

#### (b) Study Sources A and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for public attitudes towards Austria. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

There is much common ground between the Sources. Both agree that the young, including students, in Tuscany and Venice, were enthusiastic in their support of military action against Austria. In both cases it seems such groups preferred the Piedmontese. It is clear that a degree of collaboration was evident in both Tuscany and Venice which Source A suggests was frowned upon in Milan if not in Venice according to Source D. The Sources differ, however, in at least two important respects. Source A gives the impression that hostility to Austria was not as uniform or widespread as suggested by Source D. In Source A, it is suggested that Italians hated each other more than the Austrians whereas in Source D there was no affection for the Austrians regarded as a block to the national cause. In addition, it appears that in 1848-49, according to Source A, there

was a sense of urgency on the part of activists to effect revolution against Austria whereas in Source D the majority were inclined to a more patient and passive approach.

Candidates should be able to offer some evaluation of the Sources. Some might comment on the authorship, stressing the accuracy of each account. The Englishman's journal was for private interest and the diplomat was surely obliged to provide his government with an accurate report of the situation. Indeed, the tone and language of each is measured, objective and matter of fact. As such the difference between the two must be due to factors other than their authorship. The political landscape was very different in 1863 to the situation in 1850. Austria's position had weakened over this time. By the later date, most of Italy had been united (reference to the events of 1859-60 might be made) which might explain the sense of inevitability in Source D that Austria's hold on Venice would not last long, a point which candidates might stress by anticipating the war of 1866. By contrast, the uncertainty and division implied by Source A might be explained by the haphazard nature of the revolutions of 1848-49 and the depth of regional sentiment throughout the peninsula.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

### (c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Austria was too weak to resist the unification of Italy. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

It is possible to show that Austria was too weak to resist unification but also to construct a case to refute this view. The Sources may be used differently by candidates as they are open to varying interpretations. Two Sources seem to illustrate the weakness of Austria clearly. Source B shows her to be controlled by the coalition of Piedmont and France and her power being reduced. Candidates should be able to explain the terms agreed in the meeting at Plombières which anticipated the removal of Austria from Lombardy, Venetia and the Central Duchies to create a Kingdom of North Italy. [NB *The agreement is incorrectly dated - as is, therefore, the cartoon. Some candidates might realise this and explicitly say so. Whether 1858 or 1859, the date is not going to alter or affect either way any argument they may wish to make. However, allowance is to be made if there is any hint in the answer that the candidate has been thrown by the factual error on the question paper. If in any doubt, refer to your Team Leader.* Some might qualify this by emphasising the difference between the plan of 1858 and the reality of war in 1859 which ended prematurely and fell short of expectations in that Venetia remained under Austria. Source D appears to confirm Austrian weakness. Austria has lost the support of the Venetians and, despite the co-operation of a minority, the majority anticipate that Venetia will be joined to Piedmont in the near future. Candidates could comment on the momentum generated by the events of 1860 and the removal of Austrian influence in the Central Duchies, the vulnerable position of Austria

diplomatically, isolated from all the major powers, in part because of her stance on the Crimean War. Although relations with Prussia were reasonable in 1863 – they worked together on the Holstein and Schleswig question – Bismarck was in power and he aimed to confront Austrian power, to which end he was prepared to ally with Piedmont in 1866 which resulted in the loss of Venetia itself. At face value Source C also appears to suggest that Austria's power has been exposed as too weak to resist unification. However, informed candidates will point to the propaganda nature of this passage and its inherently misleading message. Despite its bombast, Italy was far from being a nation and the only territory lost by Austria was Lombardy. Further, the battles named were closely contested and the strength of Austrian arms they revealed was one reason why the French offered a truce. Candidates may be able to quantify this, explaining that French forces numbered about 200,000 but casualties were very high. Source A certainly shows Austria to be strong enough to withstand and recover from the revolutions of 1848-49. Rebels in Milan fled, and some conservative voices in Florence, at least, believed the Italian cause to have been reversed. Candidates should be able to elaborate on the events of 1848-49, expanding on the oblique reference to Charles Albert and the fighting in the north, referring to the defeats they suffered at Custoza in 1848 and at Novara in 1849, as well as the divisions between Italians (both in terms of aims and methods), acknowledged by the author. A judgement that explains how the sources show a gradual weakening of Austria over time would be sensible. Indeed, the events of the period, culminating in Austria's expulsion from Italy, confirm that Austria was, ultimately, not strong enough to resist unification.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.



## The Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61

### 4(a) Study Source C

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the abuse of the powers they had delegated to Congress’ (lines 15-16). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

Answers may well focus on the issue of state rights, linking that to Southern grievances and the secession of the Southern states that had recently taken place. The Source needs to be used to show why Davis thought Congress had ‘abused’ its powers to the disadvantage of the South. Credit can be given for linking this to ‘deep-seated resentment’. Some may note from the Source that the key concept is ‘delegated’. The point of this is that the Southern states argued that they were sovereign states. They had voluntarily joined the Union as sovereign states and could, therefore, resume the powers they had ‘delegated’ to a federal Union at any time they wished – which they had recently proceeded to do by secession (1860-61). As the introduction to Source C states, Lincoln was seen as having denied them this ‘right’ by judging secession to be ‘rebellion’. Davis’ *Message* was the reply of the Southern, seceded states.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences). Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence that the economic policies of the Union were unjust to the South. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The two Sources express similar views. Both come from Southern politicians and the differences between them are found in detail and in emphasis. Calhoun (Source A) explains more precisely how, in his view, the financial policies of the Union lead to a transfer of national wealth from the South to the North. Reagan (Source B) expresses the same view that the South is exploited by the North, but he puts it in more generalized terms. His tone is more emotive and he threatens retaliation. These differences may be accounted for by the passage of time: in 1850, secession was unthinkable whereas in January 1861 secession had begun and civil war seemed very possible. As evidence that the South was treated unfairly by the economic policies of Union, however, the two Sources give only one side of the question.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that economic grievances were the main reason why the Southern States opted for secession. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Sources A, B and C all indicate that economic issues featured largely in the South's litany of grievances –naturally, since they are all from Southern politicians. However, there is no indication in them that the economic grievances they enumerate are the main source of Southern discontent, and Source C explicitly draws attention to the slavery issue as being at least equally important. Source D broadens the discussion, identifying the fundamental issue as freedom versus slavery and linking the economic growth of the North (which underlay the complaints in the other Sources) to political dominance which threatened the South's whole system of values. Own knowledge that could be used might include reference to: aspects of the slavery issue during the 1850s (e.g. abolitionism, Dred Scott, etc.), further explanation of economic issues such as the tariff question, sectionalism, constitutional issues.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

## The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93

### 5 (a) Study Source D

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘boycotting’ (line 16).  
[20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

In September 1880 Parnell spoke at Ennis and recommended a ‘species of moral Coventry’ to be applied to enemies of the Land League – i.e. a rigid denial of all social or commercial contact with their neighbours. There was rhetoric about treating enemies as lepers, for instance if they bid for farms of evicted tenants. In October 1880 the policy was applied to Captain Boycott, an evicting land agent in County Mayo. One sixth of British military forces in Ireland had to be sent to protect them. Boycott was forced to leave Ireland. There was a thin line between legitimate political activity and this sort of direct action which was likely to lead to violence and rural unrest. Davitt may have been proud, as in the Source, but it was leading to harsher government action and putting Parnell in a difficult position, so much so that he was glad to be arrested! The economic background of depression, falling farm incomes and desperation is significant, as is the increased solidarity and effectiveness of tenant action.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences). Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for the likely support for revolt among the Irish people.  
[40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

In Source A, Butt is taking the view of the essential conservatism of the Irish peasantry – a point vindicated by the subsequent land reforms and their effects, perhaps. In Source B, the cartoon takes a more stereotypical view and the peasant is drawn inexorably towards violence and ‘communism’ (a very hostile view of the Land League). Both Sources agree on ‘misgovernment’ (Source A line 1) that has driven the peasantry to revolt. But in Source B this revolt has arisen out of ‘ignorance’ and political agitation by Parnell, not from ‘wrong’ and injustice, and there is no political dimension. The very hostile, almost ‘racist’ tone of Source B (the English cartoon) appealing to a popular readership at a time when there was concern about agrarian unrest is in very marked contrast to the more measured and reflective tones of Source A, a lawyer speaking in Parliament.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the main problem that British governments faced in Ireland from 1877 to the early 1880s came from political rather than social and economic factors. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context based on set of sources and own knowledge.

The proposition may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for - but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use all four Sources, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge. The issue here is whether the root of the problem was a desire for Home Rule and constitutional change or whether the depression and subsequent evictions and rural violence were the key factors. Source A stresses political issues in that a measure of Home Rule is seen likely to end the troubles by showing justice and good intention by Britain. Wrongs could include poor handling of social and economic issues like the Famine. However as a parliamentarian and moderate political reformer, Butt is not stressing the primacy of the sort of economic problems referred to in Source C. The cartoon (Source B) has a strong emphasis on ‘Parnell’s Political Petroleum’ showing the importance of the political factor of Parnell linking parliamentary agitation with the agrarian unrest by his support for the Land League. The restraining hand of the church suggests a moral tone – Ireland being drawn to disaffection and anarchy not for legitimate social and economic reasons but to worship the devil, anarchy – graphically portrayed in the figure emerging from the fire. The populist nature of the images at a time of increasing violence in Ireland hardly makes this a balanced comment, for instance the reference to ‘communism’. The historian in Source C sets the agitation firmly within an economic context and considers the social struggle between tenant and landlord. However, it is the linking of political and economic factors here which is emphasized. Agrarian unrest has burnt itself out before, but now it is sustained by political organization. Parnell’s role here could be explained and analysed. Note the reference to the fragility of the alliance – already breaking down when Parnell was imprisoned in 1881. Source D refers to economic grievances – relief to evicted people, and this could be explained, as could the conflicts with landlords and put in a social-economic context. However, this Source does show a strong political influence – Davitt is clearly attracted to the political possibilities of the growing strength of the League, founded to help the economic problems of the tenants. Hence the reference to ‘the complete government’ – not refuted in any way - and the satisfaction of the growing social base of the movement – perhaps a reference to Parnell and the Home Rule party. However, the influence and potential of the League are probably exaggerated in the heat of the excitement of such things as the support for boycotting (only a couple of months before this letter).

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only ‘own knowledge’ will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

## England in a New Century 1900-18

### 6 (a) Study Source B

**From this Source and your own knowledge explain the reference to ‘New Liberalism’. [20]**

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

By the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the ideas of Gladstonian Liberalism were being challenged within the Liberal party by what became known as ‘New Liberalism’. These new ideas are associated with such figures as Hobson, Hobhouse, Masterman, Lloyd George, Churchill, and even Asquith. ‘New Liberals’ believed that industrialised nations (“The evergrowing complications of civilization”, Source B line 8) required a more collectivist approach to government policy with greater state intervention in social and economic policy, especially for the working classes (“universal state provision of minimum standards of life and labour” as Source B line 10 puts it). In this Source, it is clear that Churchill is concerned that “the cause of the left-out millions” should be a main priority for the newly-elected Liberal government. That happened, producing e.g. the first Old Age Pensions (1908), the National Insurance Act (1911). It was a major thrust of the Peoples’ Budget (1909). Churchill, Lloyd George and others also saw the championing of such issues in terms of political tactics as a way to head-off the emerging Labour party. During the years 1906-14, ‘New Liberalism’ was a driving force behind the Liberal welfare reforms. Some credit may be given to mention of the social reformers linked to the ideas of New Liberalism.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

### (b) Study Sources C and D

**Compare these Sources as evidence for differing views on the benefits of the Liberal government’s National Insurance Act. [40]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Source C (an official Liberal Party poster) is obviously supportive of Liberal reform; whereas Source D (Beatrice Webb’s personal diary) is mainly critical. Both Sources centre on the 1911 National Insurance proposals. Source C promotes support for the social reforms in general; but concentrates particularly on the health provisions of the 1911 Bill. Lloyd George (in best bed-side manner) is shown illustrating the positive benefits of his scheme. The poster suggests a new and glorious dawn. As this is a Government poster, candidates may suggest that the Source shows bias. Source D gives a rather different picture. All the evidence here suggests that Webb does not think that the Government’s scheme has gone far enough to provide security for the working classes. Whereas Source C suggests that the Government is acting from the best of humanitarian motives, Source D is strongly of the opinion that the 1911 scheme is principally designed to ‘dish’ the Labour Party.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge assess the view that providing a better future for the working classes was the main aim of Liberal welfare policies in the period from 1900 to 1914. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Source C (the Liberal poster) strongly supports the above assertion: although it could be argued that such a poster is obviously designed to win political support for the Liberal Government. Candidates might support the “humanitarian” view by describing the many much-needed social reforms of this era. Lloyd George’s famous slogan ‘nine pence for four pence’ might be apt here. Source B can also be seen as supporting the emphasis on improving the condition of the poor. In this Source, Churchill (like Lloyd George, one of the New Liberals) lays down the welfare philosophy of the newly-elected Liberal government. However, answers may also point out that there was a growing argument for reform based upon concerns of national efficiency; and hints of this argument may perhaps be detected in Churchill’s remarks. On the other side of the debate, Source A suggests that as early as 1904, nearly two years before the Liberals came to power, Lloyd George was already arguing that welfare policies would be needed to preserve the Liberals in government and to fight off the growing challenge from Labour. According to this Source (a party political speech ahead of the coming general election), political reasons for policies of social reform are at least as important as humanitarian concerns. Source D also supports the idea that the Liberals were not simply concerned with improving the lives of the poor. And by 1911, the direction of Liberal policy had become much clearer. Beatrice Webb (Source D) is suspicious of Liberal motives on two main grounds. Firstly, their welfare reforms do not go far enough. Secondly, they are clearly designed to undermine the appeal of the Labour party. Supporting contextual knowledge (on both sides of the judgement) might include: details of the main Liberal welfare reforms; progress made (or not) in the fight against poverty; and the degree of advance made by Labour as the challenger to the Liberal party’s position as the main non-Conservative party.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only ‘own knowledge’ will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.



**Nazi Germany 1933-45****7(a) Study Source A**

**From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the Nazi propaganda which has terrified you with its Bolshevik scare stories’ (lines 6-7). [20]**

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of topic.

Many answers may start with a brief reference to the Nazis’ attempts of the past twenty years to build up the fear of the danger posed to Germany and German values by the USSR, by communists and by communism. Linkage could then be made to ‘German security’ (line 7). Some answers may go further by pointing up the linkage that the Nazis argued existed between Communism and the Jews – the international conspiracy. The Scholls here encourage Germans to think as individuals and challenge the Nazis’ now dominant ideology. Credit may be given for contextual reference to the German/Russian war.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

**Band I** will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

**Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

**(b) Study Sources B and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the ways in which Germans reacted to the pressures of war. [40]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both the Sources show differing ways in which the Germans responded to the pressures of war. Source B is an official summary coming from the *Gauleiters* (increasingly influential as war went on). It is a negative response to the regime which blames party members for not having the initiative to do anything to counter the increasingly gloomy mood. A more positive, though also resigned, attitude is found in Source C. Source C talks of a ‘fatalistic obstinacy, a dogged determination’ (line 20). The mood in Germany depicted in Source B is very different: wartime difficulties are producing criticism of the regime. Both Sources reflect something of the impact of war on German society, but each shows a different way in which the impact on the civilian population was manifested. The provenance of both is worthy of comment: Source B is an official report whose tone and approach refers to all of Germany yet considers criticisms, whereas Source C is a post-war reflective comment from a potential enemy on her solidarity with the people of Berlin.

**Band I** answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

**Band II** will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

**Band III** answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

**Band VI** answers will paraphrase.

**Band VII** answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

**(c) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Hitler's popularity was seriously damaged by the effects of war.** [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Source A illustrates how a minority turned to active protest against the regime, prompted by the pressures of war. Consideration might be given to how typical and popular these views were. Source B suggests the regime faced serious problems from amongst its grassroots supporters and, by implication, from unrest among the wider population. Both Sources A and B need to be weighed against wider knowledge and the view that the Hitler regime stayed largely popular until 1944 or possibly even 1945. Source C reflects the stoic ability of people determined in their sufferings to withstand the privations of warfare and try to survive – what does it tell us about the levels of Hitler's popularity? Source D emphasises that the assassination of the Führer was finally seen by some as the only way to stop the Hitler regime. Source B talks of criticism of the regime, but only Sources A and D show direct opposition (a very dangerous activity in Nazi Germany). From own knowledge, candidates may point out that Hitler's personal popularity was considerable until at least 1944, although reference might be made to the White Rose's demonstration in January 1943 in response to disastrous news from Stalingrad (a protest that led to their arrests & executions). Some may seek to distinguish between different periods within the war years, emphasising Hitler's massive popularity during the triumphant victorious years 1939-41 as well as pointing up the very significant contrast between that and his waning popularity in 1944 and 1945; in the early years of the war, Hitler had been proved 'right', and his doubting generals wrong. That was why, until at least 1944, most senior Army officers continued to support him – although there were four known plans by Army officers in 1943 to assassinate Hitler. Some may consider other reasons for opposition to Hitler that emerged during the war years, e.g. in the catholic church from 1940-41 over the euthanasia programme (e.g. Cardinal Galen's sermon of August 1941 that then circulated in underground copies). When answers seek to address 'seriously damaged', they might ask questions about the difficulty for us of knowing the extent of unpopularity – criticism, let alone stronger action, was very dangerous. Equally, some may consider the dilemma posed to many by criticism/opposition, especially in the armed forces. If Hitler was weakened, let alone removed, who but the invading Soviet armies could benefit? So, rather than turning against Hitler, many (as in Source C) simply and obstinately endured "whatever their politics, whatever their beliefs" (Source C line 22), united by the need to survive. Better answers may highlight the difference between Hitler and the Nazi regime, but this is not a requirement for any of the Bands.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**Band I** answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

**Band II** answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

**Band III** answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

**Band IV** answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

**Band VI** answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

**Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.



**Mark Scheme 2583  
June 2005**

**PERIOD STUDIES – ENGLISH HISTORY 1042–1660****England 1042-1100****1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042 - 1066****(a) Why did the Godwin family play an important role during the reign of Edward the Confessor?**

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks 'Why...?' and examiners will look for analysis in answers that are worth the highest bands. Candidates might consider both the 'positive' and 'negative' reasons. Earls occupied an important place in Anglo-Saxon society and the most powerful family in this period was the Godwins. They had a power base in Wessex, at the heart of the country. Earl Godwin probably played a crucial role in the accession of Edward the Confessor. The strength of his position meant that he could pose powerful problems to the King, for example over the influence of Normans in England. Harold succeeded to his position and the role of the family became even more important when Harold emerged as the strongest Anglo-Saxon claimant to the throne. Among the 'negative' aspects might be the personal role of Edward the Confessor. Although not a cipher, he was not a dominant head of state and this enabled the Godwins to play their part to the full.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Why did the Normans have an important influence during the reign of Edward the Confessor?**

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks 'Why?' and examiners will look for analytical structures in the best answers, certainly those in **Band I** and most of those in **Band II**. The Content in the specification that is linked to this Key Issue mentions 'Edward the Confessor's Norman connections, the advancement of Normans in England, William of Normandy and the succession to the throne'. Candidates might consider Edward's upbringing and the reputation of the Normans for efficiency in Church and state. The reasons for William of Normandy's importance before Edward's death can be examined.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

## 2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064 - 1072

### (a) Assess the problems that faced Harold Godwinson in defeating William of Normandy's claim to the English throne.

Focus: Assess the problems of a controversial ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks candidates to 'Assess the problems...' This goes further than description because it requires answers to weigh the importance of Harold's problems. Harold was widely but not universally accepted as king when Edward the Confessor died; his first problem was to establish himself on the throne. Tostig and Harold Hardrada mounted a powerful challenge. William was an important rival. Candidates are not expected to have knowledge of William's rule in Normandy before the invasion but they should know about his careful preparations, including the support from the Pope. At the time of his invasion, Harold was preoccupied with the struggle in the north and had to make a crucial decision about a strategy to defeat William. Candidates will doubtless discuss the Hastings campaign but the better answers will focus on the problems that it posed to Harold. How best should he use the fyrd against William's forces?

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

A ceiling of **Band III** might be appropriate for answers that ignore the invasion. Answers that discuss only the Hastings campaign from the initial stage of William's invasion might be worth up to **Band II** because William presented Harold with a problem before then. However, these guidelines about ceilings need to be applied carefully in the light of the actual answers written.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question. A problem might be answers that discuss only the Battle of Hastings. This is very relevant but alone will not be sufficient to merit a high mark.

### (b) How important were castles to William I's securing his throne and frontiers?

Focus: Assessment of an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks 'How important...?' and most of the answers in **Band I** might be expected to consider how castles compared with other factors but this is not a pre-requisite for this Band. At AS Level, candidates are not expected to show knowledge of historiography, for example about the extent to which there were castles in England before the Norman Conquest, although accurate references will be given credit. The existence or otherwise of castles before 1066 does not really affect the thrust of the question. Castles had an important military role - one of William's first actions on his invasion and after Hastings was to set up strong points or castles, for example at London. Their spread and elaboration, including the use of stone, reflected their importance. The reference to 'frontiers' in the question invites candidates to examine their particular role in the north and west. Castles were an important means of enforcing feudal lordship. Candidates might describe how castles tended to become urban centres that helped to stabilise William's government; the point can be given some credit but will be very peripheral because this was not really the primary reason why they were important to William I. Candidates might write relevantly but generally about the importance of castles in Norman England and not focus particularly on the rule of William I. These can merit high credit but will probably be insufficiently focused on the question set for Band I.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

### 3 Norman England 1066 - 1100

#### (a) How far did William I continue Anglo-Saxon methods of government?

Focus: Assessment of the extent of change in government in an important period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At AS Level, candidates are not expected to show knowledge of the historiographical debate on this topic, although accurate references will be given credit. However, answers in **Band I** can be expected to show some knowledge and understanding of elements of change and continuity. Answers might deal at length with feudalism but the highest credit will be given when this is linked to methods of government. Writs were used, a legacy of Anglo-Saxon government although they were not usually in English and they were used more frequently to enforce William's orders. Sheriffs and shire courts were continued but sheriffs were more evidently more important as royal officials. A change was in the personnel at the top. Normans dominated government. The personal rule of the king became more important.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

#### (b) Evaluate the claim that William II was an enemy of the Church.

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. William II was criticised for his treatment of the Church. Offices were left vacant so that he could take parts of their revenues. The see of Canterbury was not filled after the death of Archbishop Lanfranc in 1089 until the King was persuaded to agree to the appointment of Anselm. Candidates might assess the importance of William II's stormy relations with Anselm that almost led to excommunication. William's character was also controversial. However, candidates might point out that the King's reputation suffered because of the hostility of clerical chroniclers.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. They will focus on the key issue and avoid discursive accounts of other aspects of policy. (Brief accounts might, however, usefully support assessments of William's character.)



**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

#### 4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042 - 1100

##### (a) Evaluate the claim that England's wealth was an important motive for the Norman Conquest.

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question arises from the first Key Issue and related Content in the specification: 'How wealthy was England before the Norman Conquest? The economy and resources of late Anglo-Saxon England, internal and external trade, towns, England's wealth as a motive for the Conquest'. The guidance above should help examiners to understand what candidates can be expected to have studied although, at AS Level, even the most successful answers are unlikely to deal with every aspect. The temptation for limited candidates is that they will ignore the specified issue and write more general accounts of the Conquest. Candidates can merit the highest mark by arguing that other factors were more important but good answers will show a reasonable understanding of the specified factor even if they minimise its importance. As a guide, to be interpreted as always in the light of the quality of individual answers, the responses that virtually ignore England's wealth should be liable to a ceiling of **Band IV**. Answers that completely ignore it should be liable to a ceiling of **Band V**. England was an attractive target for William of Normandy; his aim was not only to secure his 'just' inheritance which was not clear-cut at the time. England was not rich when compared with some regions/countries of the Continent but its agriculture was quite varied and it had many overseas trade links. Taxes were collected efficiently. With this basis, candidates can then examine and assess other factors.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

##### (b) How far did the Norman Conquest benefit English towns?

Focus: Assessment of the economic consequences of an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Answers in **Band I** might be expected to use the instruction 'How far...?' to consider the gains and losses to towns. Some benefited because they became more important centres of administration and/or trade. The best example of this might be London. But others prospered, for example Norwich. Smaller towns grew as the centres of markets. Some developed because they were near castles. The south tended to benefit more than the north. Trade links with the Continent were enhanced. Some candidates might provide local examples; this should be highly rewarded. On the other hand, some small towns lost out as neighbours grew. The destruction of the North led to the decline of some towns although York remained eminent in that region.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

### England 1450-1509

#### 5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450 – 1470

##### (a) Why did some nobles in the mid-fifteenth century become ‘over-mighty subjects’?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks ‘Why...?’ and answers in the higher bands, certainly in **Band I**, should be analytical in approach. The civil strife of the period afforded opportunities to nobles to promote their influence and wealth. There were possibilities to have large numbers of retainers. These not only reflected the important status of nobles but also were available to give support in time of war. Kings used the award of peerages in an attempt to secure safety and loyalty - not very successfully. The nobles often regarded their local influence as superior to a king’s. A weak king exacerbated the problem and candidates can discuss the problems of ‘over-mighty subjects’ during the reign of Henry VI. Examiners should note that the Topic begins in 1450; candidates are not expected for any mark to have specific knowledge of the Minority. However, accurate references will be given credit. From 1450 the King was still troubled by strong nobles with the efforts of Yorkists and Lancastrians to control affairs. Credit should be given when candidates examine the roles of individual nobles such as Warwick and York. The question does not indicate a specific end-point but candidates should be allowed to examine the reign of Edward IV to 1483. The reign of Richard III would be taking ‘mid-fifteenth century’ too far; a brief reference in a conclusion might be acceptable.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

##### (b) Assess the military strengths and weaknesses of the Lancastrians and Yorkists from 1455 to 1461.

Focus: Comparison of problems of participants in a civil war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question is based specifically on a part of the specification but candidates might be allowed some latitude on what they see as military problems. The guidelines below point to issues such as leadership and personality that had direct military implications. The temptation to which moderate candidates might be prone is to record mostly the narrative of events. However, examiners are reminded that narrative means a record of the story that is not linked to an argument. Accurate knowledge that is used to illustrate or underpin explanation and arguments should not be undervalued; the

alternative is vague assertion that is unsubstantiated. For example, it will be valid to point out that warfare was not continuous during the specified period and then to indicate the flow of events to confirm this. The battle of St. Albans (1455) is usually taken as the opening of the Wars of the Roses. At this Yorkist victory, Somerset and Northumberland were killed. In 1459, York was defeated at Ludlow but the Yorkists were to win a decisive victory at Northampton (1460). The battle of Wakefield (1460) resulted in the death of York whilst the Lancastrians were defeated at Mortimer's Cross (1461) and Towton (1461). The problems included the difficulties of the Yorkists in winning support in view of the legal claims of Henry VI and the Lancastrians. The Yorkists benefited because their enemies were led by an indecisive king and the Queen, Margaret of Anjou, was widely unpopular. Neither side was sufficiently strong for most of the period to win a crushing victory. The Yorkists included experienced soldiers who had seen service in France but this advantage should not be exaggerated. The divisions among the nobility meant that local regions were difficult for any one side to control. The size of the armies was relatively small, making it easier for them to range widely but preventing decisive outcomes. Both sides found defence much more difficult to organize than attack. Towton was probably the exception. The size of the armies was larger than in other battles. Bad weather hampered the Lancastrians, more dependent on archers and infantry, than the Yorkists. When assessing answers to this question, examiners should note that they should not expect any balance between similarities and differences. Whilst it is difficult to argue that the problems were identical, a good case can be made out for emphasising one, probably similarities.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

## 6 The End of the Yorkists 1471 – 1485

(a) How far do you agree that Edward IV's handling of the royal finances was the most successful aspect of his government from 1471?

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. During this period, Edward IV was reasonably secure on the throne. The question suggests that the most important reason was financial. Candidates do not have to agree and can offer other explanations and in justifying their greater importance can devote more time to them. However, **Bands I - III** should require at least an adequate understanding of the stated factor even if it relegated in importance. It was an area of policy in which the King was much interested; he has been described as mean in his determination to raise much money and spend less on war (although his personal expense were high). He was determined to restore the financial stability of the crown after the long years of foreign and domestic wars. Acts of resumption were used to regain control of lands. He used more professional men to collect and handle moneys. He kept crown lands and incomes separate from the Exchequer and therefore more directly under his own control. Claims to feudal rights were investigated. The income from trade was increased and evasions were punished. The level of loans to the King diminished. 'Most successful' implies comparison and answers in **Bands I - II** should put finance into the context of other factors. Among issues that might be considered are: the Lancastrians were very weak; Henry VI and his son were dead. He solved the problems with France by an agreement with Louis XI (Treaty of Picquigny 1475). This agreement also enabled trade with France to expand. The fall of Charles the Bold of Burgundy removed another possibility of continental entanglements. Examiners should note that the question does not ask candidates to

consider failure. A relevant point would be that Edward IV was less successful in ensuring a safe succession but this approach is not necessary for any mark.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Why, after he became king, did Richard III face problems in achieving his aims?**

Focus: Analysis of the problems of a controversial king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks 'Why...?' and answers in the higher bands, certainly in **Band I** should be analytical in approach. There is some debate about Richard III's aims although AS Level candidates are not expected to know the historiography. There is no need for candidates to spend considerable time in explaining Richard III's aims; these can be outlined reasonably quickly. But the question is designed to help them to sort out issues such as the issue of control over a factious nobility, the succession and permanence of his dynasty, the maintenance of good government and the strengthening of his finances. Buckingham might be discussed as a prime example of a factious noble. He was behind an early rebellion in the west, supported by some Lancastrians who exemplified the survival of long-standing feuds. Henry Tudor became the leading Lancastrian claimant and his challenge continued directly or indirectly through the reign of Richard III. The King's attempts to win support by grants were unsuccessful and led to accusations of favouritism especially to northerners. The deaths of Queen Anne and their only son were blows. His one Parliament showed that he could produce good laws but his short period on the throne prevents a real judgement of his politician abilities. Much of his reputation as a good administrator depends on the work that he did before his accession for Edward IV. (Examiners should assess carefully accounts of Richard's career under Edward IV; it can be made relevant to the question.) His need to strengthen his support against rebellion and a dangerous rival affected the attempt to strengthen finances.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range. As a broad guide - examiners always have to give priority to what is written to be aware of alternative approaches - answers that describe only the battle of Bosworth will probably be worth no more than **Band V**. Bosworth with some valid explanation of its outcome might be worth **Band IV**.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

## 7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485 – 1509

### (a) How dangerous were Yorkist plots to Henry VII?

Focus: Assessment of particular dangers to a king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The discriminating factor that will characterise answers worth **Bands I-II** will probably be the degree to which they focus on assessments of the Yorkist danger. Henry VII won a decisive victory at Bosworth but his claim by inheritance was not particularly strong and the Yorkists still presented a danger. Marriage to Elizabeth of York was only a partial solution. The King took steps to limit the danger of Yorkist plots. The Earl of Warwick, son of Clarence, was imprisoned until the conspiracies of others provided an excuse for his execution. Candidates will no doubt spend much time on Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck but the highest marks will be awarded to answers that consider the extent to which they were dangerous to Henry VII. There were also others who might be discussed, such as Lovell and Suffolk. In themselves, Simnel and Warbeck presented little danger but they provided a focus for the plots of others in England and overseas, such as Margaret of Burgundy. Ireland was sympathetic to the Yorkists. Henry contained the danger in two ways, by taking firm action when military and diplomatic methods were necessary, and by governing wisely to control a potentially factious nobility. His kingship became stable.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

### (b) How far did Henry VII achieve his aims in foreign relations?

Focus: Assessment of a king's success in foreign policy in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. 'How far' should lead candidates to assess Henry VII's success in his foreign policy but another important characteristic of the better answers will be the quality of the explanation of the King's aims. One aim might be to ensure that foreign states did not undermine his kingship. Another was a development of this, to use foreign policy as a means of ensuring the future stability of the dynasty, for example through the marriage of Katherine of Aragon and Arthur. He tried to separate Yorkist claimants from potential assistance abroad. Henry's care to strengthen his finances meant that he used foreign policy to make trade agreements, for example the Treaty of Medina del Campo (1489) and Magnus Intercursus (1496) which secured trade with the Netherlands and eased relations with Spain. Some candidates might make reference to other measures to strengthen and protect English trade. Relations with Scotland will certainly be relevant. Ireland was not strictly part of foreign policy. If discussed, it can be given a little credit but it should not be a substantial part of the answer.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509****(a) How far do you agree that most of the 'lower orders' became more prosperous during the period from 1450 to 1509?**Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. In evaluating the claim, candidates can consider a range of factors in assessing prosperity but examiners should be realistic in their expectation of range at AS Level. There were periods of good harvests but the pattern was uneven. However, more land was available to former landless families. Peasants gained more freedom from onerous feudal duties and dues. The wool and cloth trades did well during most of this period. Enclosure affected some peasants but others were able to enlarge their flocks. Cloth towns grew and their increased wealth probably benefited the urban poor. But other towns declined. It will be relevant to consider some aspects of 'prosperity' that are not narrowly economic although this is not necessary for any mark band. The specified period might have seen some recovery from the worst problems of the Black Death but plague could be a disastrous recurrence although it was localised and periodic. However, the population appears to have grown, probably reflecting a greater prosperity. This is a topic about which historians disagree about the balance of gains and losses/winners and losers. However, historiography is not an assessment criterion at AS Level. Candidates can deserve the highest mark by good arguments that are very one-sided. The evaluation should include assessment but this should be interpreted within reasonable limits. However, this does not imply that questions on social and economic topics should be marked more 'easily' than other questions.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the strengths of the Church in England during the period from 1450 to 1509.**Focus: Assessment of the condition of the Church.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Among the strengths that might be discussed is the relative freedom from heresy. Lollardy continued but was not a major danger, being mostly limited to outlying regions. There might have been a slight revival at the end of the fifteenth century. Although they were not major figures, the leaders of the church were able and dedicated. The Church itself was a very wealthy institution although there were considerable variations in the wealth of different degrees of clergy. Monastic life and the friars continued to maintain a reasonable standard, in spite of the descriptions that had been written earlier by Chaucer. Anti-clericalism was typical of a later period. There was some building and re-building as well as the foundation of new institutions, including colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. 'Popular' religion from such evidence as gifts and the foundation and maintenance of chantries continued to confirm the strength of the Church. Very high credit should be given to candidates who discuss the elements of change and continuity during the specified period but this is not a requirement, even for **Band I**.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

### England 1509 - 1558

#### 9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509 - 1529

##### (a) Why did Wolsey rise to power during the period from 1509 to 1514?

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for the rise of an important minister.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The discriminating factor that should characterise answers in the two highest mark bands will be their attention to analysis because the question asks 'Why...'. Answers in the other bands might give more attention to 'How...?'. However, examiners should not undervalue sound knowledge that underlies or seeks to prove the points made in an analysis; this should not simply be dismissed as narrative. Henry VIII was an ambitious king who sought to impose himself at home at the top of an active court and abroad by winning a reputation as a successful soldier and diplomat. His laziness during these early years of his reign should not be exaggerated but he was quick to appreciate the usefulness of talented ministers and servants. Wolsey soon impressed the King by his ability and he became a member of the council in 1509. His administrative ability in helping to organise an expedition to France made him more useful to Henry. Wolsey was also a man of considerable personal drive; he was keen to seize the opportunities for advancement. He outwitted the nobles such as Surrey. He was also a willing pluralist, becoming Chancellor and then taking on other duties. By the end of 1514, Wolsey was the King's leading minister. Some candidates might take the argument beyond 1514 -15. This material will not be relevant and examiners are reminded that irrelevance does not lead to the reduction of a mark that would otherwise be given. Irrelevance is ignored inasmuch as candidates get no credit for it and in practical terms are wasting their time. All answers will be given credit according to the positive qualities that they show, whether many or few.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Why did Henry VIII's attitude to Wolsey change by 1529?**

Focus: Analysis of the relationship between a king and an important minister.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The discriminating factor that should characterise answers in the two highest mark bands will be their attention to analysis because the question asks 'Why...'. Answers in the other bands might give more attention to 'How...?'. However, examiners should not undervalue sound knowledge that underlies or seeks to prove the points made in an analysis; this should not simply be dismissed as narrative. There is likely to be much material on the Divorce question and this will be valid because it was the single most important issue in the deteriorating relations between King and minister. Successful answers that might merit a very high mark might show why Wolsey's attempts to solve the problem and satisfy Henry VIII led to his downfall. This might well depend on a chronological approach. Less impressive answers might assert that the Divorce changed Henry's attitude to Wolsey and embark on a version of the story; this will be using narrative less effectively. Some good candidates might look more widely, for example considering the elements that were exposed by the Divorce, such as the ambition of the Boleyn faction, the growing distrust of Katherine of Aragon and her supporters and those who simply wished to bring down an over-mighty minister. The reasons for Wolsey's wider unpopularity can be explained and assessed. By 1529, Henry VIII was surrounded by those who thought ill of Wolsey, who lacked effective supporters.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529 - 1558****(a) Assess how far Thomas Cromwell achieved any two of his aims in government in the 1530s.**

**(Do not include religious changes in your answer.)**

Focus: Assessment of the achievements of an important minister.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question clearly specifies that religious changes will not be relevant and should therefore be ignored in the assessment. This does not exclude a brief mention in an introduction or conclusion but they should not be a part of the main argument. (However, as always, examiners should be ready to consider seriously alternative, but not irrelevant, approaches. It is not easy to distinguish between politics and religion in Tudor history.) At AS Level, candidates are not expected to show knowledge of the historiographical debate on this topic, although accurate references will be given credit. Candidates might consider his administrative reforms including the reform of the Privy Council, his use of Parliament and statute, the greater unification of the country through a strengthening of the Council of Wales and the Marches and the Council of the North, together with policy to Ireland. They might consider his views of national sovereignty or 'empire'. His attitude to kingship can be examined. In **Band I**, answers should focus on explanations of Cromwell's aims and assessments of their achievements. They will define two aims clearly and deal with them in a balanced way. In the two highest Bands, answers should be reasonably balanced in the time given to the achievement of each aim. A balance of 60:40 either way can merit any mark band. A balance of 70:30 will normally lead to the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given. The question does not demand a comparison of success in achieving his aims but normally the answers at the top of **Band I** will include some comparison, perhaps in an introduction or conclusion.



Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How serious for the English monarchy were the financial effects of the wars with Scotland and France from 1542 to 1558?**

Focus: Assessment of the financial effects of war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question arises from the second Key Issue and associated Content of this study Topic: 'What was the impact of foreign relations on domestic affairs? The main events (and the effects on ...finances of) war with Scotland [1542-6 and 1547-50] and with France [1543-6, 1547-50 and 1557-8]'. In this question, examiners can show more leeway in assessing the balance of answers. A balance of 70:30 either way might be enough to merit any mark band because the emphasis should be on the financial impact of the wars rather than on their events. War was expensive and the crown was generally short of money. To worsen the situation, the wars were generally unsuccessful. The financial pressures added to the causes of inflation as governments tried to remedy the situation. On the other hand, the monarchy and its governments under Edward VI tended to ignore finance when framing policies. Wars might not have seemed particularly serious in their financial effects to those who waged them in the sixteenth century.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**11 Church and State 1529 - 1558**

**(a) How far do you agree that the Church in England did not need major reforms in 1529?**

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Candidates might disagree with the claim in the question but it is designed to help them to consider some of the positive features of the Church on the eve of the Reformation. The question does not claim that the Church was free of problems but that there was not a major need for reform. At AS Level, candidates are not expected to show knowledge of the historiographical debate on this topic, although accurate references will be given credit. Candidates might consider the evidence that people still volunteered money to the Church, for example in wills. Lutheranism and Lollardy had few supporters although in their different ways, both were significant. Candidates can assess the condition of the clergy. It might be argued that they were evidence of major problems or that the situation was no worse than in the past. Anti-clericalism was a problem for the Church but it was

not a new phenomenon, nor were anti-papal feelings. Reference might be made to Hunne's case or to Simon Fish. The significance of Wolsey as a leading figure in the Church will be very relevant.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Who did more to make England a more Protestant country by 1553, Somerset or Northumberland? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Comparison of the religious policies of two important ministers in a time of change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question is based on a comparison, which should indicate how candidates should best structure their answers. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance. 60:40 either way can merit any mark Band whereas 70:30 might normally lead to the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given. **Band V** will require a basic understanding and knowledge of one of the ministers. A case can be made out for either Somerset or Northumberland but most might well agree that Northumberland went further than Somerset, for example in the 1552 Prayer Book which was more Protestant than that of 1549. There was more destruction of Catholic representations in churches (iconoclasm) and the attack on the Church's wealth was more evident. More radical appointments were made, for example Ridley (London) and Hooper (Gloucester). This is not to minimise the changes under Somerset. He ended the prosecution of Protestants and opened the way to continental Protestants to come to England. Treason and heresy laws were repealed. Chantries were abolished. A moderate Prayer Book was introduced in 1549. Somerset's policies provoked resistance, for example the rebellion in Cornwall, but did not halt the tendency to Protestantism. Some might argue that the survival of Catholicism meant that both had limited success, a valid point but not one that makes the question meaningless. Candidates shouldn't that the question ends in 1553. The reign of Mary I will not be relevant unless referred to briefly.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**12 Social and Economic Issues 1509 - 1558****(a) How far were towns affected by changing trade patterns during the period from 1509 to 1558?**

Focus: Assessment of urban change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Candidates can spend some time explaining 'changing trade patterns' as long as this does not become too descriptive. Answers in **Band I** will be guided by 'How far..?' to consider benefits and losses. However, examiners will not be looking for balanced answers. Candidates are likely to concentrate more on towns that grew and this approach can merit even **Band I** although probably not the highest marks in this band. London can be used as a prime example. It continued to be the most important centre of trade and thus attracted a growing population across wide social groups. Some new trades, for example coal, helped some towns in the north east such as Newcastle. Some candidates might refer to local examples which can be given high credit. In the west, Bristol gained from the greater volume of overseas trade. Nevertheless, most towns saw little change in this period beyond those caused by the impact of inflation and enclosure, which can be given a little credit but hardly signified changing trade patterns.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How successful were governments in dealing with enclosures during the period from 1509 to 1558?**

Focus: Assessment of governments' success in dealing with a major social and economic development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question is based on an assessment and the answers in the two highest bands will focus on evaluations whereas the answers in the lower bands might well tend more towards descriptions. The major problem in curbing enclosure was that they befitted some of the more influential groups in society, landlords on whom governments relied for effective local government. Some were MPs and many were connected to important political figures. The profits from enclosure were one means of alleviating the effects of rising costs and prices. Legislation depended on the often unwilling co-operation of these groups. Some good candidates might point out that the problem of enclosures was very regional; the total was small but the effects were severe in particular places. Wolsey made efforts to limit enclosures (1517, 1518, 1526) but, in addition to the opposition referred to above, he was distracted by his many other responsibilities. Cromwell had similar problems when he tried to tackle enclosures (1539). The inflation of the 1540 saw an increase in enclosures in spite of the criticism of the practice by Commonwealth Men. Somerset took the problem seriously especially in the face of riots. He promoted the Hales Commission (1547) but his position was weak and his fall ended real efforts by governments in this period to deal with the problem.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

### England 1547 – 1603

#### 13 Church and State 1547 - 1603

(a) How far had Mary I achieved the restoration of Roman Catholicism by the time of her death in 1558?

Focus: Assessment of the success of a controversial religious policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Answers in **Band I** will be guided by 'How far..?' to consider Mary's successes and failures. However, examiners will not be looking for balanced answers. Candidates are likely to be very critical about her achievement and can gain very high marks by taking this approach but they should consider alternatives. Candidates might see as positive achievements the re-introduction of Roman Catholicism as the state religion. On the other hand, it was clear that she would not be able to reverse the financial losses of the Church or restore monasteries. These measures would have alienated powerful social groups. Marriage can be seen as a religious policy and she succeeded in making a match with Philip of Spain although candidates might question how successful this was. She was successful in suppressing a major rebellion led by Wyatt but achieved little in putting down popular opposition in spite of harsh persecution. Nevertheless, candidates might argue that this was the opposition of a minority and most people were content to accept the changes. The question specifies the end point as 'the time of her death in 1558'. However, examiners can allow candidates to use evidence from the early years of Elizabeth I's reign to support their claims. This will not be irrelevant.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How widely supported was the Church of England at the time of Elizabeth I's death in 1603?**

Focus: Assessment of the religious condition of England in a specified period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Candidates can deal with a wide variety of factors in their arguments. They can examine the Church of England directly and can also take a more indirect approach by considering the state of Roman Catholicism and Puritanism. However, a major characteristic of answers in the two highest bands will be that they will concentrate on the end of Elizabeth I's reign. **Band I** will also normally need more emphasis on the direct than the indirect approach. The Queen gave her full support to the Church and could rely on Church leaders who were generally able. Whitgift was an active archbishop whilst Hooker provided intellectual support. Most of the population conformed, apparently happily. The Queen's policies were sufficiently broad to be acceptable to most people, including the most important social groups. Catholicism was in decline partly because of the effectiveness of official policy, partly because of the divisions between its exponents and partly because of the lack of priests who could minister to believers. Puritanism was also not as active as it had been earlier. Candidates can look ahead to the early years of James I's reign but should not take the argument too far in this direction.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**14 Foreign Affairs 1547 - 1587**

**(a) How did the developing situation in the Netherlands affect Elizabeth I's foreign policy to 1585?**

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for an important aspect of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question ends in 1585 and few candidates will probably attempt to take the argument further. Candidates might consider the strategic importance of the Spanish Netherlands to England, the religious implications of the Revolt where radical Protestants wanted Elizabeth I to give open support to the rebels, the repercussions for relations with Spain which was the strongest Catholic country in Europe, and trade because of the traditional reliance of the English wool trade on outlets in the Low Countries. Competing pressure groups causes internal problems for Elizabeth I in framing policy whilst external factors meant that the Netherlands could not be ignored. The Netherlands had a strategic importance.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How successfully did Elizabeth I handle relations with Scotland from 1559 to 1587?**

Focus: Assessment of the success of a particular aspect of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question arises from the third Key Issue and associated Content, 'What were the main factors that affected Anglo-Scottish relations between 1559 and 1587? The Franco-Scottish threat 1559-60, Mary Queen of Scots in Scotland (1561-68) and in England (1568-87)'. Most candidates will probably conclude that Elizabeth I was very successful but answers in **Band I** and most answers in **Band II** should consider alternative judgements. Elizabeth was faced with an immediate problem in Scotland because of the link between Mary and France, especially the very Catholic Guise group. England might also be dragged into the political and religious unrest in Scotland. Although the outcome was successful, it was uncertain for a long time and exposed the inexperience of the new English queen. But Mary's claims to be heir or even the rightful ruler of England continued to be a factor in Anglo-Scottish relations and the situation as complicated when Mary fled to England. In an option on English history, candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of internal affairs in Scotland but should be aware of the impact on England of the continuing uncertainty in that country. Stability had been achieved by 1587 but at a cost, including the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, that Elizabeth had so long tried to avoid.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558 – 1603****(a) How successfully did Elizabeth I handle factions in her court and government to 1603?**

Focus: Assessment of a ruler's success in dealing with a major problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. There is no need to differentiate between court and government in answers but they need to show a basic understanding of faction for **Band V**. In these moderate answers, the treatment of factions is likely to be very broad. However, even in **Band I** examiners are not looking for sophisticated treatment at AS Level. A problem might be the answers that interpret 'faction' too widely, for example to include Puritans as a separate faction and hence to discuss religious policies. There were religious elements for example in Leicester's sympathy with Puritanism but candidates should be careful in their definitions. Candidates can examine Elizabeth I's methods and policies in dealing with factions. She tried to maintain a balance, for example between the William Cecil/Burghley and the Leicester groups, then between the Robert Cecil and Essex groups. This was reasonably successful until Essex's rebellion left Robert Cecil unchallenged in the last years of the reign. She tried to use her patronage both to create loyalty to herself and to avoid the emergence of an over-mighty minister. William Cecil was eminent but not pre-eminent. Some excellent candidates might point out that factions sometimes co-operated with each other against the Queen; Cecil and Leicester were not always in a state of rivalry. Elizabeth was sometimes isolated, for example over Mary, Queen of Scots. Candidates might conclude that Elizabeth was mostly but not completely successful.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How far would you agree that Elizabeth I's government was a failure after 1588?**

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question arises from the third Key Issue and associated Content in the specification: 'How far, and why, did the popularity and effectiveness of Elizabeth I's government decline after 1588? The pressures of the war against Spain, financial problems, the Irish Rebellion, Essex's Rebellion, the parliament of 1601 and the monopolies debate'. Answers in **Band I** can be expected to deal with most, but not necessarily all, of these issues. Some might supplement them by looking at the Queen's growing personal isolation or the succession issue. Some might look at the social and general economic problems. Most candidates will agree with the claim but answers in this band should consider the limitations of the claim. The Irish rebellion was put down. Elizabeth's position was not seriously threatened. There was religious peace with the decline of Roman Catholicism and Puritanism.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. They will concentrate on an assessment of the reign during the relevant period. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**16 Social and Economic Issues 1547 - 1603**

**(a) How far, during the period from 1547 to 1603, was English trade affected by the collapse of the Antwerp cloth market (1551)?**

Focus: Assessment of the an important economic development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question arises from the third Key Issue and associated Content in the specification, 'The collapse of the Antwerp cloth market, changing patterns of trade with northern Europe, the opening of new overseas markets'. Antwerp had been England's most important overseas market for the vital cloth trade. Attempts to build up London to provide an alternative had failed. Therefore, the collapse of Antwerp as a trading centre, gradual from the middle of the century but increasingly obvious from the onset of the Dutch Revolt and especially after the 'Spanish Fury' (1576) was a major blow to the English economy generally; the effects were not limited to cloth. Candidates might explain briefly why cloth was so important; the various stages of production made it an outstanding source of wealth as well as the major provider of employment in the country. Candidates can consider other changes in trade ('the **most** important change..?') but many of these were linked to Antwerp's collapse. Attempts were made to develop other markets in Europe but these were largely unsuccessful because of the worsening diplomatic situation with war between France and Spain and then civil war in France. Spain tightened up its monopoly within its empire. New companies were launched, for example the Muscovy and Levant Companies, either to exploit new markets or to maximise trade with previously minor markets. There were attempts to find new routes to the Indies (the North West and North East Passages). Hawkins and others sought to exploit trade in the Caribbean but Spain's hold over the region was quite secure. Reference might

be made to develop settlements in North America (Virginia). The overall level of success was very limited in this period. The answers should focus on trade and take care to link other factors to this. For example, those who continued to rely very heavily on wool and the production and sale of cloth tended to suffer. Those who could diversify or who could exploit their tenants more effectively did better. The crown generally suffered because Elizabeth I especially did not adapt to the changing sources of wealth to revise taxes. However, these aspects are very peripheral to the question and are not pre-requisites for any mark.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How important were developments in industry, such as mining and manufacturing, during the period from 1547 to 1603?**

Focus: Assessment of particular economic developments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. England was still a pre-industrial society but there were signs of change, although the economic problems that prevailed throughout most of the period prevented major changes. The specification mentions mining and manufacturing but some candidates might relevantly, but not necessarily, mention other factors. Some places saw improvements in the cloth industry, largely promoted by immigrants who settled in places nearest the Continent such as Kent and East Anglia. Building was encouraged by the large-scale wealth of some. Stone began to replace timber and encouraged stone mining whilst coal was used more for heating the houses of the rich, promoting trade especially with the north-east. The demand for luxury goods meant that those who were involved in their production and sale benefited. Many towns were still dominated by guilds but the organisation of industry changed in some places. But elsewhere new companies developed along similar lines to the guilds, such as the Mines Royal Company. Answers might argue that these developments were not very important in an economic context that was more static and this approach can be given full value but candidates in the two highest bands should be aware of some changes that they can assess.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.



**England 1603 - 1660****17 Politics and Religion 1603-1629****(a) How far do you agree that both James I and Charles I, to 1629, handled their Parliaments badly?**

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. In the two highest bands, answers should show a sound knowledge of the relationship of both kings, to 1629, and their Parliaments but the shorter relevant period of Charles I's reign means that examiners will not expect an even balance between the two periods. Most answers are likely to agree with the claim in the question but **Band I** answers can be expected to consider the alternative and most answers in **Band II** will do so - but this is guidance and should not be interpreted as prescriptive. In support of the claim, it might be argued that both Stuart kings were tactless in their approach to Parliament and its position in government. Until his last years, James I insisted on his rights and appeared to deny Parliaments a significant role. Charles I took a similar line. However, members were increasingly coming from influential social groups that sought a greater role in public affairs. Candidates might examine areas of policy that proved unpopular although time will prevent much detail, even in the best answers, because both domestic and foreign policies will be relevant. Against the claim, it can be argued that Parliaments did not appreciate the problems, e.g. financial pressures on the kings and that the proposed policies of critics (e.g. in favour of intervention in the Thirty Years' War) might have caused more problems.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How far do you agree that Charles I's most serious problem to 1629 was his shortage of money?**

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Candidates can agree or disagree with the claim in the question. However, they are expected to deal with it satisfactorily for a mark in **Band III** or higher. This does not imply that it must occupy a major part of answers. Candidates can claim that other problems were more serious and therefore justifiably give less attention to Charles I's financial difficulties. Some answers might consider only the King's shortage of money. In most cases, this would point to a ceiling of **Band II** because the question asks about 'the most serious problem'. Charles I was faced immediately with a financial problem because of Parliament's virtual refusal to grant supplies as a protest against the influence of Buckingham and foreign policy. The King's use of a Forced Loan (1626-27) made matters worse; there was widespread resistance to the levy. Arbitrary taxation became an important feature of the Petition of Right and the Three Resolutions (1628). Other problems of Charles I might be seen in his unpopular marriage and the hostility to Buckingham. Foreign policy such as the La Rochelle expedition was both unpopular and a failure. Candidates might consider other parts of the Petition of Right such as the protest against billeting, martial law and arbitrary imprisonment. Puritanism was becoming stronger and opposition to the King's religious policies was added to the Three Resolutions.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

## 18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629 - 1649

(a) **Assess the aims of the parliamentary opposition to Charles I from the meeting of the Short Parliament in 1640 to the outbreak of civil war in 1642.**

Focus: Analysis of the aims of an important political group.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question specifies the approach that the answers; examiners will be looking for (1) explanation rather than description and (2) a focus on the aims of the opposition to Charles I. This should be supported by appropriate factual support. Very high credit should be given to answers that explain how, and how far, the aims changed during these years. In 1640, Pym and others sought to prevent a recurrence of the long period of personal rule. The Short Parliament refused to grant the funds that the King needed so badly before they had received guarantees or satisfaction for their grievances. It will be relevant to explain the King's growing unpopularity from 1629 to 1640 but candidates should not spend too much time on this; the key issue is about the period 1640-42. By 1642, the aims and demands of the more radical group had become more extreme. Charles's decision to summon the Long Parliament was a sign of weakness; he had no alternative. Members were generally united in their aim to remove unpopular ministers such as Stafford and Laud. They sought to remove the means by which the King had ruled 'arbitrarily', for example by ending unparliamentary taxation such as Ship Money, Forest Fines and Knighthood Fees. Prerogative courts were abolished: Star Chamber and the courts of the Councils of Wales and the Marches and the North. There were attacks on the Church, for example the Root and Branch Bill that showed the aims in religion. However, this also revealed growing splits in Parliament between the moderates and the more extreme members. This was underlined in the Grand Remonstrance. The Irish Rebellion led to the dispute about control of the militia where again the radicals demonstrated their more extreme aims. By now, more moderate members were willing to make a settlement with a King whose freedom of action had been limited.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How far do you agree that Charles I lost the First Civil War (1642-46) because of his financial weakness?**

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Candidates can agree or disagree about the importance of finance in deciding the outcome of the First Civil War. However, they are expected to deal with it satisfactorily for a mark in **Band III** or higher. This does not imply that financial weakness (and by implication the financial strength of Parliament) must occupy a major part of answers. Candidates can claim that other factors were more important and therefore justifiably give less attention to finance. Charles I was forced to rely largely on gifts from his supporters. These were adequate in the early stages of the war but dried up later as defeat, confiscations and fines hit the royalists. As the war proceeded, the King had to rely on piecemeal measures. Parliament mostly controlled the revenues that came from normal taxes, which continued to be paid. Reference might also be made to Pym's Excise. Parliament's handling of money was more efficient (although this does not imply that it was very efficient); the county committees proved useful. Charles's support tended to come from the less prosperous parts of the country; London was a major financial as well as a strategic loss. Parliament controlled most of the major ports and the ensuing revenues from trade. Among other factors that candidates might consider is leadership, the New Model Army, and geographical factors that made it difficult for Charles I to formulate an effective strategy that would win London, the vital prize. A few candidates might range more widely, for example the King's inability to secure foreign aid or Parliament's alliance with the Scots.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**19 The Interregnum 1649-1660**

**(a) Why did Oliver Cromwell become Lord Protector in 1653?**

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for a controversial historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks 'Why...?' and examiners will be looking for answers that are analytical in approach when awarding the two highest bands. Candidates might take one of two approaches. They might focus narrowly on 1653, from the dismissal of the Rump to the Parliament of the Saints (Barebones) to the establishment of the Protectorate in the Instrument of Government. Alternatively, they might take a longer view to show how previous governments had failed Cromwell and why he resorted to the Instrument of Government. Both approaches can achieve the highest mark but candidates should take care in taking the second route. It can be reasonable for them to begin in 1648-49 with emergence of the Rump and the execution of Charles I but it difficult to see how earlier material can be made very relevant unless mentioned briefly in an introduction. Credit will be given when candidates analyse the Instrument of Government, setting up the Protectorate, to support the argument by connecting its terms to the analysis of reasons for its introduction. The Instrument of Government appealed to Cromwell because it appeared to balance order, the role of the army, and liberty. Power was shared between the one Protector, the Council and Parliament. He saw it as defending religious toleration. A written constitution was hoped to provide a permanent settlement and avoid the uncertainties of the Rump and Barebones. Its moderation might attract wide support and even the royalists were not permanently excluded from participation. The constitution would prevent the efforts of 'self-seeking' members of the Rump to perpetuate their influence and end the 'indiscipline' of Barebones. (But since Cromwell is so controversial, candidates might claim other

motives: ambition for power etc. As always, the answers will be assessed on their merits.) Candidates should note that the question asks why the Instrument of Government was introduced. They are not required to go beyond 1653 although a brief survey of its success might be suitable for a conclusion - but no more.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the aims of Oliver Cromwell's foreign policy from 1653 to 1658.**

**(Do not include relations with Scotland and Ireland in your answer.)**

Focus: Assessment of the aims of foreign policy in a specified period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The parameters of the question are clear. Candidates should focus on assessments of the aims of Cromwell's foreign policy. Considering a variety of aims, how relatively important were they? Why were they important to Cromwell? The question begins in 1653, the beginning of the Protectorate, but examiners should be sympathetic to answers that refer to the war against the Dutch that was waged by the Rump and opposed by Cromwell. He ended it in 1654. The hope for a Protestant alliance will certainly be relevant. At AS Level, candidates are unlikely to have studied his religious attitude to Sweden in foreign policy and this should not be regarded as a gap. Candidates might consider the importance of religion in respect to France and Spain and the most successful candidates might point out that both were Roman Catholic countries. He allied with France more for commercial than religious reasons although he still voiced harsh criticism of the treatment of the Waldensians by the French government. His commercial aims can be explained and assessed. This might well lead to a study of the expedition that was launched in the Caribbean. Some candidates might refer to naval activity in the Mediterranean against pirates. Intervention on the Continent on the side of France against Spain, leading to the battle of Dunkirk, might lead candidates to examine Cromwell's ambitions to establish England as a continental power.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**20 Society and the Economy 1603 - 1660****(a) Why did the Anglican Church lose its authority during the 1640s and 1650s?**

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for an important religious development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks 'Why...?' and examiners will be looking for analytical approaches in the best answers. The relevant Content in the specification mentions 'The breakdown of censorship and the authority of the Anglican Church, the multiplication of religious sects, the effects of the Civil War and the parliamentary army on religious and political radicalism'. Some candidates might extend this to discuss the loss of power by the King, with whom the Anglican Church was closely associated. The opposition was increasingly dominated by religious radicals, some of whom were more extreme than Cromwell. Examiners can apply some flexibility to coverage of the period as a whole; there might well be more on the 1640s than the 1650s and it can be argued that this was a more important period for the issues raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Why did London remain the most important commercial and financial centre in England during the period from 1603 to 1660?**

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for an important economic development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. The question asks 'Why...?' and examiners will be looking for analytical approaches in the best answers. The question arises from the second Key Issue and related Content in the Study Topic, 'Why did London play an increasingly important part in national affairs? Growth in the population and the spread of London ... the Court, ...commercial and financial activity, a centre of conspicuous consumption'. London outstripped other centres such as Norwich and Bristol. As well as the centre of the largest population in England, it also benefited as the most important centre of overseas trade and trading companies.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV** and **V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI** and **VII** will not answer the question.



**Mark Scheme 2584  
June 2005**

**Period Studies, English History 1780 – 1964****England 1780 – 1846****The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783 – 1830**

1(a) To what extent was Pitt's repressive policy the main reason for his success in resisting the radical challenge to 1801?

Focus: An evaluation of Pitt's repressive policy as a reason for successfully resisting the radical challenge.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to assess the relative importance of Pitt's policy in the context of other factors leading to radical containment – the onset of war in 1793 which rallied opinions against France and identified radicalism with its revolution; the creation of a coalition government based around order in 1794; the extreme views of the radicals themselves who focussed on democracy and a republic and who were driven underground after 1795. It may be argued that Pitt was lucky that popular grievance was more economic than political, that extended poor relief did its job well and that Burke split from Fox in 1790 and the latter was less active in the second half of the 1790s. However, candidates are likely to stress the relative importance of Pitt's policies, especially after 1794 – suspension of Habeas Corpus (indefinite detention), the Treasonable Practices Act extending the scope of treason, the Seditious Meetings Act and higher Stamp Duties to restrict press readership and radical ideas. By 1799 Radical Societies were being banned. George III and loyalty to him were actively promoted against Painite principles. The impact of this will need to be assessed. Better candidates may stress how selective and shrewdly temporary some of this was to avoid the accusations that traditional liberties were permanently suppressed. Nonetheless Pitt was quite prepared to use the Army when necessary (Ireland in 1798). He had no difficulty using Parliament, Monarchy and Army to prevent a minority gaining popular support for its radical views but, arguably, he did so expertly.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**1(b) 'A Liberal awakening was the most important reason for the reforms of the Tory governments from 1822 to 1830.' How far do you agree?**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for reforms 1822-30.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Better candidates are likely to distinguish between general and more specific factors, perhaps pertaining to a one-off reform. It is important that they assess the relative importance of, for example, a revived economy, which offered some opportunities for commercial changes under Huskisson, Robinson and Peel with say the ministerial changes of 1822 (just a reshuffle with more of the same or a genuinely different group of ministers with a Liberal Tory outlook?). The given factor must be engaged with significantly, even if it is to be rejected as of lesser importance. A lessening of radical activity also made some reforms more possible especially at the Home Office. How important was the role of new ideas – on a freer trade, on religious toleration and on the law? Were these merely a reawakening of ideas already considered by Pitt in the 1780s? What was the



relative importance of individuals in promoting reform like Huskisson, O'Connell and Burdett (Roman Catholic Emancipation 1828 – 29), Peel at the Home Office (important administrative work largely to do with efficiency and the need to gain convictions from juries), or the Radical MPs. Hume and Place in the repeal of the Combination Acts in 1824. Pressure groups like the Dissenters clearly had an impact on the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Act in 1828. Better candidates may pick up on 'degree' of reform and stress that it was limited in many respects (on trade for example where Huskisson was forced out in 1828) and that the governments were certainly opposed to Parliamentary Reform. A brief mention might be made of Canning's foreign policy if related to change, but anything substantial here will divert answers away from the question.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### War and Peace 1793 – 1841

**2(a) Which was the most important interest Britain sought to maintain in its wars with France in the period from 1793 to 1815? Explain with reference to at least three interests.**

**Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of British interests in the French Wars.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to focus on the relative importance of three or more of the following interests during the French wars – strategic security, trade, the balance of power and maintenance of naval power. Any one of these could be considered the most important although it is likely that many will argue for either security or trade as the key. On security, candidates could point to the cause of war being French occupation of Belgium and the Low Countries, fear of invasion in the 1790s and especially in 1803–05 (the Grand Army in Boulogne). Better candidates may realise that a particular interest could be the most important at any given time during the war. Security was clearly dominant in 1797 and 1803-5. Ideological security was important throughout. Trade in 1793 (a French threat to trade routes via the river Scheldt), 1794 (seizing the French Sugar Islands), 1800 (taking Malta to control Mediterranean trade) 1801 (the break up, using naval power, of the Armed Neutrality which threatened northern trade), 1804 (attacks on Spanish silver convoys) and 1806-7 onwards which saw serious trade blockades on both sides. European trade was vital to Britain's wealth and power. Naval power, it may be argued, was a means to this end, vital for both security and the protection of trade and colonial interests (in the West Indies in 1794, the Quiberon expedition to promote counter revolution in Western France, against the Dutch in 1795 and 1797, to end Napoleon's Egyptian campaign in 1798, to wreck the Armed Neutrality in 1801, to destroy any chance of Franco-Spanish naval power completely at Trafalgar in 1805 and to enforce the trade blockade). Similarly the Balance of Power was a means of securing Britain from attack, Coalition diplomacy was a means of balancing Napoleon's attempted domination of Europe.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**2(b) 'Canning and Palmerston dealt effectively with the Greek and Eastern questions but not with relations towards the United States'. How far do you agree with this judgement on the period to 1841?**

**Focus: An assessment of the relative success of Canning and Palmerston's policies towards Greece, the Ottomans and the US.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to assess the effectiveness of policy from 1822 on the Greek and Eastern questions. Both wanted stability in the Eastern Mediterranean and to prevent a weakening of the Ottomans at the hands of Greece and then Egypt, which would benefit, respectively, Russia and France, Britain's main European rivals. Their effectiveness could be questioned – on the one hand Canning moved boldly in alliance with rivals (Treaty of London), to manage and arbitrate with the Turks a form of Greek independence that would territorially advantage no one. After his death, however, conflict led to a severe weakening of the Ottomans at the Battle of Navarino and a Russo-Turkish war that advantaged Russia. This may have led to a more unquestioning support for the Ottomans under Palmerston. The Ottomans could exploit this. Nonetheless, candidates could point to decisive action by Palmerston in 1840 to curb Egypt's Mehmet Ali at Acre, preserve Syria and force terms between Egypt and the Ottomans, especially given neglect of Mehmet Ali between 1830 and 1831. However, this was at considerable cost to relations with France that verged on war by 1840. As regards Russia the Straits Convention of 1841 undid the damage of Unkiar Skelessi in 1833 (Russian access to the Mediterranean) and could be considered effective. Candidates can equally be open handed on relations with the US, which remained frosty throughout (1812 War, the Slave Trade, Texas, Canadian frontier, fishing rights and trade). Canning annoyed the US by his high profile Latin American involvement whilst Palmerston insisted on 'rights of search', agreed to recognise an independent Texas in 1836 and backed Canadian attempts to suppress US backed rebellion. By 1841 the McLeod case threatened war with the US. Relations with them were stalemated under both Canning and Palmerston – both sides had to live with the others' niggling interference. Yet it could be argued that both effectively upheld British interests.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### The Age of Peel 1829 – 1846

**3(a) ‘Peel’s policies towards Ireland were repressive rather than reforming in the period from 1829 to 1846’. How far do you agree?**

**Focus: An assessment of Peel’s Irish policies to 1846.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates could stress ‘Orange’ Peel’s concerns to maintain the status quo in Ireland (Pitt’s Act of Union) and especially to uphold law and order there (reference to his Chief Secretaryship in the 1810s is not necessary). They can stress his dislike of O’Connell and mistrust of Catholic Nationalism, citing the repression of the Roman Catholic Association in 1829, the Repeal Association in 1843, the Mass Meetings of 1842–43, the creation of a police force (Royal Irish Constabulary), the prosecution of O’Connell in 1843–44 and the absence of Church and land reform. There was much agitation in Ireland. Better candidates may stress that when reform did occur it might have been motivated more by a strategy to remove any support for O’Connell, especially the excising of the Irish Freeholder from the electorate in 1829 than be a sincere desire to tackle Irish problems. Conversely one could credit Peel with the major reform of Catholic Emancipation (a useful area for discussion either way), which underpinned the rise of Catholic nationalism and was a significant blow to the Protestant Constitution (was he forced into it or was it important for his Liberal Tory or Conservative stance that it be conceded?) In the 1840s, he did attempt Land Reform (Devon Commission and a Land Bill in 1845), concessions to the Catholic Church (the Maynooth Grant) and charitable and educational reform, all firmly opposed by many in the party. Was Peel repressive or intelligently aware in his policies towards the Famine?

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**3(b) How far would you agree that the main aim of Peel’s reforms from 1841 to 1846 was to improve the conditions of working people and the poor?**

**Focus: An evaluation of the motives and aims of Peel’s reform in his second government.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates who wish to argue that a social motive prevailed (the condition of England etc.) could stress his post-1846 reputation as the provider of cheap bread and food, his own stated concern in the 1842 Budget that an Income Tax paying rich should rescue the country from bankruptcy whilst he alleviated indirect taxes that fell on the poorer sections of society. The background of the Great Depression, the need to cheapen manufacturing costs on raw materials and provide stable employment to feed an ever expanding population were important to Peel (candidates can cite his Budgets, the Sugar Duties and Corn Law Repeal as evidence of this). Although radicals and Tory paternalists would challenge such a view, stressing a betrayal of working people (his support for the New Poor Law, his comprehensive opposition to Chartism and Factory Reform) Peel himself would argue that he wished only to defend jobs through a free adult labour market and to get the idle to work, even stressing the role of young people in working class budgets. The Mines Act and Graham’s Factory Act provide useful evidence of differing attitudes one can take to his aims. Candidates can also stress the relative importance of other factors – a businessman’s agenda that suited a commercial and industrial middle class, a welcoming of individual progress, a concern to

balance industry and agriculture or simply a response to Whig fiscal ineptitude, the Great Depression and the social and political consequences of this (Chartism, the Anti-Corn Law League, etc.).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### **The Economy and Industrialisation 1780 – 1846**

#### **4(a) How important were factories to Britain's economic growth during the period from 1780 to 1846?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of factories in Britain's economic growth to 1846.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The role of factories (large scale use of powered machinery requiring a regimented workforce to perform particular tasks) has been a controversial one. Candidates can stress the growing importance of this type of production from the first (Cromford Mill in 1771 where 5000 was employed by the 1780s), to the stream powered mills of the 1840s. The factory became the symbol of the Industrial Revolution and was significant enough to attract opposition and reform from 1800 onwards. It transformed the cotton industry, especially post-1782 when steam power could replace water- power and post 1786 when weaving as well as spinning could be mechanised. The same happened in the Iron Industry. This in turn led to a huge expansion in exports and international trade (cotton). By the 1830s, some 70% of the value of all exports was in factory-based cotton. However, such developments were often 'slow burn' – factories could be quite small, power looms were not widely used until the 1820s whilst most industry remained domestic or workshop based and factory resistant (all other textiles especially wool and silk), although wool rapidly became factory- based post 1811 in Yorkshire. There was a distinction between export-based industry and those providing for the domestic market. Candidates will need to examine other factors affecting growth – rising population, demand, the expansion of markets overseas (was growth largely determined by this?), the requirements of war, and the availability of capital. The picture was a mixed one.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**4(b) 'Trade Unionism became the most effective popular response to industrialisation in the period from 1780 to 1846: How far would you agree?'**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of Trade Unionism as a response to industrialisation to 1846.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Trade Unions or Combinations were one of many popular responses, some political (Chartism) others more economically focused (Luddism, Owenism, the Co-operative movement, Short Time committees, the Anti-Poor Law League etc.) Candidates will need to discuss their relative effectiveness and a fully comprehensive evaluation is not expected. It is sufficient to compare Trade Unionism with two other 'responses' although a wider survey is possible. A focus just on Trade Unions will have a **ceiling of low Band III**. Better candidates will pick up on 'became the most effective', demonstrating an awareness of change over time. It is perfectly possible to challenge the assertion, pointing to Trade Union illegality between 1799 and 1824, to the failure of Owen's Grand National Consolidated Union, to the legal problems after 1825 and to Trades Unions relatively low profile in Chartism. Nonetheless much was done in secret, Luddism could be seen as a form of Trade Unionism (triggered 1812-15 by well paid Croppers being replaced by machinery) and there were significant advocates in people like Owen. Workers banding together helped promote the growth of a working class but Trades Unions were difficult to organise outside factories and certain trades. Other groups could be seen as more effective, especially Factory Reformers (with a Parliamentary leadership) and the Anti-Poor Law League who impacted on the imposition of workhouses in the North. The Cooperative Society had some success in undermining the Truck System whilst the Chartists could frequently mobilise very large numbers indeed.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**Britain 1846 – 1906**

**Whigs and Liberals 1846 – 1874**

**5(a) Who had the greater influence on the development of the Liberal party in the period to 1868, Palmerston or Gladstone? Explain your answer.**

Focus: a comparison of the relative importance of Palmerston and Gladstone in the development of the Liberal Party.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Better candidates are likely to focus on how both contributed to the key issues in Liberal development – policies (who was the more Liberal here, arguably Gladstone), party development, winning elections, party cohesion, winning key electoral groups etc. On policies Gladstone certainly identified Liberalism with an attractive financial and economic package of low taxation and free trade in his budgets of 1853/4 and 1860-63 whilst Palmerston took strong stances on national and foreign issues (Crimean war, China and the US.). Candidates might comment on how they clashed on these, threatening Liberal cohesion (in 1855, 1858 and 1861). Gladstone resigned, becoming very unpopular between 1855–59, whilst Palmerston retained support and was able to defeat Radical censures on China by appealing to a patriotic electorate. Up to 1868, when Gladstone

played a major role in ‘winning’ the election of that year, Palmerston was the more effective electoral manager. Most liberal MPs. were only moderately reformist and appreciated Palmerston’s stance against Irish and Parliamentary Reform, hence the Liberal split in 1866 when Gladstone and Russell introduced the latter. It was Palmerston who ‘founded’ the Liberal Party in 1859 over the Italian principle. Gladstone didn’t attend the Willis Rooms meeting and up to then had remained a Peelite, perhaps more likely to rejoin Conservatism. Against that view candidates could point to Gladstone’s work in the 1860s when he created a liberal press via Repeal of the Paper Duties, made contact with Trades Unions, converted himself into a popular politician and forged contacts with the Radicals (Cobden and Bright), Nonconformists and the liberally inclined. It is likely that candidates will argue that Palmerston was the more important in the 1850s, whilst Gladstone assumed more importance in the 1860s. Those who only consider one politician **cannot go beyond Band IV**. An unequal treatment between the two (beyond 70:30 either way) **cannot go beyond Band II**.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### **5(b) How liberal were the domestic reforms of Gladstone’s first ministry (1868 – 74)?**

Focus: An evaluation of the extent of liberalism in Gladstone’s domestic reforms to 1874.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may include Ireland (disestablishment, land and university) but the UK-wide reforms provide ample evidence for and against the role of liberalism (education, the army, the civil service, public health, licensing, trades unions, the secret ballot etc.). They need to understand liberal criteria (Peace, retrenchment or economy, reform of abuses, laissez-faire and the minimum state) to be able to assess some of the reforms. Most exhibit a range of features, not always liberal. Army Reform could be seen as creating a more liberal army with less floggings, greater inducements to enlist and the idea of a military police force to maintain the Pax Britannica but Cardwell’s motives may have been simply efficiency and a better army (promised cost savings that never materialised) whilst there was outrage at the attack on property involved in the abolition of the purchase of commission and the method of evading Parliament to get it through. Forster’s Education Act increased local taxation (rates) and failed to satisfy those who sought a secular educational system. The Liberal Nonconformists thought far too much had been given to a Conservative Church of England. There were liberal elements, especially maintaining the voluntary sector, but also an un-denominational secularism disapproved of by many. Bruce’s Trades Union legislation is another example – liberal in that Trade Unions were recognised as self-help Friendly Societies but illiberal in its approach to picketing, although candidates could point to maintaining a free labour market here. Irish Disestablishment, Civil Service Reform and the Secret Ballot Act are good examples of pure liberalism (the ending of privilege and patronage). However the Irish Land Act interfered in land ownership and alienated Whigs whilst the Licensing Act fell foul of all sides in its attempt to steer a course between working men’s rights to a pint and Non Conformist desire to see greater state powers to regulate the trade. Public Health however remained a question of very liberal, permissive, administrative structures. Most candidates are likely to conclude that liberal principles predominated but it is possible to argue that for illiberal state intervention, rising local rates, interference in tradition and rights (including property rights in Ireland) and other illiberal aspects. Gladstone was not always happy.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### The Conservatives 1846 – 1880

**6(a) 'Outdated policies were the most important reasons why the Conservatives were out of office for most of the period from 1846 to 1874.' How far do you agree?**

Focus: An evaluation of the reason for Conservative failure from 1846 to 1874.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The suggestion is that the most important reason is outdated policies. Certainly protectionism played badly in the late 1840s and for much of the 1850s, despite Disraeli's attempts to ditch it in his 1852 Budget. Nonetheless his attempt to compensate traditional interests who has 'lost' from Free Trade gave the impression of a party devoted to Land and traditional commercial interests when the bulk of the electorate was in small and large boroughs benefiting from Liberal trading and tax policies. However better candidates could challenge this, especially after 1858 when the 2<sup>nd</sup> Derby-Disraeli government dealt with a reorganisation of India and introduced Parliamentary Reform, something brought to a triumphant conclusion in 1867. This was hardly outdated. It might suggest that other factors were of more importance – the concentration of effective leadership in an anti Conservative coalition that eventually consolidated itself into the Liberal Party after 1859. The Mid Victorian Boom that rendered Protection obsolete and which was so effectively exploited by Gladstone and the Liberals. Of great importance was the failure of the Peelites to rejoin the Conservatives. Disraeli's presence was a hindrance rather than a help here. Foreign and fiscal policy favoured their opponents, although Disraeli was unlucky that he faced Gladstone in his first Budget in 1852. The failure of Derby and Disraeli to make much headway, despite Liberal mistakes, reflected a tense relationship between them. All these factors continued to impact up to 1873-74 (post-Derby, Salisbury and co, continued to dislike Disraeli's leadership).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**6(b) To what extent was Disraelian Conservatism dominated by the upholding of British interests abroad and in the Empire?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of foreign and imperial issues in Disraelian Conservatism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may range widely from 1846 to 1880 although a focus on 1867 onwards is to be expected. Candidates could argue that Disraeli's Conservatism was essentially a traditional English view of one nation, supporting the traditional institutions of State – Monarchy, Aristocracy and the Church of England. Earlier evidence, especially the attack on Peel in 1846, would suggest this was the key – to fend off Whig/Liberal cosmopolitanism. The Second Reform Act could be used to show Disraeli restoring artisans to a system that had seen them ejected in 1832. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ministry Disraeli is concerned with the rural areas and clearing the Church of 'Romish practices'. His speeches at Crystal Palace and Manchester in 1872 dwell especially on these traditional issues. Before 1872 Conservatives regarded foreign interests and the Empire as an extension of traditional values. Whilst Palmerston was in power he monopolised a strong stance here, relegating Disraelian Conservatism to lukewarm support for the position of the traditional powers. However candidates could agree with the suggestion in the question by focusing on 1872-80, Disraeli seizing on Gladstone's apparent weakness over the Alabama Arbitration and the Black Sea Clauses and focusing on Empire (South Africa, Egypt, India and Afghanistan) and on challenging Russia in the Eastern Question when in power after 1874. Certainly upholding British interests seemed to be the key, much mentioned in his 1872 speeches and much condemned by Gladstone in his anti-Beaconsfieldism campaigns of 1876 and 1879–80. However, Candidates could challenge the domination of Conservatism by traditional English values and British interests by discussing whether Tory Democracy was ever the dominant leitmotiv – an alliance between workers and Tory aristocrats against their common middle class 'liberal' enemies, using worker numbers to gain power for a government who then delivered on social reform. Some consideration of this view may be appropriate to achieve a balanced judgement on the nature of Disraelian Conservatism.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846 – 1902**

**7(a) Who was the more successful in securing British interests in the Eastern Question from 1854 to 1878, Palmerston or Disraeli? Explain your answer.**

Focus: A comparison of the relative success of Palmerston and Disraeli in serving British interests in the Eastern Question.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to compare Palmerston's effectiveness in containing Russian threats and maintaining Ottoman integrity during the Crimean War with Disraeli's efforts in the Balkan Crisis of 1875-78. British interests were located in the security of the Indian Empire, commercial interests in Turkey and the Near East, the balance of power in Europe and the maintenance of peace. Both Palmerston and Disraeli followed a clear policy of resisting Russia and supporting Turkey, although



the advent of the Suez Canal made the Straits even more important for Disraeli. Palmerston was hampered by not being Foreign Secretary in 1854-55, Disraeli by Derby's opposition to warlike threats to Russia and his resignation. Both took a very strong line against Russia. Palmerston could be blamed for prolonging the Crimean war unnecessarily for another year by insisting on the reduction of Sebastopol. The Peace Treaty satisfied British interests by demilitarising the Black Sea, creating a new state on the Danube and guaranteeing Turkish integrity. The Russian threat was curbed, just as it was at Berlin in 1878 when Disraeli obtained a revised Balkan settlement. However Palmerston, it could be argued, unnecessarily humiliated the Russians who were bound to seek a revision of the Paris Treaty, and did so in 1870 when France was defeated by the North Germanic Confederation. Disraeli did not humiliate Russia in 1878. He took a wider view of Russia aggression before 1878, given the Suez Canal, which better candidates may question given that it would lead to unquestioning support for Turkey (and insensitivity to the Bulgarian atrocities). Disraeli faced a divided cabinet, not dissimilar to Palmerston in 1854-5, but insisted on war preparations to overturn San Stefano. Yet he succeeded without war, unlike Palmerston, and might be considered the more successful. However Salisbury, as the new Foreign Secretary, did much of the groundwork for revising San Stefano at Berlin. The result was similar to Palmerston's success – the gain of Cyprus to monitor the area (soon made redundant by the acquisition of Egypt post 1882), the integrity of Turkey and a break up of a large, pro-Russian, Bulgaria. The main criticism of Disraeli was that policy soon changed to backing Balkan states rather than Turkey as a more effective barrier to Russia. However this is criticism by hindsight. Both succeeded in their aims in the short term. Expect a judgement one way or the other. Candidates who only consider one **cannot go beyond a low Band IV**. An unequal balance between the two (beyond 70:30 either way) **cannot go beyond Band II**.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**7(b) 'The most important reason for the pursuit of imperialism from 1880 to 1902 was that it could be exploited politically'. How far do you agree?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of the reasons for imperialism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to consider whether political exploitation was the most important reason. Certainly the party that dominated 1880-1902 were the pro-Empire Conservatives. Candidates could point to the Khaki election of 1900 where their victory, an overall majority of 268 was, in part, the result of patriotic fervour in the earlier part of the Boer War. Joe Chamberlain built a new career in the Conservatives on the basis of popular imperialism, as did Lord Curzon, Under-Secretary of State for India in 1891-92 and Viceroy for India 1898-1905. The growing electorate was certainly subjected to imperial educational influences and religious concerns (late Victorian hymns frequently had imperial references whilst missionary activity captured public interest). Post-Gladstone, the new Liberal leader Lord Rosebery realised the political importance of the Empire. However, candidates could challenge the primacy of politics in the pursuit of imperialism. In 1880 Disraeli lost the general election largely due to Gladstone's anti-Imperial campaign. Gladstone in turn was in trouble by 1885 over Egypt - and especially for his failure to send sufficient troops to save General Gordon in the latter's attempts to defend Khartoum from the attacks by the Mahdi. He seems to have gained little politically from the 1884 Berlin Conference, potentially

advantageous to Britain in Africa. Lord Salisbury, Conservative Prime Minister, perhaps because of this, took a low profile on Imperialism in the late 1880s and 1890s. After 1900, the Boer War did not play so well for the Conservatives. The Empire was always politically controversial and divisive, especially for the Liberals. After Gladstone, the Liberal imperialists (Rosebery, Grey, Haldane, Asquith) split from those who stuck to Gladstone's suspicion of Empire (Bright, Morley, Lloyd George). Whether the working class were responsive to imperialism was far from certain, especially as the Empire could be portrayed as wasteful when social reform pressed domestically. As a consequence it may be argued, post-1880, that other factors were of more importance than political ones – strategic concerns, especially in N.E. Africa; economic issues – gold, diamonds, rubber, tea and coffee; cultural and humanitarian – “the White Man's Burden”; religious concerns (missionaries), social reasons (the link between public schools and imperial administrators, the Empire as an issue promoted strongly by the press and magazines). Examiners are not to expect a full coverage of all such issues – what matters is that the question is engaged with.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

#### **Trade Union and Labour 1867 – 1906**

**8(a) 'To 1906, the emergence of a Labour party was entirely due to new political groups, such as the Fabians'. How far do you agree?**

Focus: An evaluation of the importance of new political groups in the emergence of a Labour Party to 1906.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many candidates may focus on the relative importance of the new groups (the Marxist SDF in 1884, the Fabians in the same year, the Scottish Labour Party in 1888, the ILP in 1893 and their merge in 1900 to form the LRC) *vis à vis* the Trade Unions. 'Entirely' needs to be addressed. None the less other factors could also be discussed – the inadequacy of the main political parties in acting as a vehicle for labour interests, the increased electorate and the key role of the Courts whose decisions could only be countered by parliamentary act (*Lyons v. Wilkins* 1896 on the illegality of peaceful picketing and the *Taff Vale* case in 1901). In a political sense candidates could point to the early initiatives of the political groups on the grounds that, before 1900, the Trades Unions remained affiliated with the Liberals. Such groups were socialist and insisted on an identity separate to Liberalism (the Fabians were the exception, stressing evolutionary socialism through the actions of existing parties). The SDF had an important presence in London and the Fabians were successful propagandists for Gas and Water socialism. The ILP and Hardie took the initiative on a separate Labour Party stressing economic issues, downplaying the word Socialist. The leadership (Hardie, MacDonald, Snowden and Glasier) came from the new groups and took the electoral initiative with the liberals in 1903 which secured 29 MPs in 1906. Alternatively, candidates could argue their role was more limited pointing to the lack of success before 1900 (in numbers there were less than 2,000 socialists, the loss of all the ILP's seats in 1895 and their influence restricted to the North etc). Shifts in Union attitudes, especially the railway Unions, were arguably of more importance at the end of the 1890s and the initiative for founding the LRC came from this, with a Union majority. *Taff Vale* boosted union membership of the LRC and income to finance

elections and pay MPs. Clearly organised numbers and money came from the Unions, ideas, leadership and to some extent tactics from the political groups.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**8(b) To what extent did both the Conservative and Liberal parties ignore the rise of the trade unions and the working class in the period from 1871 to 1906?**

Focus: An assessment of the Conservative and Liberal attitudes to unions and workers.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to address both parties – consideration of only one will have a **ceiling of low Band IV**. Neither party ignored the unions in the 1870s, although how their legislation (Gladstone's Trade Union Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871 and Disraeli's Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act 1875) is to be interpreted is up to candidates. Taken together they represent a highpoint in Union legal recognition. Liberals certainly secured both Union and working class allegiance at the higher level until the 1890s. The working class were often anti-state in their attitudes and most remained off the electoral register. Yet it could be argued that the conservatives made inroads using patriotism, drink and anti-catholic Irish sentiment with the working class and economically many disputes in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century were between Unions and Liberal factory owners (in Bradford and Lancashire). After 1875 both parties neglected major social reform, despite the onset of Depression. The Liberals, at a local level, failed to promote working class candidates. Their 1884 Reform Act made registering to vote very difficult for a mobile lower working class, whilst the Re-Distribution Act of 1885 favoured conservative and middle class suburbia. They showed little interest in the 8 hour day. By the 1890s Conservatives became associated with the managerial legal backlash against the Unions. Up to 1903 neither party seemed concerned to act on this, either to introduce new Trade Union legislation or actively to prevent the threat of independent labour representation. However, candidates might point to 1903–06 where the Liberals did respond – the Electoral Pact with Labour in 1903 (which could be seen as over compensation for previous indifference), the victory of 1906, where working class voters responded to a variety of liberal issues – Conservative failure to repeal Taff Vale, Chinese Slavery and the 'small loaf' liberal campaign (which played to very good effect on the liberal mentality of working class votes) and finally a Trade Disputes Act which did repeal Taff Vale. A few candidates might even point to the fact that both parties may have been right to ignore such developments before 1900, on the grounds that not much was afoot.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.  
Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### Britain 1899-1964

#### Liberals and Labour 1899 – 1918

#### 9(a) How important was the First World War in helping the Labour party achieve a strong and independent position by 1918?

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of the First World War in explaining a position of strength for Labour by 1918.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Clearly, the War strengthened Labour and, partly accidentally, gave it both governmental experience (Henderson) after 1916 and ‘independence’ thanks to the ‘Doormat Incident’ which disassociated Labour from the increasingly Conservative coalition and ended the electoral pact with the Liberals. Economically collectivisation and fairness to all became more acceptable. The Unions were drawn into government via labour dilution agreements and thanks to full employment increased their power and membership. Electorally, the Fourth Reform Act of 1918 finally enfranchised all, including a group whose allegiance was likely to be Labour. The electoral pact with the Liberals was jettisoned and the party reorganised during 1917-18. The Liberals at the top were severely weakened by the war – small divisions in 1914 became major with the 1916 Asquith-Lloyd George split and the subsequent policies of Lloyd George. Competition on the centre-left was much reduced. However, candidates need to place this in context (‘How important?’) – the Liberals had lost their overall majority by 1910 and had to deliver on issues that helped Labour as a party. Full manhood suffrage was only a matter of time. Working-class Liberalism had never liked a focus on Irish Home Rule. This would play badly for the Liberals from 1912. Pre-war industrial unrest may (or may not) help labour and damage the liberals. Post-1906 many more Unions affiliated with labour whilst in local government Labour was doing well. This might suggest that the war only accelerated existing trends pointing to growing strength and independence. Nonetheless it would have been difficult to foresee the 1916 split and Lloyd George’s subsequent actions whilst, after initial splits, Labour (MacDonald and Henderson) from 1915 did more to exploit the situation well severing all links with Liberalism and reorganising labour. In 1918, some 400 Labour candidates were fielded in comparison to 79 in the December 1910 general election.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

#### 9(b) How successfully did British governments handle the Irish problem in the period from 1909 to 1916?

Focus: an evaluation of the handling by British governments of Irish problems 1909 – 1916.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to be familiar with the problems of the period – after 1910 Liberal dependence on Redwood’s Home Rule Nationalist MPs which ensured a 3<sup>rd</sup> Home Bill, bitterly resisted by a well organised Ulster with strengthening links to the Conservative party; the end of the Lords’ veto on Home Rule; problems with handling a crisis which threatened to get out of hand

1912-14; the impact of war on Ireland; the handling of the Easter Rising of 1916. Pre-1914 it could be argued governments were less than successful in containing the crisis over Home Rule both on the ground and in gaining inter party agreement (culminating in the failure of the Buckingham Palace conference in 1914). Asquith was faced with squaring a very difficult circle – satisfying Redmond on Home Rule yet getting agreement on the temporary exclusion of  $\frac{6}{9}$  Ulster counties to appease the Ulster Unionists and Conservatives who pressed for 9 or 6 on a permanent basis. Locally he was unable to prevent the militarisation of Ulster and its moves to create a government within a government (Ulster Volunteers and the Ulster Council, ably led by Carson and Craig). Asquith and Seely at the War Office, were clearly responsible for the fiasco handling the ‘Curragh Mutiny’, all but assuming that Army officers would refuse coercion, thereby condoning and encouraging it. No action was taken to curb Ulster’s leaders. They also failed to stop Ulster gun running whilst successfully preventing the copy cat measures of the South’s Irish Volunteers. This appeared very one-sided. Nonetheless the moderating influence of the Irish Chief Secretary Birrell up to 1916 was a success and all seemed solved by the rush to patriotism in 1914. Both South and North dedicated their ‘Volunteers’ to the war effort and accepted temporary suspension of Home Rule. Ireland ceased to be a problem until 1916 (it did well out of the war and seemed a vital part of the Union). 1916 proved disastrous, the fault lying at the Coalition Government’s door, whose over-reaction via General Maxwell to an unsupported minority rebellion in Dublin transformed Irish opinion, leaving Redmond’s Nationalists high and dry in the talks that followed and boosting Sinn Fein, who moved to control local and National Irish politics. Some candidates may assess Irish policy within the context of events and the extent of the problems (e.g. Conservative exploitation of Ireland to force a general election on Empire and Union pre-1914?).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### **Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918-1939**

#### **10(a) To what extent did a failure to solve domestic problems destroy Lloyd George’s coalition government from 1918 to 1922?**

Focus: An assessment of the role of domestic failure in explaining the end of the coalition government in 1922.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates could focus on the assertion of a failure to solve domestic problems or stress the politics of an association with Lloyd George, particularly linked to senior Conservatives (Balfour, Birkenhead, Austen Chamberlain)\_who worried about how to contain the Labour threat. Conservative rank and file followed more reluctantly. Domestically Lloyd George’s hopes of continued coalition, appealing beyond a Conservative electorate, lay with tackling post-war politics to satisfy promises made during the war (“Home Fit For Heroes”). The Radical Liberal Housing Minister, Addison, was furious that his Council Housing Act was undercut by Conservative fears on spending (he was sacked in 1921), as Fisher had been over his Education Act in 1918. Lloyd George was undermined by Conservative fears and the onset of Slump (the Geddes Axe), despite his success in heading off industrial disputes, especially in coal. However better candidates could point out that the loss of Lloyd George Liberals to Asquith or Labour mattered far less than the alienation of Conservatives. This may suggest that they were the key and that his status as the ‘man who won the war’ had a sell-by date that diminished over time. Local conservative activists,

resentful at the blocking of promotion to higher office (they provided 70% of the Coalition's parliamentary strength yet 9 of the 21 Cabinet posts were reserved for Lloyd George liberals, the so called 'stage army!') demanded from 1920 via their National Union that the Coalition adopt more conservative policies (on 'waste,' reduced expenditure, protective tariffs and reform of the House of Lords to restore effective power to block Labour). They were determined to end the Coalition in 1922, reinforced by opposition to Lloyd George's negotiations with Sinn Fein and the Anglo-Irish Treaty. In 1921 Lloyd George's attempt to capitalise on Ireland by holding sudden elections saw local Conservative rebellion. His fate was perhaps decided less by domestic failures (often brought about by attempts to appease the Conservatives over costs or the use of the Black and Tans in Ireland) than by a Conservative revolt, centre and right, against their own leader Austen Chamberlain in the Carlton Club rebellion. This was fuelled by distrust over Lloyd George's support for Greece in the Chanak Crisis, the Honours Scandal and his alleged 'presidential' aloofness. Some candidates might argue that Chamberlain's poor handling of this sealed the fate of the government. Bonar Law and Baldwin had been underestimated.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**10(b) Which were the most successful measures adopted by the National governments of 1931-39 to tackle the economic problems of the 1930s? Explain your answer.**

Focus: a comparison of the relative success of National government measures to tackle the economic problems of the 1930s.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can examine a range of measures to assess success (or relative failure): Snowden's Budget 1931 balancing the budget via economies and taxes to restore confidence; the end, at the same time, of the Gold Standard; Chamberlain's Protective policies and the abandonment of Free Trade in late 1931 and 1932; the Ottawa Conference and Imperial Free Trade 1932; National agreements with 17 countries (fixed input quotas and foreign tariff concessions) 1932-1935; Cheap Money forcing interest rates down and restricting investment abroad; Agricultural Marketing Boards (subsidising prices); Prestige projects like the Queen Mary; Special Areas Act 1934 and 1937 (trading estates). Nationalisation (transport in London 1931; coal royalties in 1938; air transport in 1939 – BOAC) Candidates need not be exhaustive but must establish relative success in relation to a stable currency, tackling unemployment, relieving poverty and tackling the problems of older industry (coal, Iron and Steel, Cotton etc.), in-itself a considerable regional problem. There was success in stabilising the Pound (Snowden's Budget and the end of the Gold Standard) even though the government had been formed to stop this. It boosted exports and reinforced confidence, although better candidates could point to external pressure in forcing this. 'Cheap Money' proved very successful in lowering costs, although Britain was lucky that prices dropped far more than wages, enabling those in work to feel better off and sustain newer industries. Protection was more controversial (although less so for the predominant conservatives) in its impact. It may well have had little impact unless linked, as in Steel, to re-organisation. The Ottawa Conference saw little real gain for British industry. Most Dominions' concessions consisted of making tariffs against foreign goods even higher than those against Britain. Infant Dominion industries remained protective. As for poverty relief, government continued with the Public Assistance Committees but was determined on cuts to avoid overspend – the Means Test, later removed, remained very unpopular.

It preferred to create the conditions to enable private enterprise to prosper, with some success in the Housing Boom in new suburbs. Its one attempt to tackle regional economic problems, the Special Areas Act, was on too small a scale (investment) to achieve much. Nationalisation was small scale and selective: London Transport was already underway, coal owners were compensated, BOAC consisted of 2 loss-making companies joined to avoid damaging competition. The 1936 Jarrow March was testament to token gestures on relief when faced with the near collapse of a large industry. Yet welfare payments continued at a higher level than most countries.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### Foreign Policy 1939 – 1963

#### 11(a) How successful was British decolonisation in the period from 1945 to 1960?

Focus: An evaluation of the relative success of decolonisation 1945 – 63.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might examine decolonised areas or countries in India/Pakistan /Ceylon/Burma, the Middle East, Malaya and Africa from the point of view of the decolonised but some consideration needs to be given to Britain's aims in the period, achieving a transition from Empire to Commonwealth which aided political adjustment whilst at the same time dealing with economic and strategic problems (the need to commit to Europe as part of the Cold War). Success may be more evident in the latter than the former, although a special relationship with former territory is open to dispute, despite the emergence of a Commonwealth. A leisurely progress was not possible given US attitudes and nationalist politics. Both India and Palestine were decolonised very quickly, leaving considerable ethnic, religious and territorial disputes behind (Pakistan v. India, Kashmir's status, the Palestinian problem, Cyprus) whilst an attempt to retain assets in Egypt led to the humiliation of Suez in 1956. Another rapid de-colonisation in Africa began in 1959 after considerable hopes for economic development had failed – the Colonial Development Cooperation, the East African groundnut scheme and the Sterling area which harshly affected colonies who experienced shortages as a result. Africa was never turned into a source of dollars. British economic schemes were not a success, although oil interests were protected in the Middle East, particularly in Iran, wholly in Kuwait. White settlers proved a difficult and embarrassing problem to deal with (Kenya, South Africa). Few decolonised countries would see the process as a successful one; Ghana and Tanzania are the most likely examples for ones that might. On the plus side, candidates could point to the remarkable defeat of Communist insurrection in Malaya (winning 'hearts & minds': Templer & Young) and the slower defeat of Mau Mau in Kenya. Some answers on Kenya might question 'success' when 'victory' involved such abuses of power (eg. the Hola Massacre 1959) but, equally, might use that to show how the Kenyan horrors revealed from 1959 spurred a determination in London to African decolonisation. Electorally, no government was punished during decolonisation - except Eden who resigned over Suez before electoral problems occurred. The speed of withdrawal prevented major British casualties and the soaring commitments it was doubtful the economy or public would bear. Candidates can range widely in the period as they consider success/failure. Full coverage is not expected, provided the focus is evaluative.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**11(b) ‘Britain was involved in the Cold War only to maintain its status as a great power.’ To 1953, how far do you agree with this verdict?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of great power status as reason for Britain’s early involvement in the Cold War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to address a variety of reasons for involvement, assessing them in comparison to the need for continued status on a European, global and UN scale. Rightly or wrongly such status was seen as vital to British post-war economic recovery in a more hostile world where, economically, Britain had traditionally a proportionately high share. In a superpower Cold War Britain felt it needed to punch above its weight, but also felt threatened by subversion at home, in Europe and in her overseas spheres of influence. A withdrawal of commitments to her ‘sectors’ in Germany would have deprived her of leverage, as would standing-aside over Berlin or Korea. Candidates might point to the Atom Bomb as a good example of prestige and status (‘a seat at the top of the table’) for which much was sacrificed to 1953 – the illusion of British control of this rather than relying on US nuclear protection that might not materialise was clearly important. However Britain lay within range of Soviet Bombers, unlike the US. Events (a failure to defend Greece and Turkey from Communist insurgency in 1947, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid of which Britain gained a major share) pointed to US predominance but Britain feared US hostility to her Empire and loss of control to the US. Other factors could easily be stressed – that Britain’s global position and active role in Europe inevitably determined her prominent role in the Cold War; that a traditional fear of Russian expansion was axiomatic in British foreign policy; that all British governments were concerned to alert the US to the need to commit to Europe and that wartime alliances and military cooperation with the US were standard. To have scaled down to the point of neutrality or isolationism were simply not possible. Self interest rather than status propelled alliance diplomacy (NATO etc) and a decision to closely ally with the US. Most candidates are, therefore, likely to conclude that status was not the main or only reason for involvement in the Cold War.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.



**Post War Britain 1945 – 1964****12(a) How far did the social reform from 1945 to 1951 show that the Labour governments were moderate rather than extreme in their policies?**

Focus: An assessment of the extent of moderation in Labour's social reform 1945-51.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to focus on whether the social reform in health, housing, education, poverty and nationalisation reflected a moderate, Fabian or neo-liberal approach to the issues or were a major move towards Clause IV socialism, a radical departure from existing policies. Some reforms may be more radical than others (a health service free to all at any time, in contrast to building on the liberal contributory ethic in National Insurance). Did the Right prevail over the Left? Was it a triumph for British peaceful revolution or not? Certainly in the long term a consensus was built that the conservatives accepted, suggesting practical, sensible and moderate solutions. Better candidates might point to the context – post war reconstruction and economic problems that often forced an apparently radical measure (the case with much of the Nationalisation policies – railway and coal owners were only too happy to let government take the responsibility of semi-bankrupt industries). The author of much of the ideas was a Liberal, Beveridge, who had no intention of undermining thrift and self responsibility. He merely advised plugging gaps to facilitate this (in Education, Health and Insurance). Most ministers were moderate. Much had already been agreed after the 'collective' experiences of wartime, which had forced Governments to plan within a consensus. Communist MPs were driven out of the party and the Trade Union leaders were moderate. It was certainly in tune with the electorate's desires. However a case could be made that 1945-47 did see radical and extreme measures – a draconian emphasis on public housing as opposed to private and a neglect of industrial reconstruction to finance a radical NHS designed by a radical left-winger, Nye Bevan, resisted by the Right and the medical profession and from which Bevan, conscience of the Left, could resign over the principle of free treatment when prescription charges were mooted to save money. Yet only in 1950-51 did this issue of rearmament v. reform emerge. Most of the social reforms originated as solutions to the perceived evils of the 1930s. In education, Wilkinson and Tomlinson were quite happy to see a tripartite secondary system emerge that was sociably divisive, resisting comprehensives. Compromises on doctors' salaries showed even Bevan could shift his position, gaps were filled in the insurance system by Griffiths. Existing managers and practices continued in the nationalised industries.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**12(b) To what extent was the success of the Conservatives in maintaining themselves in power from 1951 to 1964 the result of weaknesses in the Labour Party?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of labour weakness in explaining Conservative success 1951 – 1964.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many candidates may see national affluence plus Conservative leadership and organisation as being more important than Labour weakness. Labour weaknesses were certainly important in preserving the Conservatives in power. Labour failed to modernise its policies to a more affluent

Britain and the party was constantly divided. The parliamentary party was split between Left and Right, fuelled by Bevan's left wing hostility to Hugh Gaitskell. The former wanted an expansion of the public sector, Gaitskell and Morrison did not. They succeeded to the leadership and agreed on a social democracy rather than a socialist one, attempting to remove Clause IV in 1961, but failing. Only with the gloss provided by science and technology were they finally able to offer a realistic choice to the electorate in 1964. This enabled the Conservatives to avoid the electoral consequences of their mistakes – Suez 1956 and the subsequent resignation of Eden. Their worst moments did not coincide with general elections (the Profumo Scandal 1961, rejection of the application to join the EEC 1963). Candidates could also point to the importance of other factors, arguably of more importance than Labour weaknesses. Party and national leadership by Conservative prime ministers (with the exception of an aged Churchill, Eden's Suez mistakes and Alec Douglas Home's unsuitability in 1963) was proficient under Eden pre-Suez and under Macmillan. The latter especially was good at exploiting television and the media, and he could be ruthless (his 'Night of the Long Knives' was criticised for sacrificing friends). The economy was of great importance – recovery, the end of austerity and relative affluence were credited to the Conservatives (uncertainty under Thorneycroft not seeming to figure). Elections were well managed in 1951, 1955 and 1959. The Cold War played into the hands of the Conservatives – free enterprise no longer had the stigma of the 1930s. Organisationally, the Conservatives recovered (Lord Woolton) and this impacted on more coherent policies (the work of Butler, Maudling, Powell and MacLeod – a property owning democracy). The period 1957-59 saw Hailsham re-launch a successful new campaign that swept Macmillan to victory in 1959 with a majority of 100 in the Commons.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**Mark Scheme 2585  
June 2005**

**Europe 1046-1250****1 The Reform of the Church 1046-1122****(a) How important was Urban II in the development of the power of the Papacy during the period 1087-1122?**

Focus: Assessment of role of an individual in wider historical context.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to assess Pope Urban II's contribution within the context of the period mentioned and not just focus upon his role and place. Answers which do the latter, no matter their quality, will have a **ceiling of Band III** since other contributions need to be assessed against his (the 'How far ...' of the question). The 'power of the Papacy' needs to be considered and the aftermath of the Investiture Crisis will feature here. Many answers may see Urban II (Pope 1088-99) as important or very important: his identification with the First Crusade, his vigorous preaching, his use of the Crusade to strengthen the Papal position. Beyond there are other issues relevant to the question theme: Urban was a reformer; he was a skilled administrator; there was a strong Cluniac dimension to his reforms; he continued the Gregorian reforms, sought a working relationship with the Byzantine Church, further reorganised Church administration, made improvements in Rome, centralised power, developed the idea of the Curia and created a basis for the eventual College of Cardinals. He held two important Synods in 1095 and 1098. He had uneven relations with secular rulers and faced a sturdy challenge in the anti-Pope Clement III. His successor Paschal II (pope 1099-1118) furthered aspects of papal control, power and pretensions and entered into disputes with the Emperors Henry IV and V as well as with the French and English kings. He continued reforms and resolved the investiture issues with the French and English kings. He was forced to make concessions at the Synod of Sutri (1111-12), but was able to have these reversed. In turn, his successor Pope Callixtus II (1119-24) eventually settled the long-standing disputes with the Emperor in the Concordat of Worms in 1122, where there was compromise. He also furthered the centralisation of the Church and upheld strongly Papal control and power; he used legates as representatives to enact his decrees and pursue reforms. Candidates may well conclude that Urban's was the most significant contribution, but answers do need to embrace the period to 1122.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the reasons why different types of monasticism emerged in the period from 1046 to 1122.**

Focus: Assessment of causation of religious change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should consider several examples of the 'new' monasticism of the period, even if they concentrate upon the best known, the Cistercians. They may refer to (e.g.) orders such as the Carthusians, the Premonstratensians, the Gilbertines. The general spiritual-religious context is important here since it shaped the demands for a different direction in monasticism. The elites, not least lay, were keen to achieve a better form of spirituality and there was a search for forms of a purer Benedictinism. Prayers, good works, ways to salvation, traditions of patronage, family connections and family needs, the appeal of the monastic life to younger members of families, all were involved. 'New' monasticism had a greater appeal over 'old', the latter appearing safe, stale,

contaminated, too worldly, over-comfortable. Contrasts between 'old' and 'new' might work well here, though candidates need to keep their emphasis upon the types of 'new' monastic activity with suitable examples. Issues that might be raised: community sense, brotherhood sense, location (often remote), asceticism and hermetical traditions, austerity, types of lay involvement, the uses of lands, true and pure Benedictinism, the links to episcopal and Papal authority and power as well as to lay rulers and patrons. It would be possible to illustrate by examples and an idea of the scale of monastic growth, not least Cistercian. That said, it would be helpful to draw out some of the issues surrounding, for example, the eremitic and cenobitic nature of the Carthusians and the rather different Cistercian approach. Responses that simply describe the different types of monasticism should merit no more than **Band IV** unless there is some attempt to analyse, in which case **Band III** is possible. An answer that dealt exclusively with the Cistercians, no matter how well done, will have a **ceiling of Band III** since the question refers to 'different types' so consideration of more than type is required.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## 2 France and the Empire 1152-1250

### (a) To what extent did Frederick II weaken the German monarchy in pursuit of his ambitions in Italy and Sicily?

Focus: Assessment of impact of policies from one area upon another.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is about Germany and, though some referencing to events and activities in Italy and Sicily is acceptable, this is not a question about the latter area. Consequently, answers that become heavily involved in Italian and Sicilian affairs will not merit much above low **Band IV** unless there is some linkage to Germany. Many answers may conclude that Germany was neglected and that imperial authority and power there were weakened. Candidates may consider what Frederick II inherited (the legacy of Henry VI, the Minority period, the inner feuds, the powerful aristocracy) and they may make effective contrasts with the situation in 1250. The nature of imperial authority and government, the power of the German aristocracy, the effects of progressive feudalism, are all germane here; so, too, the importance of the Golden Bull of Eger and the concessions made there, should be assessed. Frederick's awkward relationship with his elder son, Henry, the concessions the latter made and the alliances he created with sections of the aristocracy as well as his refusal to aid his father all led to Frederick's decisive intervention between 1234 and 1237. Another son, Conrad, was placed on the throne but Frederick did not spend time in regaining lost authority, preferring to return to Italian and Papal affairs. Frederick neglected Germany thereafter, though he drew what resources he could from there.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Explain the reasons why Philip Augustus was able to strengthen the power of the French monarchy.**

Focus: Assessment of causation of major historical change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers might compare and contrast the situations in 1180 and 1223 and note that there was a progressive strengthening, based in part around the benefits of the accretion of Angevin lands and resources. Philip was helped by the inheritance from Louis VI and VII and he was a strong personality, quick to exploit his position as feudal suzerain as his ties with the Church and with many towns. He possessed a formidable range of skills, political, diplomatic and administrative, and he was a decent commander. He was aided by the problems of his opponents, above all the Angevins, especially King John. He manipulated a favourable context and used his suzerainty and growing resources-base to the full. A developing administrative system at local and central levels, good use of royal lands, alliances with towns, skilled use of the law, the mobilisation of wealth (there was big increase in income as taxable capacity rose), all aided Philip. The sense of ambition and purpose as well as the development of a strong provincial network in administration, a strong Royal Court, the mixture of sacral and seigneurial powers, the enhanced position of the Crown, were all further factors.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### **3 Crusading and the Crusader States 1095-1192**

**(a) How important was religious zeal in the motives of those who went on the First Crusade?**

Focus: Assessment of causation of major historical event.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is an evaluative question ('How important ...?') and the focus is upon a balanced coverage wherein the role of religious zeal is set against a range of other factors. The question is about the launching of the Crusade rather than its course and candidates need to make brief mention to the latter if at all. Responses that deal solely with the Papacy, no matter their quality, will **not rise above a good Band III** mark; to go higher they will need to assess other factors in evaluating motives. Narratives or descriptions of the background to and/or start of the Crusade will **not move beyond Band IV** unless there is some linkage to analysis of motives. Many candidates may argue for the central importance of the Papacy, citing Urban II's enormous personal commitment, energy and drive, his preaching and the responses elicited. Such can be allied to (e.g.) prevailing religious zeal, ideas of the armed pilgrimage, penance, remission of sins, salvation routes, plenary indulgences. Without doubt, his personal leadership inspired many, not least knights and ordinary people. Other factors can be adduced, however. These include a desire to stop fighting in Europe

and to export violence; possibly a desire to ease over-crowding of lands and to meet land hunger; actions to prevent Turks seizing Christian lands and killing Christians and destroying churches (this would link to 'liberation' of the Holy Land); possible fears of Turkish advances into the European heartland; care for fellow Christians in suffering and appealing for help; succour for the Byzantine Emperor and the possible benefits to the on-going tensions between the Churches of the West and the East (a desire to reunite the two under Papal leadership); perhaps a desire to assert strong Papal leadership and so enhance Papal leadership of Western Christendom (the struggle with Emperor Henry IV ran on). No set answer is expected; the quality of argument is what matters.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How successful was the Third Crusade (1189-92)?**

Focus: Assessment of outcome of a major historical event.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many may argue for a lack of success, but the best answers will be directed by 'How ...?' and so try to assess and balance failures against successes. Some may conclude that there were at least some important short-term successes. Failure areas for consideration might include: the most obvious failure to achieve the Crusade's goal – the recapture of Jerusalem - and thus the failure also to recover control of the Holy Places. The underlying tensions between Philip Augustus and Richard I might merit some attention since they weakened aspects of the Crusade. However, there were Crusader successes and these will need some evaluation: Richard I fought Saladin to a near-standstill, winning the Battle of Arsuf in 1191, and obtained a valuable truce; there was the promise (no more) of future crusading actions and Arsuf had dented Saladin's formidable reputation. Cyprus was acquired (in Latin, not Byzantine hands), a useful strategic and trading point, a base for possible future activity. Tyre had been held and there was success at Acre. The Crusade gave birth to the Teutonic Knights. The peace settlement of 1192 confirmed Jaffa (a useful port) as Christian and allowed Christian pilgrims access to Jerusalem. Some blows to Muslim morale had been delivered and Richard I had acquired a great reputation, even amongst enemies. The Crusade had ensured the very survival of existing Crusader States, though any territorial gains were limited; survival alone was the future of those States; the importation of further rivalries and the evidence of Muslim power once concentrated were other factors of note.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**4 Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century.****(a) How far did the role of the knight in society change during the twelfth century?**

Focus: Assessment of changing role of important social group in historical context.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to be evaluative, with a strong sense of tackling the requirement to consider 'How far ...?' They will need to place the role of the knight in a wider context, assessing against other social groups in contemporary society, military and social roles, the role of chivalry, the feudal context, the idea of the knight as both leader and guardian, social status, membership of noble retinues, fighting skills, local leadership can all be assessed and some linkage to contemporary knightly representations in art and literature would be useful. A sense of historical change as the position and role or roles of the knight shifted across the century will be important: arguably, the military role became less prominent as against, for example, social significance, an enhanced role in leadership at local level.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the reasons for the growth of the schools in the twelfth century.**

Focus: Assessment of causation of cultural-educational change in context.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is an evaluative question calling for an ordering and prioritisation of key reasons. The question does focus upon the 'growing importance' and the best answers will seek to address that, not least by placing the schools in their educational, political and social context. A range of factors can be used here, such as: their place as learning centres; the role of the great masters or teachers in attracting the bright and the best; the rise of lay literacy and education; the importance of theology, classics and the law (including the growing interest in canon law); the greater requirements of both ecclesiastical and lay administrations; the twelfth-century Renaissance. Specific examples of academic centres, notably Bologna in the South and Paris in the North, will add to the argument. The schools created a powerful base for the subsequent rise of the universities and they were strong centres of interest and attention in this period.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.



**Europe 1450-1530****5 The Italian Renaissance 1450-1530**

**(a) Assess the reasons why the patronage of the princes and nobles was so important to the development of the Italian Renaissance during the period 1450-1530.**

Focus: Assessment of an important cultural development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to put forward a range of reasons and better answers will attempt to rank these. Some may argue that, without patronage, the Italian Renaissance would not have been possible. Issues that may well be discussed include, for example: the issue of money and family self-promotion, linkage to the changing nature of artistic subject matter, competition between families and other groups, political ambition. Some may distinguish between secular princes and princes of the church (popes and cardinals). Some may develop their evaluation by some comparison with the patronage of non-noble/royal merchants and/or the patronage of organizations such as guilds, religious orders. Candidates will need to use some specific examples to back up their arguments.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent did the political condition of the Italian states influence the work of Machiavelli and Castiglione?**

Focus: Assessment of an important political development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates are required to assess the impact of the political condition on the writings of Machiavelli and of Castiglione. This can be done by weighing the influence of political conditions against other factors. There will need to be treatment of both authors, although this need not be balanced 50:50 even for top Band I. Issues that may well be discussed include: the structures and functions of government in various Italian states, the functions of rulers and personalities, criticisms made by the authors of the systems and their blueprint for good governance. Some may see the interdependent relationship between authors and systems, but not all answers even in the Band I will achieve this. Simple descriptions either of the condition of Italy or the writings of these authors will have a ceiling of **Band IV**.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**6 Spain 1469-1520****(a) How important was religion in influencing the policies of Ferdinand and Isabella?**Focus: Assessment of Religious motivation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question seeks to measure how important religion was in determining policy alongside other issues which might determine policy, such as internal stability, foreign concerns, economic and social concerns and so on. There is no doubt that Isabella personally was very pious and that there are areas of policy which were heavily influenced by this (such as the *reconquista*, the inquisition, reform of the Church), but other issues need also to be explored if 'How important ...?' is to be addressed. Some may consider areas where pragmatic solutions came into play. Some may consider linkages between religious influences and other influences.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent were the problems faced by Charles I from 1516 to 1520 of his own making?**Focus: Assessment of a serious political problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question focuses on the causes of the problems experienced by Charles in this period rather than the solutions he found for them. The range of problems that may be brought into the consideration include: issues of noble power, relationships with the Church and others, the poor impression made by Charles on his arrival in Spain, support for Charles' brother Ferdinand as an alternative ruler, financial issues, the various revolts. Charles was not responsible for the financial problems of the crown that he inherited, but he was responsible for financial exactions when he arrived. He was not responsible for the worsening relations with the nobility under his grandfather, but he was responsible for alienating them further when he arrived. The discontent behind the revolts had long-term causes, but candidates may argue that they were not inevitable and that Charles may be seen as a trigger.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### 7 The Ottoman Empire 1451-1529

**(a) Assess the military strengths and weaknesses of the Ottoman Empire during the period from 1451 to 1529.**

Focus: Assessment of military strength.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to evaluate the military strength of the Ottoman Empire in this period. Clearly there will be high and low points and some candidates may well take the line of assessing those for what they tell us about the military strength of the Empire. More generally, issues of strength may be assessed by evaluating issues such as: the abilities and strategies of individual sultans, the organization of the military and their ability to be placed on a war footing, the janissaries, the sipahis, financial backing for the military, the efficacy of supply lines. Answers may focus on times of strength, or factors which mitigated for or against military strength. Answers which narrate military activity or military organization will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent did Suleiman the Magnificent fulfill his aims to 1529?**

Focus: Assessment of the reign of an individual.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question focuses on the degree of success achieved by Suleiman in meeting his aims in the early years of his reign. Many candidates may conclude that he was very successful and that he achieved his aims to a very great extent. The best answers will establish the areas where he was more successful and areas where he was less successful. Areas for consideration might include: the establishment of his regime, military conquest, anti-Habsburg policy, reform of the navy, reform of the administration. Extent may be measured by reference to specific achievements and failures, such as: the capture of the island of Rhodes, the capture of the strategic fortress city of Belgrade (opening the way into the Danube Valley), victory at the Battle of Mohacs (1526) and the occupation of most of Hungary, failure against Vienna and retreat (1529).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**8 Exploration and Discovery 1450-1530**

**(a) How far was religion the main motive for Spanish exploration and empire-building during the period to 1530?**

Focus: Assessment of an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must consider the issue of religious motivation in some depth, even if they reject it. However, a range of issues need to be considered in order to assess the relative importance of religious motivation. Clearly, the issue of religious motivation has a number of facets, such as: the religiosity of individuals, the piety of Queen Isabella, the religious motivation of individual explorers, the motivation of evangelism in new lands, the attitude of the church. Some of the other issues to be explored may include: rivalry with Portugal, the possibility of expanding wealth and developing trade, curiosity in the natural world, land hunger, the need for new settlements. Better answers may see and explore linkage between the factors or change and development in the relative importance of some factors.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent were technical advances responsible for success in exploration and discovery from 1450 to 1530?**

Focus: Assessment of a significant development of technology.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is an evaluative question which seeks to set technical advances against other issues. It may well be argued that, without such advances, no exploration could have taken place and indeed that exploration itself gave rise to technical advances. The best answers may see and explore linkage between technical advances and other issues. Areas of technical advance that may be brought into the assessment may include: the use of the caravel, map-making, navigation (especially the use of latitude and astrolabes). This might be set against other reasons, such as: issues of finance and patronage, success breeding success, religious motivation.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**Europe 1498-1560****9 The Holy Roman Empire 1517-1559****(a) Assess the reasons why Charles V was unable to prevent the spread of Protestantism in Germany.**

Focus: Assessment of a significant religious event.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The most successful answers will see this as a multi causal question and will seek to evaluate a range of factors for Charles' failure. The question could be tackled in a chronological way, looking at significant moments and turning points - as long as it does not take the form of a narrative (information must be used to develop the argument, not merely to provide illustration). Alternatively, some candidates may look thematically, considering areas, such as: Charles' power in Germany, his frequent absences, the independent nature of the German princes, the effectiveness of Luther, appeal of Lutheranism, the power of printing, the lack of effective support for the church in Germany support from the Papacy, frequent distractions because of wars with France and the Turks.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent did Charles V's relationship with the German princes change during his reign?**

Focus: Assessment of change and continuity.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The focus of this question is the extent of change over time. Clearly candidates will need to have a clear picture of the nature of Charles' relationship with the princes, the diversity of that relationship within the Empire and possibly an assessment of the relationship at the start and end of his reign. Issues that may be considered include: his election and start of his reign (perhaps referring to the Compact of Brussels 1522), the legacy he inherited, the impact of his absences, the reform movement, economic considerations, religious choices and the formation of rival military leagues by both sides, the impact of prolonged external war. Some candidates may look at individual examples, considering similarities/differences at Diets over his reign (such as Worms 1521, Speyer 1526 & 1529, Augsburg 1530 & 1555), the Knights' War, the Peasants' War, the on-going issue of Ferdinand's election as King of the Romans, the dissolution of the Swabian League, the Recess of Regensburg 1541, the Schmalkaldic War 1546-47. Some may take a particular prince like Philipp of Hesse or successive Electors of Saxony to consider the nature of the imperial-princely relationship.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### 10 Spain 1504-1556

**(a) How successful was Charles I in the conduct of Spanish foreign policy? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates are expected to answer on Charles policy as King of Spain, this will chiefly involve his policies against France and Turkey. Candidates are not expected to refer to Charles' roles elsewhere (e.g. in the Empire) but, as ever, material of this nature which is focused on answering this question will be given credit. Many candidates may suggest that Charles had some moderate success, but at the expense of a worsening financial situation. Issues that may be covered include: the personal rivalry between Charles and Francis I, control of the duchy of Milan, rival claims to Navarre, victories such as Pavia and Landriano, the French invasion of Naples, Treaty of Cambrai, Peace of Crepy, Charles in the Mediterranean against the Ottomans and their allies (e.g. Tunis, Algiers, Tripoli, the skills of Barbarossa, defeat at the Battle of Prevesa 1538). Some candidates may look at Charles' aims in order to assess his success - this could be a fruitful line to take. Others may look at relative success - which should also work well. Many answers may conclude that he was as successful as he could have been given the range of issues he had to deal with elsewhere.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How strong was Spain domestically in 1556? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of political strength.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is an evaluative question which seeks to assess Spain on its own terms - this is not intended to present a comparison with other states. The issue of financial strength may be prominent and there may be discussion of apparent wealth and impending bankruptcy. There may be discussion of how well Spain was governed and what administrative changes had done to strengthen the monarchy, the use of councils, the effectiveness of the Viceroy and perhaps areas of dissent. There is no requirement to discuss foreign policy although candidates might validly consider how it strengthened or weakened domestic government. The argument may center on the apparent lack of unrest, but balance of this against financial and economic problems will be required.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### 11 France 1498-1559

#### (a) Assess the successes and failures of French foreign policy from 1499 to 1559.

Focus: Assessment of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is an evaluative question which seeks to assess the successes and failures of the all-consuming wars between France and the Habsburgs during this period. This was a policy based on dynastic territorial disputes over areas such as Milan and Naples. But there was also personal rivalry between successive French kings (Francis I and Henri II) and the Emperor Charles V. In terms of successes, candidates may consider elements such as: the gaining of Milan in 1499 and 1515 and 1524, victory at Marignano 1515, the League of Cognac, the occupation of Savoy & Piedmont 1536-37, Treaty of Crépy 1544, the occupation of Corsica 1553, the recovery of Calais 1558, the regular frustrating of Charles V's attempts to solve the problems of Germany. Failure may be considered in relation to: expulsion from Naples 1503-04, expulsion from Milan in 1512 and 1521 and 1525 and the failure of all attempts to recover it thereafter, failure in the imperial election 1519, the Battle of Pavia 1525, the Treaty of Madrid, defeats by the Spanish at St. Quentin 1557 and Gravelines 1558. Alliance with the Ottomans may be brought into the evaluation. Some candidates may mention war weariness and the growing (and massive) financial costs – some may use this as the deciding factor in their evaluation. Others might use the gains and losses of the Treaty of Câteau-Cambrésis 1559 to make their determination.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

#### (b) How successfully were religious problems in France dealt with during the reign of Francis I?

Focus: Assessment of a significant area of policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There are a variety of issues which might be dealt with, including: spiritual malaise during the period and the efforts of Christian Humanist reformers to redress problems (e.g. the Meaux Circle) and Francis' active support for individual preachers and scholars like Louis de Berquin, Francis' control and use of church offices. Heresy and Lutheranism are clearly important topics, as is persecution. The issue of the royal relationship with the church in France is important, as is the relationship with the Papacy (Concordat of Bologna 1516). Specific aspects that may be considered to help make the assessment include: problems with Louis de Berquin, the Affair of the Placards 1534, the Edict of Coucy 1535, the Edict of Fontainebleau 1540, the massacre of the

Waldensians in Provence 1544-45. Some candidates may take the view that since religious strife broke out later in the century, Francis I was unsuccessful in dealing with religious problems during his reign. Such a view would have to be justified.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## 12 Warfare 1499-1560

**(a) Assess the problems facing rulers in raising military forces during the period from 1499 to 1560.**

Focus: Assessment of an important military development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There are a range of problems to be assessed here which clearly are closely linked to each other - more successful answers may see those links. Some candidates may argue that the chief problem for all rulers in this period was the escalating cost of warfare. This is clearly linked to the length of some conflicts, in particular the Habsburg-Valois conflict and the issue of inflation, but it links also to the impact of *trace italienne*. The responses of rulers to new tactics can include: changes to fortifications, the use of the infantry, the increased use of firepower. Some candidates may assess problems such as: the problems of using mercenaries, the problems of raising national armies, the changing role of the nobility. Many candidates may conclude that the problems were immense, though not insurmountable. Many may suggest the cost of war as the most significant problem that rulers faced.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent did military tactics change during from 1499 to 1560?**

Focus: Assessment of change and continuity.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question seeks to measure the tactics that changed alongside those that did not and come to some sort of evaluative answer. Issues which might be brought into the evaluation include: the new role for the infantry ushered in by the Swiss and da Cordoba, the developing use of the battlefield artillery and hand-held guns, the use of battlefield fortifications (e.g. key at Cerignola 1503, Bicocca 1522). In turn, the best answers will show understanding that tactics were forced to change by the



adoption of ballistic shaping in fortifications and then fully-fledged *trace italienne* fortifications, bringing war of movement to an end again and locking armies down in ever-longer sieges (the Battles of Pavia 1525 and Landriano 1529 were the last set-piece battles of the Habsburg-Valois Wars). Some may point out that most if not all of the developments affected only parts of Europe and more traditional warfare continued outside Italy and the disputed border lands of the Habsburg-Valois Wars. Many candidates may conclude that there was significant change, perhaps held back by the problems of finance, recruitment and supply.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## Europe 1545-1610

### 13 The Counter Reformation 1545-c.1600

**(a) How important were the Jesuits in the revival of the Roman Catholic Church in the period from 1545 to c.1600?**

Focus: Assessment of a significant religious movement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question seeks to evaluate the importance of the Jesuits alongside other engines for change during the Counter Reformation. Some candidates may contend that the Jesuits were very important to the revival of the Catholic Church. Some may see them as the key factor in catholic revival. Better answers may well see them in the context of other new orders of priests like the Oratory, or new monastic orders of the period (perhaps the Capuchins, new orders for women). In terms of the Jesuits themselves, candidates may bring into their evaluation aspects such as: their training and privileges, their devotion and linkage to the Papacy, their role at Trent, their missionary role in Europe and beyond. This could be set against other factors at work in bringing about revival, such as: the work of individual popes (perhaps Sixtus V, Gregory XIII, the legacy of Paul III), the significance of the decrees of the Council of Trent (What did they really represent? Had they been implemented by c.1600?), the activities of secular princes, such as Philip II and dukes of Bavaria. Better answers will see and explore something of the inter-relationships between some of these and/or other factors.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How serious were the problems facing the Catholic Church in the mid-sixteenth century?**

Focus: Assessment of a religious problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A wide range of answers may well be found in answer to this question, ranging from a confirmation that the problems were very serious because of the spiritual malaise and the threat of Protestantism to the other end of the extreme that the Church was still very strong in most parts of Europe and a spiritual revival had already begun with new religious orders and lay piety. Issues that might be considered include: the quality of the clergy (senior and junior), clerical abuses, the secular interests of the Church and Papacy, the lack of reform from the center. Some may distinguish between such 'internal' issues and the threat of protestant evangelism. How much had actually been lost to the heretics by c.1550? The debit side might be set against positive factors, such as: continued lay support, increased lay participation, strong church finances, glittering new church building and ornamentation, the support of rulers such as Charles V. Equally, some may point to serious internal reform under way before c.1550 – notably under Pope Paul III. Candidates may assess individual problems or take more of an overview, but there must be real assessment.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**14 The Reign of Henry IV 1589-1610**

**(a) To what extent did the Edict of Nantes (1598) settle religious problems in France during the period to 1610?**

Focus: Assessment of a religious problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may accept this statement in terms of arguing that this is traditionally seen as the end of the Wars of Religion, or they may argue that it really settled very little as Henry was assassinated. Answers need to look at the issue of extent and evaluate the impact that the Edict had on France to the end of Henry's reign. Issues that might be considered include: the provisions of the Edict itself what is gained by the Huguenots and what restrictions still remain, the creation of a 'state within a state' and how effective that was, the nature of implementation at the King's pleasure, and how far this depended on Henry personally. Some candidates may set this against other factors which promoted religious settlement, including the settling of the international situation, a war-weariness, the good administration and more settled nature of Henry's reign. The best answers will really evaluate extent and may explore links between some of these issues.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess Henry IV's effectiveness as King of France from 1598 to 1610.**

Focus: Assessment of a reign.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question asks for an evaluation of how well Henry dealt with the problems of his reign and how effectively he governed France during his reign. A number of responses can be expected. Some may argue that he was very effective since he was able to heal and settle a kingdom split by civil war. Others may argue that these problems were never far from the surface and that since he was assassinated his rule could not have been that effective. Areas that might be used within the assessment include: the Edict of Nantes, religious policy, crown finances, economic policy, relations with the nobility, relations with the parlements, how effectively the regions were governed, effectiveness of the administration and how effectively Henry restored the authority of the crown.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**15 The Dutch Revolt 1563-1609**

**(a) Assess the reasons why the Spanish were able to retain the Southern provinces of the Netherlands.**

Focus: Assessment of a significant historical problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may take a long or a short term view of this question, they might look at the final outcome and explain why the Spanish were able to keep the Southern provinces, or they may look at significant events and turning points and analyse them in terms of how they resulted in the Spanish keeping part of the Netherlands. Issues that might be considered are as follows: the geographical problems and advantages of the southern provinces, the effectiveness of military campaigns, the religious issues and how they polarized opinion, the leadership of the Spanish and problems encountered in maintaining their hold on the Netherlands. Candidates may also refer to particularist issues that mitigated in Spain's favour.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How important was Calvinism to the outbreak and continuation of the Dutch Revolt?**

Focus: Assessment of causation of an important historical event.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There is considerable debate over this issue and candidates could well argue successfully in a number of ways. It will be important to see the issue of Calvinism in the context of other issues and to evaluate its importance against other possible factors responsible for the outbreak and continuation of the Dutch Revolt. It is important that candidates answer the question by looking at both the outbreak and the continuation of the Revolt. Candidates may well conclude that the factors at work at the outset were different from those at work later on in the Revolt. The range of factors for consideration within the evaluation includes: Calvinism (which was not so important to start with), religion more generally, regionalism within the Netherlands, the actions of Philip II himself, taxation, constitutional issues, the behaviour of Spanish forces (a factor later in the Revolt).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**16 Spain as a Great Power 1556-1598**

**(a) How serious were the economic and financial problems facing Phillip II throughout his reign?**

Focus: Assessment of economic and financial problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Both financial and economic problems were acute during this period, but the seriousness of these issues can be assessed in different ways during the reign. Issues that might be included are as follows: the strength of the Spanish economy, its ability to react to the constant demands for taxation, the effects of inflation, attempts to raise money by the crown, the constant demands for money as a result of the foreign policy, economic [policies and bankruptcy. Better answers will assess these various issue and rank them. Some will consider linkages between some of the issues.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent was Philip II motivated by his religious beliefs in ruling Spain?**

Focus: Assessment of religious motivation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question seeks to explore Phillip's motivation in his domestic policy - it is not a question about religious policy, although this might form part of the answer. Candidates will need to weigh the issue of religious motivation against other factors which motivated Phillip. Candidates might consider issues such as: Phillip's uncompromising personality in all issues (not just in religion), his insistence on overseeing everything himself, financial considerations, the impact of foreign issues on the governance of Spain (which could include the Dutch Revolt), the impact of court faction, the impact of provincialism. Better answers may conclude that he was rarely motivated by single issues, although religious motivation was very important to him – handling of the *morisco* problem might be used to illustrate this.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**Europe 1598-1661**

**17 Richelieu and Mazarin 1622-1661**

**(a) How far did Richelieu achieve his aims in his religious policies?**

Focus: Assessment of Richelieu's success in achieving his aims in religion.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Candidates can be expected to explain Richelieu's religious aims and might put them into a political context. For Richelieu, all religious minorities, whether Huguenots or Catholic Dévots, were to be subjugated under royal control. His view was that religion should not be allowed to interfere with the prosecution of war, although it might provide a motive for war, or with the powers of the monarchy. In his dealings with the Huguenots, Richelieu demonstrated a judicious mix of ruthless force and compromise in dealing with the 'state within a state'. Reference might be made to the crushing of La Rochelle and the Peace of Alais. With the Dévots, fears of links with Spain led to their suppression and clearly demonstrated the supremacy of political and foreign policies over religion. Candidates are not expected to go beyond 1661 (the end of this Study Topic) in assessing Richelieu's success, for examining in dealing with the Huguenots. They might refer to the support from Huguenots for French policies in the Thirty Years' War but a failure to mention developments during the reign of Louis XIV should not be regarded as a gap. On the other hand, answers can be given credit if they mention the point. In political terms, Richelieu's policies helped to increase the power of the crown internally and externally assisted France to overtake Spain as a major power.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How far was France a stronger international power in 1661 than it had been in 1622?**

Focus: Assessment of international strength over an extended period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Candidates should be expected to deal with the two specified dates in order to address the comparative element in the question. Long narratives that lack comparison, however accurate, with very little comment should normally be subject to a ceiling of **Band III**. France was not completely stronger in 1661. There were limits and weaknesses in its position, for example Louis XIV had yet to make his mark. However, the position was substantially improved. In 1622, France was still in partial recovery from the civil wars of the late sixteenth century, and there were further internal tensions to come. However, the potential for increasing external strength was there. Irrespective of France, the European scene was changing anyway. Spain was in serious economic decline. England was about to enter a period of upheaval between King and Parliament. The most serious threat to France was probably from the Austrian Habsburg Empire and would remain so for some time. By 1661, France had gained considerably from the Thirty Years' War and Westphalia (1648) confirmed this. The Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) saw the defeat of Spain and the recognition of French territorial rights. On the other hand, the United Provinces had emerged as a serious trade rival by 1661 and England was to become more of a threat in trade and in military coalitions against France. In general, one might argue that in 1622 France was under threat whilst it was the main threat to European peace in 1661.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**18 The Problems of Spain 1598-1659****(a) How successful was Olivares in providing Spain with effective government?**Focus: Evaluation of Olivares's policies for government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Candidates might explore the difference between Olivares's intentions, which were probably sound, and his methods, which were often ill-chosen, contradictory and unsound. The outcomes worsened affairs to the point of widespread insurrection. Olivares's key policy of centralisation was defensible in theory. However, a number of factors conspired to thwart him. Iberian unification was comparatively recent and not deeply embedded, with provinces jealous of their rights. Central administration was limited in efficiency. Some might argue that Olivares was poorly supported by Philip IV. There were huge debts particularly from wars. The internal economy was weak and the empire was contributing little. If one adds to this Olivares's inability to compromise or reduce the amount of reform that he advocated, the result was nearly fatal to Spain. Reference might be made to rebellions in Catalonia and Portugal.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent were Spain's economic problems during the period 1598-1659 caused by foreign wars?**Focus: Assessment of wars as a cause of Spain's economic problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. The Study Topic begins in 1598. Candidates might explain the economic situation in 1598 with reference to Philip II's wars but they are not expected to provide detail of developments outside the period of the Study Topic. But 1598 is only a starting point and sound answers should show an understanding of the specified period as a whole. There is no need to provide a blow-by-blow account of the wars of the first half of the century but examiners will look for an awareness of the effects of the wars. Apart from wars, Spain was beset by problems such as a general social and economic backwardness, regional protectionism over trade, the jealousies of Castile, inefficient and inequitable tax burdens, and the costs of maintaining an overseas empire that was in creakingly under pressure from the Dutch, English and later the French. Candidates might make the point that, even in the peaceful decade after the Dutch truce of 1609, Spain's economic problems were not addressed. The renewal of the Dutch war and entanglements in the Thirty Years' War and afterwards to 1659 proved catastrophic.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### **19 The Thirty Years' War 1618-1648**

#### **(a) How far did the Edict of Restitution (1629) mark the peak of Habsburg success in the Thirty Years' War?**

Focus: Assessment of a turning point in the Thirty Years' War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Examiners will look for an assessment of the Edict of Restitution and its significance. The Habsburgs saw it as the successful end of the conflict but their triumphalism led to deep suspicion within the Empire and, perhaps more significantly, outside it. The Edict followed a string of Habsburg military victories. It was also the cause of Swedish and French intervention, after which Habsburg victories came only singly and occasionally. In considering 'How far...?', it might be argued that the defeat of Denmark was the military peak. Alternatively, the death of the Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus at the Battle of Lutzen in 1632 might be considered - with France then taking up the baton of direct military intervention. The war continued long after 1629 to become a prolonged stalemate. The Habsburgs failed to consolidate their gains represented by the 1629 Edict. Protestantism and the rights of princes were strengthened. Westphalia in 1648 recognised a very different position from 1629.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

#### **(b) Assess the reasons why the Thirty Years' War lasted so long.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the prolongation of an important war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. In coming to an assessment, the most successful answers will normally be expected to explain some order of priority among factors. Candidates might consider the impact of the Edict of Restitution (1629), which alienated many German princes including those who otherwise had Catholic sympathies. Foreign intervention can be considered, first by Denmark then by Sweden and France. Spain's intervention on the side of the Austrian Habsburgs was not decisive but helped to prolong the war. To 1629, the anti-Habsburg and Protestant forces were able to survive in spite of their comparative weakness. From 1629, by contrast, it was the turn of the Habsburgs and their allies to survive. Neither side was able to muster the resources necessary to bring the conflict to a decisive conclusion. Many countries that were involved in the war had economic and political problems that impeded their military effectiveness. Candidates might note that the Treaty of Westphalia reflected this because it did not signify an outright victory for any of the participants.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.



Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## **20 Social Issues in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century**

### **(a) How far did the social structure in France limit economic change during the first half of the seventeenth century?**

Focus: Assessment of the relationship between social structure and economic change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Candidates might consider the latent economic strength of France. Its resources were many and its population was large. Yet its economy did not reflect these advantages. Commerce and overseas trade were not attractive outlets for the wealthy and were not seen as the paths to social and political improvement. Land and office were more promising. An aspiring middle class was too small to make an impact. The lower orders were usually tied to subsistence farming and were exploited ruthlessly by taxation. There was little movement because the (social) estates. Answers might refer to attempts, for example by Sully and Richelieu, to make economic changes. Sully's work has been praised but probably had little long-term effects because of the lack of political support after the death of Henry IV. Richelieu's efforts, although well meant, were hindered by his preoccupation with other problems and the deadening effect of established customs and attitudes.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### **(b) Assess the reasons for the increase in scientific development in the first half of the seventeenth century.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for scientific development in a specified period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. In coming to an assessment, the most successful answers will normally be expected to explain some order of priority among factors. Answers might consider the work of great scientists; the Specification mentions Kepler and Galileo. There was a growing challenge to religious dogma. The case of Galileo shows that the Roman Catholic Church continued to exert an influence in science but there were regions and societies in Europe, for example the United Provinces, where scientific investigation and claims could be pursued within fewer limits. There is evidence of an increasing interest in science. There were more scientific publications and journals. There were a growing number of amateur scientists, often

from a bourgeois or gentry background. Technical improvements assisted enquiry and discovery, for example the better telescopes.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## Europe 1660-1718

### 21 Sweden and the Baltic 1660-1718

**(a) How far do you agree that the increase of royal power in Sweden was the main aim of Swedish kings in the period 1660-1718?**

Focus: Assessment of aims in relation to increased royal power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. The legacy of Charles X might be examined as an introductory context but the reign of Charles XI will probably occupy most of the candidates' time. His main aim was the increase in royal power through absolutism. Policies that developed included the Reduktion (reclaimed royal land and revenues), appeals to and support from the Rikstag and the development of a central collegiate administration and bureaucracy. Another aspect might be the maintenance of a large local standing army. The result was a popular royal absolutism that was supported by Church, towns and peasantry. It might be argued that the reign of Charles XII was different in that his main aim was the aggressive defence of his realm against ultimately overwhelming odds. He did increase royal power by more rigid control of the economy, which was directed to war. However, his defeat ensured that very strong royal authority in Sweden was substantially weakened.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'The main reason for the collapse of the Swedish Empire was because it was too large for Sweden to maintain.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the Swedish Empire during the reign of Charles XII?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for the decline of an important power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. It might be claimed that the relative dearth of natural resources would always make it difficult for Sweden to maintain the scattered Empire that it had gained especially through the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). Sweden was under-populated. Copper was becoming scarce after making such an important contribution. Candidates might consider that the Empire had also been won partly because of default: the weakness of other Baltic states including Russia. Warring rivals such as England, France and the United Provinces, allowed Sweden a temporary supremacy over Baltic trade. Its commitment and territories in Germany would make Sweden's interests there difficult to defend in the long term, even with greater resources. Candidates might examine the claim that the major reason for Sweden's collapse was the rise of Russia under Peter the Great. (Examiners will note that this Study Topic is on Sweden and the Baltic. Candidates are not expected to have detailed understanding and knowledge of the rise of Russia itself.)

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## **22 France and Europe 1661-1715**

**(a) To what extent did the end of the Dutch Wars in 1679 mark the highest point of Louis XIV's power in Europe?**

Focus: Assessment of a suggested turning point in French international power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. The case for the importance of 1679 might include the fact that the anti-French forces had been defeated by the strongest military machine in Europe. Louis XIV's new navy had also performed well. He had strengthened his frontiers and acquired new territories, socially in the Rhineland region. Specific mention might be made to the Peace of Nijmegen (1678). Counter-suggestions might include 1684, when Regensburg secured French claims to the 'Reunion' territories. To put 'highest point' in context, some might see the Peace of Ryswick (1697) or the beginning of the War of the Spanish Succession (1702) as marking the end of French dominance. Louis' enemies became more effective. They found outstanding generals, for example Marlborough and Eugene. The attempt to combine France and Spain put too much pressure on France. The costs increased. Candidates might take either of two approaches. The first might be to consider the reign of Louis XIV as a whole, to see 'turning point' in a wide context. Others might focus more narrowly on 1679, or another specific period. Both can be equally valid although the first might tempt candidates in writing long surveys that lack an argument.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How extensive was the cultural influence of Louis XIV's France on other European states to 1715?**

Focus: Assessment of the cultural influence of France.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Louis XIV's view and use of culture as an extension of policy to enhance his glory and that of France was highly influential. The adoption of this belief by other rulers, including those of different religions and governmental systems, was significant. Some answers might note the link between culture and political aspirations. Candidates might refer to the copying of Versailles as an architectural style and as a hub of government. French was widely spoken by governing classes. On the other hand, rulers who encouraged the arts were often willing to patronise native artists using non-French styles, for example in the United Provinces.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**23 The Development of Brandenburg-Prussia 1660-1713**

**(a) To what extent was the policy of Frederick William, the Great Elector, towards the junkers the main reason for his increased power in Brandenburg- Prussia by 1688?**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the increased power of a ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Candidates might consider that Frederick William had to deal with the power of the junkers in most of the important matters of government. His major policies included the creation of a loyal and efficient bureaucracy, dedicated to state service, a large and loyal army, and the centralisation of his scattered territories. He was highly, but not completely, successful. The junkers will still be influential by the time of his death in 1688. They had been allowed to keep substantial estates in return for obedience and loyalty to the Great Elector. They were largely exempt from taxes as they raised taxes for the state. They enjoyed feudal rights over the peasantry and in turn gave up much of their independent regional power in the Estates. The role of the junkers was redefined in relation to the powers of the Great Elector; they were neither ignored nor emasculated. They filled the highest ranks of the administration and military, but they owed their positions directly to Frederick William. In turn, he strengthened the ruler's position in Brandenburg-Prussia very considerably although there was a

variation between the different regions. He was less successful in dominating Cleves-Mark than Brandenburg. Candidates might assess other factors that helped to give Frederick William increased power. These might include his realistic personality: determination combined with a willingness to see that was possible. He tried to avoid wars that could damage his state and his power within it. He was tolerant in religion and willing to encourage enterprise and innovation in the economy.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent was the foreign policy of Brandenburg- Prussia's rulers mainly defensive during the period 1660-1713?**

Focus: Assessment of the major characteristics of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Candidates might argue that both Frederick William, the Great Elector, and Frederick I pursued foreign policies that contained strong defensive qualities inasmuch as they did not begin an unprovoked war. However, there are counter-explanations that might be offered. It might be claimed that personal prestige or a desire for territorial gain and consolidation were major factors. Consequently both rulers seized opportunities for gain by joining in wars - and sometimes changing sides - for example for and against Louis XIV. This might not seem like a purely defensive stance. Brandenburg-Prussia's foreign commitments depended on subsidies that in turn shaped those policies. The Great Elector gained East Prussia and Frederick I attained kingship in Prussia for supporting Leopold of Austria against France. Candidates might point out that Brandenburg-Prussia was not strong enough to fight alone against a single major power, nor was it strong enough to adopt an outright aggressive policy. A fair assessment of foreign policy in this period might be that it was cautious and self-seeking whilst minimising serious risk to the fledgling power.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**24 Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century**

**(a) How far was Newton's work the main contribution to scientific development in the second half of the seventeenth century?**

Focus: Assessment of the work of a great scientist.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. Answers might claim that, in terms of an impact in the relevant period, Newton's work was either the outstanding achievement or that it had actually had little impact on others. Candidates are not expected to have knowledge of his influence in the eighteenth century and afterwards. The sheer breadth and depth of his intellectual creativity in so short a period of time was unparalleled. He unified previous scientists' work on planetary/terrestrial motion in the theory of gravity. He also proposed laws of motion that were to become fundamental. Candidates might consider the period as one that saw the emergence of a number of professional scientists (NB the Specification mentions only Newton by name – "especially Newton" - and candidates are not required to show detailed knowledge of others, such as Boyle, Huygens, Leeuwenhoek, Leibniz). The spirit of a scientific community was developed in this period. As well as astronomy, mathematics and physics, biology and chemistry also saw considerable changes. The period saw the growth of science academies that added to the intellectual rigour of investigation and publication.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the reasons for the importance of Amsterdam in the Dutch economy in the second half of the seventeenth century.**

Focus: Evaluation of the importance of Amsterdam to the Dutch economy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners should be willing to consider alternative explanations. In coming to an assessment, the most successful answers will normally be expected to explain some order of priority among factors. Amsterdam was important to the Dutch economy for a number of reasons, but particularly because of its role in the international economy. It was involved in trade, banking and more general economic activity. It contained a substantial proportion of the Dutch population. An atmosphere of religious toleration with a highly comparative degree of integration of immigrant groups with business and commercial skills was important. For example, the Jews were better integrated here than in other European cities. Civic pride promoted economic activity. Candidates might note that the Dutch economy did not afford many alternatives means of gaining wealth. By the end of the century, Amsterdam's pre-eminence was under threat from England and to a lesser extent France. However, it was still the largest and most important city in the United Provinces.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.





**Mark Scheme 2586  
June 2005**

**Europe 1789-1849****1 The French Revolution 1789-95****(a) Assess the impact of religious division on the course of the Revolution from 1789 to 1795.**

Focus: Evaluating the relative role of one factor.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The main focus of the answer should be on the impact of religious division on the course of the Revolution. Candidates may seek to show how religion became an important issue in determining attitudes to the Revolution after 1789 and particularly after the proposed Civil Constitution of the Clergy and its associated oath. Candidates may point to the divisive effect of the Civil Constitution, and the association between Catholicism and potential Counter-Revolution. We may get discussion of the King's attitude and actions (the Flight to Varennes), the role of religion in fomenting Counter Revolution in the West and the de-christianisation associated with the Terror. There may also be discussion of the Cult of the Supreme Being. The impact of religious division may also be set in the context of other factors affecting the course of the Revolution.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'Without the extreme measures of the Terror, the French Republic would not have survived.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the survival of the French Republic from 1792 to 1795?**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for survival of French Republic.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In order to score in the higher bands, candidates need to deal with the impact of extreme measures even if they wish to argue that other factors were significant in the Republic's survival. Candidates may argue that the Terror was introduced as an emergency solution to the crises/threats facing the Republic from 1792-93. They may argue that the emergency measures taken (Committees of Public Safety, General Security et al., *levée en masse*, Maximum, Revolutionary armies, Revolutionary Tribunals, Representatives on mission, de-christianisation and so on) were necessary to deal with the threats foreign invasion, rebellion, economic crisis and counter-revolution posed to the survival of the republic. However, they may also argue that the extremes of the Terror deepened the crisis (and that the French Republic survived for other reasons – such as military success, lack of cohesion/organisation in opposition). They may also argue that the Terror became most extreme at the time when the threats that had brought about its inception had been dealt with and so argue that the Terror came to threaten the survival of the Republic rather than ensure its survival.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## 2 Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815

**(a) To what extent was the strength of the French army the main reason for Napoleon's success in Europe in the period to 1807?**

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the factor in the question adequately in order to score in the higher bands, even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may point to the veteran nature of the Grand Army, a machine honed in nearly a decade of constant warfare. They may discuss the impact of the reforms heralded by Guibert, Du Teil and others, the '*levée en masse*', the motivation of soldiers, the new style of warfare and so on in support of the case for the strength of the French army. They may balance this against Napoleon's generalship, the organisation of the French state for war, and the weaknesses and mistakes of Napoleon's enemies. They may seek to argue that a combination of factors brought success and establish how the different factors linked together.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'Despite constitutions and plebiscites, Napoleon ruled France as a dictator.' How far do you agree with this verdict?**

Focus: Evaluation of Napoleon's rule of France.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is intended to elicit a discussion of the nature of Napoleonic rule in France. Given the clue, candidates may seek to balance the apparent authoritarian features of Napoleonic rule (such as: censorship, propaganda, police, centralised control, the power of the 1<sup>st</sup> Consul/Emperor) against the apparent more liberal aspects – such as the existence of a constitution (in various forms over time), ratification of changes by plebiscite, the guarantees of rights (as in the civil code) and so on. Candidates may also choose to argue that over time Napoleon's regime became more dictatorial, or that from the very start the apparent constitutional framework was no more than a fig leaf hardly covering naked dictatorship.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### 3 France 1814-1848

**(a) To what extent did the policies of Louis XVIII change during the period from 1814 to 1824?**

Focus: Evaluation of change during a reign.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may focus on the apparent contrast and relative conservatism of Louis' final years compared to the apparent liberalism and desire to reconcile monarchy and liberalism in the early years. Candidates may point to the murder of the Duc de Berry as a turning point and the rise of the ultras, or they may see the period more as a whole or as one of gradually increasing conservatism. There may be discussion of the nature of the Charter, the Chambre Introuvable, responses to the 'white terror', different government administrations (Richelieu, Villele), press freedom and electoral changes.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) How important was failure in foreign policy in bringing about the overthrow of Louis Philippe in 1848?**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for downfall.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal adequately with the issue of failure in foreign policy to score in the higher bands even if they wish to argue that the impact of failure in this area was not as important as other factors in bringing about Louis Philippe's overthrow. Candidates may refer to Louis Philippe's failure to deliver '*la gloire*', Belgian independence, and humiliation over Mehmet Ali, for example. Examination of the impact of failure here may be balanced against growing opposition (liberals, socialists, Bonapartists), lack of reform, social unrest, the influence of Guizot, the onset of social and economic crisis and so on. The key to a good answer is how far the candidate has addressed 'How important...?'

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

#### 4 Revolution and Repression in Europe 1815-1849

**(a) How important were economic and social factors in bringing about revolution in the Austrian Empire in 1848?**

Focus: Evaluation of causes.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to deal with the role of economic and social factors adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important in order to score in the higher bands. Answers in the higher bands may establish linkages between economic and social factors and other causes. Many candidates may concentrate on the 'short term' economic crisis from 1846, but some may place this in the longer term context of growing social problems associated with urban growth and the beginnings of industrialisation. Economic and social factors may be balanced against a range of other factors such as the growth of opposition, liberalism and nationalism and the effect of the revolution in France. Candidates may deal separately with the revolutions in Austria, Hungary, Bohemia and (legitimately) Lombardy and Venetia. There should be some awareness of the range of revolutions to score in the higher Bands.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'The revolutionaries failed because they were hopelessly divided.' How far do you agree with this verdict on the failure of the revolutions in the German Confederation in 1848-49?**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for failure.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the issue raised in the question even if they wish to argue against the contention in order to access the higher bands. In relation to divisions amongst the revolutionaries, candidates may discuss the tensions between liberals and radicals, between *grossdeutsch* and *kleindeutsch* nationalists, and between local/provincial revolutions and national (represented by the Frankfurt Parliament). Discussion of the impact of these divisions may be set in the context of the role of the King of Prussia, the loyalty of the Prussian army, the waning of economic crisis, the lack of an army, and the recovery of Austria.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## Europe 1825-1890

### 5 Italy 1830-1870

#### (a) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Italian nationalism in the period 1830-49.

Focus: Assessment of nature of a development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The key to a good answer is how far the candidate provides an argued evaluation of the nature of Italian nationalism in this period. They may point to developments over time and suggest that there was some strength to Italian nationalism because it was a major theme of the revolutions of 1848-49 and the key protagonist, Piedmont, made Italy a rallying cry. Candidates may discuss the relative strength and appeal of Mazzinian and liberal versions of the nationalist idea. In discussing weakness, candidates may refer to the lack of popular support, divisions between different leaders, groups, ideas, and the subsequent failure to coordinate or agree on action, as well as the failure to win over the 'liberal' pope and the opposition of Austria and most Italian rulers.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

#### (b) Assess the role of Garibaldi in bringing about Italian unification in the period from 1848 to 1870.

Focus: Evaluation of the role of a key individual in a historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The central focus of the question is on Garibaldi and his actions, but in order to score in the higher bands there must be real assessment of his role. This can be done in terms of the impact of his actions and/or in relation to other forces at work. Descriptive accounts of Garibaldi's actions cannot score in the higher bands, even if full and detailed – there must be assessment. Whilst candidates may focus on the key years of 1859-60 and the exploits of Garibaldi and his 'thousand', there should be broader treatment to include the 1848 revolutions and/or activities in the 1860s to score in the higher bands. There may be discussion of Garibaldi in relation to Cavour/Piedmont, Napoleon III, the force and appeal of his personality and actions, his abilities as a military leader and the problems he caused for the new state of Italy after 1861.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## 6 Germany c. 1862-1890

### (a) Assess the reasons why Bismarck went to war with Austria (1866) and with France (1870).

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates have to deal with both wars in order to score in the higher bands, but there does not need to be a 50:50 balance. Candidates may seek to argue that Bismarck decided to go to war for broadly similar reasons (e.g. Prussian interests in Germany) in both cases and so deal with them together. Others may stress differences and deal with them separately while some may take a mixture of both approaches. The key is relevant discussion of Bismarck's reasons. Candidates may discuss: Bismarck's aims and methods, the interests of Prussia, the role of German nationalism, the consequences of the Danish war, the consequences of the Austrian war, Bismarck's diplomacy with other German states and France, French actions, his aims in the Hohenzollern candidature crisis and the Ems Telegram, issues related to internal German politics.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### (b) To what extent was the isolation of France the main aim of Bismarck's foreign policy in the period from 1871 to 1890?

Focus: Evaluation of Bismarck's foreign policy aims.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The aim of this question is to elicit discussion of Bismarck's foreign policy aims. Clearly isolation of France was one, and discussion of this aim must form part of any answer even if the candidate wishes to argue that other aims were as or more important. Candidates may argue that this aim was important because, at least in the 1870s, France appeared to be the greatest threat to the new German state. Candidates may point to Bismarck's fear of revanchisme and examine the war scare of 1875 to support this. They may also see isolation of France as the key driving force behind the desire to maintain good relations with Austria and Russia ('à trois in a world governed by five...') – Bismarck wanted to avoid the possibility of a Franco-Russian understanding especially. Others may argue that Bismarck's desire for good relations here was motivated more by a general desire for peace and equilibrium in Europe and the desirability of an alliance with

other conservative and anti-socialist/republican powers. Candidates may point to the domination in German foreign policy of issues relating to the Balkans – especially the Bulgarian crises.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### 7 France 1848-1875

**(a) ‘Napoleon III simply wanted to re-establish France as a great power.’ How far do you agree with this judgement on Napoleon III’s aims in foreign policy?**

Focus: Assessment of foreign policy aims.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The aim of this question is to elicit discussion of Napoleon III’s foreign policy aims. Candidates must deal with the aim given even if they wish to argue that this was not the main or a significant aim. Candidates may point to Napoleon’s playing on the Napoleonic past and the desire for ‘*la gloire*’. They may argue that the Crimean War, his intervention in Italy, his dealings in Mexico and the friction/war with Prussia/Germany all point to this desire to recover the Napoleonic legacy and re-establish French power. On the other hand they may also point to other motives/aims – peace (*L’Empire, c’est la paix!*), a concern for nationalism (‘to do something for Italy’), imperialism (Algeria, West Africa, Indo-China), the pressures of domestic politics (appeasing Catholics and commerce) (hence, the French garrison in Rome, intervention in Mexico, intervention in the Hohenzollern candidature, declaring war on Prussia). Alternatively candidates may argue that Napoleon III had no consistent foreign policy and aims shifted according to circumstance or that whilst ‘re-establishing France as a great power’ may provide a general framework, aims in particular circumstances shifted.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.



**(b) 'More authoritarian than liberal.' How far do you agree with this verdict on Napoleon III's rule of France from 1852 to 1870?**

Focus: Assessment of Napoleon III's rule.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with both the authoritarian and liberal issues to score in the higher bands, but no specific judgement is being looked for. Candidates may adopt the traditional argument that the Empire moved from authoritarianism to liberalism over time and that whilst authoritarian fairly describes the 1850s, liberal more fairly describes the 1860s (constitutional changes, development of opposition, relaxation of press laws). Others may argue that the Empire remained essentially authoritarian and made liberal reforms only when forced to in the 1860s and that concessions were relatively minor. On the other hand, others may seek to show that there was a mixture of liberalism and authoritarianism from the start pointing to constitutional arrangements, freedom of worship, equality before the law, elections, progressive freeing up of trade and secular education.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**8 Russia 1825-1881**

**(a) 'Thirty wasted years, with nothing achieved.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the reign of Nicholas I?**

Focus: Assessment of the rule of Nicholas I.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may agree or disagree with the judgement. Candidates may argue, for example, that Nicholas I missed the opportunity to develop Russia and move her forward as the Westernisers wished. Instead he was pre-occupied with maintaining autocracy and thereby preferred repression (Third Section, censorship, 'Russification') to reform. The consequences of the failure to change were demonstrated in the Crimean War. On the other hand, others may argue that whilst Nicholas I was concerned to maintain autocracy, he was not opposed to cautious change which did not risk revolution – hence the codification of the law, currency reform and limited reform of serfdom.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'The maintenance of autocracy was always more important than reform.' How far do you agree with this verdict on the rule of Alexander II?**

Focus: Assessment of the rule of Alexander II.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may agree or disagree with the verdict offered in the question. Candidates may argue forcefully that Alexander II was essentially a reformer and moderniser and point to the Emancipation of the Serfs, the reforms of local government, the judicial system, financial, educational and military reforms as evidence of this. On the other hand, some answers may point to the retreats from reform when these might threaten the regime (e.g. Russification in Poland), increased censorship in the 1870s, imposition of martial law in most cities in 1879). More sophisticated responses may argue that whilst there were many reforms the aim behind them was essentially to maintain and reinforce autocracy by absorbing some of the pressure for change.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## **America 1846-1919**

### **9 The American Civil War 1861-1865**

**(a) To what extent was the South's failure to win international support the main reason for its defeat in the Civil War?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for defeat.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to address the issue raised in the question even if they wish to argue (as most probably will) that other factors were more important. In discussing international support, candidates may discuss the attempts made by the South to secure British/French support and the hopes they placed in these efforts. Candidates may also refer to the fears of the North in this regard, the efforts they made in relations with Britain and France and the role the North's concern played in Lincoln's decision in 1863 to proclaim emancipation. Discussion of the importance of the failure to win international support needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: military campaigns, leadership, morale, resources.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of General Grant as a military commander.**Focus: Assessment of an individual.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Assessment requires that both strengths and weaknesses are addressed for a reasoned judgement to be made. Candidates may well consider that Grant had far more strengths than weaknesses, but there needs to be some attempt at balanced assessment to score in the higher bands unless very well argued. On the down side, candidates may refer to the criticisms made of Grant that he was wasteful of men's lives, was caught flat-footed at Shiloh and only won because of greater resources (each of these can be explained away). On the plus side, candidates may argue that both as a field general and as a Commander-in-Chief he showed a shrewd and impressive grasp of the strategic possibilities. Candidates may draw on his exploits at Vicksburg and Chattanooga as well as his grasp of overall strategy in the period 1864-65. Candidates may refer to his personal qualities of calmness in the field, personal bravery, single-mindedness, respect for his enemies.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**10 Politics and Reform 1877-1919****(a) To what extent were Trusts the main problem faced by American presidents in the period from 1877 to 1896?**Focus: Assessment of problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

To score in Bands II or I, candidates must discuss the problem of Trusts even if they wish to argue that it was not the main problem. Candidates may argue that Trusts were clearly a major problem which occupied the time of presidents over this period, but that there were other problems that were as significant as Trusts or that were more significant than Trusts. These might include: currency issues, civil service reform, tariffs, pensions, the rise of populism. Candidates may focus on the issues in relation to particular presidents, but there should be some sense of the whole period for Bands II & I.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the reasons for the emergence of Progressivism in America in the early twentieth century.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for a development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The answer must be focused on reason for emergence of Progressivism to score in the higher bands. Candidates may point to longer term/general developments in the USA as the context for Progressivism – such as industrialisation/urbanisation - and the problems connected with these developments (including working hours, working conditions and the franchise). They may point to the heritage of the populist movement and the failure of previous governments in the ‘Gilded Age’ to resolve the issues surrounding tariffs, corruption and big business. They may also point to the role played by ‘muckrakers’ the writers and journalists who ‘exposed’ bad practices and conditions.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### **11 Western Expansion 1846-1900**

**(a) ‘The Indian Wars were the inevitable consequence of westward expansion.’ How far do you agree with this verdict on the period 1846-1900?**

Focus: Assessment of the relationship between Indian Wars and westward expansion.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may agree or disagree with the verdict given. The key to a good answer is the extent to which the candidate deals effectively with ‘How far...?’ Candidates may tend to agree with the verdict given and seek to show how continued expansion into the Great Plains and the extension of the farming and mining frontiers and the virtual extermination of the buffalo brought settlers into conflict with Indian tribes and resulted in the various outbreaks of violence in the 1860s and 1870s. Such an analysis may be set in the context of other attempts to reconcile Indian and settler differences through treaties, reservations, Americanisation, and so on. Some candidates may comment on the role of the Federal government and how successful it was in policing westward expansion.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'Federal governments did very little to solve the problems created by westward expansion.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the period to 1900?**

Focus: Assessment of Federal policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may agree or disagree with the verdict given. The key to a good answer is the extent to which the candidate deals effectively with 'How far...?' Amongst the problems created by westward expansion candidates may refer, for example, to: lawlessness, land, settlers' rights, Indian rights, governance, transport and communications and conservation. Candidates may argue that in relation to transport and communications the federal government was quite active and promoted/sanctioned the building of railways. They may also argue that in relation to issues of governance (not within the specification but may be mentioned) the Federal government was also necessarily active in establishing territories and states. The Federal government was also heavily involved in encouraging settlement through such mechanisms as the Homestead Act. Federal government's performance with regard to relations with the Indian tribes, however, was much more patchy and despite reservations and treaties there was conflict and war. Lawlessness was a serious problem in the 'wild west', but the federal action did take place with regard to conservation towards the end of the period.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## **12 Race Relations in the South 1863-1912**

**(a) Assess the impact of Constitutional Amendments (the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>) and Civil Rights Acts on the position of Blacks in the South from 1863 to 1912.**

Focus: Assessment of the impact of legislation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

To score in Bands II or I, candidates should show an understanding of the legislation and deal with its impact over much of the period (i.e. beyond the period of Reconstruction). Candidates may argue that whilst the constitutional amendments and other legislation appeared to give Blacks political and civil rights these were (except for the 13<sup>th</sup>) in practice undermined especially after 1877; indeed the undermining of the apparent rights in the 14<sup>th</sup> (guaranteeing equal protection under the law) and 15<sup>th</sup> (guaranteeing the right to vote) Amendments and the Civil Rights Act of 1875 (guaranteeing equal rights in public places) was effectively sanctioned by key Supreme Court decisions. Among other elements, candidates may refer to some of the following in building their answers: the Jim Crow laws, segregation, 'grandfather' clauses, and Supreme Court decisions (the 'Slaughter House Cases', *US v. Cruikshank*, *Plessy v. Ferguson*, *Mississippi v. Williams*).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'Neither Booker T. Washington nor William du Bois achieved much for Blacks in the period to 1912.' How far do you agree with this judgement?**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of individuals.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question does not require comparison, although candidates may wish to draw comparisons about the relative impact of the two individuals: if answers do so, they should be credited in so far as the comparisons are argued effectively. Candidates may agree (or, perhaps more likely) or disagree with the judgement, but the key to accessing Band II or I is the degree to which 'How far...?' is effectively addressed. In relation to Booker T. Washington candidates may discuss his advocacy of self-help, self-reliance and social advancement, his work at the Tuskegee Institute, his Atlanta Compromise speech and his relationship with the White House – but the key will be the assessment of his impact in encouraging Blacks and winning white support. In relation to Du Bois, candidates may have less to say as he comes to prominence only towards the end of the period. They may discuss his differences with Booker T. Washington, his involvement in the Niagara Movement and the NAACP and his propaganda (*The Crisis*) – some may suggest that Washington's influence is really felt after 1912.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## Europe 1890-1945

### 13 Russia 1894-1917

**(a) Assess the reasons why Tsar Nicholas II was able to survive the 1905 Revolution.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for failure of Revolution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must do more than simply identify and explain some reasons for the Tsar's survival to score in the higher Bands. There must be assessment of the reasons: for example, by showing how they linked together and/or by assessing their relative importance/significance. Candidates may discuss some of the following reasons: divided opposition (Social Democrats – Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, Kadets, Socialist Revolutionaries), nature of the 'revolution' (uncoordinated series of events from January to December, 'dress rehearsal'), timely concessions (October Manifesto), use of force (against Moscow Soviet), despite mutinies most of army remained loyal, followed by mixture of reform and repression (Fundamental Laws, concessions to peasantry, military courts etc.).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) To what extent was Lenin's leadership the main reason for the success of the Bolsheviks in the 1917 October Revolution?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with the role of Lenin's leadership adequately even if they wish to argue that other reasons were more significant. In relation to Lenin's leadership candidates may discuss the importance of his ideology, his galvanising of the Bolsheviks on his return to Russia in April, the appeal of the April theses and slogans in winning worker/public support, his role in helping Bolsheviks gain a majority on key Soviets, his persuasion of the party to attempt to seize power in the wake of the Kornilov affair, and so on. This discussion may be balanced against other possible factors, such as: the mistakes/incompetence/weakness of the 1917 Provisional Government, the role of the Petrograd Soviet, the failure of the 1917 summer offensive, the Kornilov affair, the role of Trotsky.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**14 The Causes and Impact of the First World War c. 1890-1920**

**(a) To what extent were generals to blame for the long stalemate on the Western Front?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for stalemate.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The role of generals in producing stalemate needs to be adequately dealt with even if the candidate wishes to argue other factors were more important in order to score in the higher bands. Candidates may argue that generals on both sides helped contribute to the stalemate by the strategies and tactics they adopted. Candidates may examine the actions of generals such as Haig, Rawlinson, Nivelle and so on with reference to particular failed offensives and examine how far lack of progress can be attributed to their command of the forces available. Such discussion may be set in the context of other factors such as the scale of warfare, the manpower available, the nature of weapons and defence systems and other war-related resources (e.g. transport systems), the lack of alternative strategies and tactics – again, examples may be drawn from particular campaigns to support points made.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'A compromise that satisfied nobody.' How far do you agree with this verdict on the Treaty of Versailles (1919)?**

Focus: Assessment on the nature of the Treaty of Versailles.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may agree or disagree with the verdict given. The marks given should depend on the quality of the assessment made. Candidates may discuss the degrees of satisfaction felt by both the Allies and Germany as a result of the Treaty. The level of satisfaction may be judged against the aims and expectations of the protagonists and/or by an examination of the particular terms of the Treaty. Many candidates may well agree with the verdict given in the question, at least to a significant extent. They may argue that Germany was not satisfied and was unlikely to be so because it was the defeated power – and may go on to explain reasons for dissatisfaction – the 'Diktat', the Polish Corridor, War Guilt, disarmament, reparations, etc. They may argue that France was dissatisfied because although Germany was punished severely it was not crippled and France still felt vulnerable. They may argue that Britain was not satisfied because the punishment was too harsh, or not harsh enough. They may argue that the USA showed their dissatisfaction by not ratifying the Treaty, and so on.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**15 Italy 1919-1945**

**(a) The main attraction was its opposition to communism.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the appeal of fascism in Italy in the early 1920s?**

Focus: Evaluation of the appeal of fascism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to deal adequately with the factor raised in the question, even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may point to the support for communism in post-war Italy and the fears that strikes and workers unrest aroused in the two 'red years'. They may argue that the actions of fascists on the streets drew support because here was a party actually taking on the communists. They may argue that this helped win support from business and the establishment in Italy. However, they may argue that there were other reasons for growing



support for fascism – the weakness of post-war liberal governments, the failure to win hoped for territory in the peace treaties or to deal with economic and social problems, the alignment of fascism with nationalist aspirations and the hope of strong government. There may also be consideration of the propaganda and personal appeal of Mussolini.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) ‘Little more than propaganda.’ How far do you agree with this verdict on Mussolini’s domestic policies from 1922 to 1940?**

Focus: Assessment of domestic policies.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may agree or disagree with the judgement in the question. The key to a good answer will be whether the candidate has dealt effectively with ‘How far...?’ Domestic policies considered may well focus on aspects such as: propaganda, economic policies, social policies (the various ‘battles’, education, youth policies and so on) but quite legitimately might also range over domestic politics, corporativism, church-state relations, the machinery of dictatorship. The key will be how far an answer analyses these areas in relation to the question set – appearance over reality, style over substance.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**16 Germany 1919-1945**

**(a) Assess the reasons why the other political parties failed to prevent the rise of Hitler to power. [Do not include anything after 1933 in your answer.]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for an historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is not a straight rise of Hitler question and to score in Bands II or I an answer must focus on the factors explaining why other political parties failed to prevent Hitler’s rise. Answers can legitimately set their discussion of reasons relating to political parties in a broad sense in the context of other reasons relevant to Hitler’s rise. Candidates may argue that factors relating to the political system and the range of parties and views rendered them incapable of united resistance. They may discuss to the failure of the main democratic parties to cooperate in dealing with the

depression (collapse of the Grand Coalition), the existence of several parties critical or opposed to Weimar, the relationship between the Nationalists and Hugenburg with Hitler, the attitude of Hindenburg, the fact that until after 1930 Hitler did not seem a great threat, the rise of the communist party, the actions of particular political leaders such as von Papen, the electoral support for Hitler, and so on.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'Hitler's economic policies (1933-45) were only concerned with preparation for war, and then supplying the needs of war.'** How far do you agree with this judgement?

Focus: Assessment of economic policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may agree or disagree with the judgement in the question, but the key to accessing the higher bands will be the degree of success in addressing 'How far?' Candidates may argue that, under the guidance of Hjalmar Schacht, the initial priority of economic policy was to solve the problems caused by the Depression and to raise living standards, but that under the Four Year Plan (1936) the priorities changed to the needs of war with rearmament and autarky becoming the key aims, and that once war started (especially after 1941) it came to dominate economic policy under the guidance of Todt and Speer. Others may argue that rearmament and self-sufficiency were a key focuses of economic policy from the start and that these only accelerated after 1936. There may well be reference to Goering's slogan 'Guns not butter'.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**Europe and the World 1919-1989****17 International Relations 1919-1941**

**(a) How far were the Locarno Treaties (1925) the most important reason why there were no major conflicts in the 1920s?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for relative peace.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The emphasis is around the international impact of Locarno. Candidates will need to set the significance of Locarno in the wider context of international diplomacy in the 1920s, for example the Washington Naval Conference 1922, the Kellogg-Briand Pact 1928, the Dawes Plan 1924, the Young Plan 1929. The impact of the legacy of World War I and the universal yearning for peace would provide a useful perspective in answers. Individual examples will need to be related to the question, and thus used to help consider the significance of the Treaties. Candidates may refer to disputes before 1925 to show that Locarno alone was not the sole influence (e.g. the League's successful arbitration over the Åland Islands, Upper Silesia). Some may point out 'main conflicts' in the question and make clear that the 1920s were not conflict free (e.g. Vilnius 1922, Corfu 1923). Many answers will probably argue that the League itself promoted a greater degree of international cooperation (Kellogg-Briand with 15 powers pledging to reject war as an instrument of national policy in 1928 is a good example).

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) 'The crises over Manchuria (1931-33) and Abyssinia (1935-36) fatally weakened the League of Nations.' How far do you agree with this judgement?**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of 2 crises on the League.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to evaluate the impact these two crises in undermining the effectiveness of the League. Answers might take the impact of each one separately. Some might consider the impact of the one crisis on the other – the degree to which the League in dealing with Italy was already weakened by Manchuria. The attitudes of the major powers, especially Britain and France may be discussed, along with their desire to construct other means of security. The issue of whether the League was doomed from these crises onwards could usefully be discussed. Some may go on, specifically considering the fate/role/significance of the League from 1936 onwards, e.g. over the Spanish Civil War, subsequent Japanese aggression in China, during the crises with Germany in 1938-39. Equally, some may question the strength of the League in the first place, arguing that Manchuria and/or Abyssinia only confirmed fatal weakness inherent from its foundation. Its Disarmament Conference (opened 1932) failed. It had not stopped the Italian invasion of Corfu 1923. It failed to stop war between Bolivia and Paraguay in the early 1930s. The Geneva Protocol had never been ratified (Britain had vetoed it 1925) so collective military action was impossible.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

### 18 The USSR 1924-1953

#### (a) How successful was collectivisation in the period to 1953?

Focus: Evaluation of the success of a policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to evaluate collectivisation. The reasons for its introduction might provide some useful perspective, as long as such an answer does not spend long considering the causes themselves. Consideration of the relative success of this policy would be a good way to answer the question and this might be done in by evaluating success in relation to various objectives/needs (economic, political, strategic). Some may seek to distinguish between different periods of collectivisation to help in their evaluation (e.g. initial small scale collectivisation 1928-30, mass collectivisation 1930-37, the major disruption of World War II, slow recovery from 1946). Many candidates may refer to the famines of 1932+ to illustrate the major problems that collectivisation created (estimates vary between 3.5 and 20 million dead). Answers may consider the problem of how 'success' is to be measured when the official statistics were so unreliable. Equally, collectivisation affected different aspects of farming differently: e.g. grain output exceeded pre-collectivisation levels as early as 1935 whereas that did not happen to livestock numbers until 1953. The economic results are a matter of real controversy. Did it shift resources from rural to urban areas, thereby enabling more rapid industrialisation? Was it more or less effective than the NEP which in 1924-28 also produced insufficient grain? Was collectivisation an economic disaster? There is much that candidates can draw on and argue about.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

#### (b) How effectively was the USSR organised for waging the Great Patriotic War (1941-45)?

Focus: Assessment of Russian preparedness.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers might start with some discussion of various types of preparations (eg. diplomatic economic, military) in order to help assess Russian effectiveness in 1941-42. The Soviet Union had tried to protect its borders from German aggression non-aggression pacts, yet the anti-fascist alliance never emerged. The opportunity of the Nazi Soviet Pact (1939) for Stalin to gain more time will probably be considered by many candidates. Within that, some may question what Soviet foreign policy had really aimed for – defence against Germany or, behind a smokescreen, on-going

close links with it? Some may consider the success of the first three Five-Year Plans in delivering an economic base capable of waging effective war. Many answers will probably consider the effects of the Purges on the ability of the Red Army to fight effectively in 1941-42, linking them to the dire Russian situation by late 1941. An awareness of the importance of the War's different phases (from retreat in 1941 to defence in 1941-43 to attack from 1943) would prove an effective way to measure Russian capability. Stalin's loss of nerve in 1941 may be referred to. So too for 1941 may the implementation of the scorched earth policy and the establishment of the Stavka (and its effective tactics of 'superior force' and 'defence in depth' that proved so significant in 1943). The capabilities of Soviet intelligence could be considered – it knew the German invasion was coming, but Stalin ignored them. In contrast, their ability to read Japanese codes (thus knowing an invasion in the east was not coming) allowed Russian troops to be concentrated by Zhukov for the defence of Leningrad and Moscow. Zhukov was one of a number of great commanders; despite the Purges, Soviet military leadership was good. Industrial output was impressive from the new factories of the Five-Year Plans beyond the Urals, aided by supplies from America and Britain. Economic recovery from the shock of 1941 was swift and the Russians soon out-produced the Germans in replacing destroyed military equipment. Collectivisation did continue and it kept the USSR fed. Some may note that, in waging war, the USSR was helped by factors beyond its control, such as poor German strategy, the Russian weather. Stalin's ability to further smother opposition during the War might be brought into the evaluation. But the ultimate debate remains: did the USSR's wage successful war because of German mistakes or Soviet strengths?

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

## **19 The Cold War in Europe 1945-1989**

### **(a) Assess the success of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan in containing the spread of Communism in Europe to 1956.**

Focus: Evaluation of the significance of given factors in the early Cold War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to evaluate the degree to which the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan (both announced 1947) impacted on the Cold War in Europe to 1956. US loans had become a weapon in containment. The developing positions and tensions around the division East and West in this period may well be considered in answers. The implementation of the Marshall Plan might provide a basis for analysis, whilst perspectives on the wider development of the Cold War would help to provide valuable context. Other factors influential in containing communism might be brought into consideration to help establish relative significance, such as e.g.: Kennan's 'Long Telegram' (1946), the formation of NATO (1949), the failure of the Berlin Blockade (1948-49) – but these might equally be linked to the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Some may question how far Communism in Europe was contained during the period to 1956. The Doctrine and Plan did not prevent the Communist election victory in Hungary (1947) or Rumania (1947) or their coup in Czechoslovakia (1948) or the establishment of East Germany (1949). They didn't save Hungary in 1956. Did they provoke the Russians, producing the Cominform and strengthening/entrenching Communist power in 'peoples democracies' in Eastern Europe? On the other hand, there was no further communist extension, no 'domino' effect. Greece and Turkey were held against the

Communists. So too was Berlin. The Marshall Plan enabled the defeated states of Western Europe to recover, and it kept Britain afloat.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the impact of the Hungarian (1956) and Czechoslovakian (1968) uprisings on Soviet control in Eastern Europe during the period 1956-89.**

Focus: Evaluation of the strength of Soviet control.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to focus on evaluation the significance of these two challenges to Soviet control. What short and long term impacts did they have on Russian control across Eastern Europe? Answers might refer to the building of the Berlin Wall (1961) as showing a new Soviet determination after Hungary to keep a firm grip by blocking off the exit route to the West. Equally, the Brezhnev Doctrine of 1968 was a direct response to the Prague Spring, seeking to limit dissent in the Communist bloc. Some answers may note that Soviet policy could be flexible – Khrushchev invaded Hungary but not Poland in 1956. Soviet troop deployments were significantly reduced in various Warsaw Pact countries in the later 1950s. The Russians did not block the rapprochement between East and West Germany from 1969. Did the impact of Hungary and Czechoslovakia later wane or was Russian failure to act against rising dissent in Poland during the 1980s more a sign of Russian weakness exposed by the Second Cold War? Perhaps not entirely – Gorbachev publicly abandoned the Brezhnev Doctrine in 1985 and he talked openly at the 27<sup>th</sup> Party Congress (1986) of the Russian mistake in invading Czechoslovakia in 1968. He stressed the fact that East and West shared a ‘common European home’. Some answers may suggest that other factors/events were of greater significance in influencing Soviet control, e.g. Stalin’s death in 1953 and the emergence of Khrushchev. Perhaps the great tipping point was the emergence of Gorbachev. Soviet control of Eastern Europe seems to have been reasonably secure and stable in 1985. Was the subsequent Soviet collapse there in only four years the result of his policies, starting in Poland and Hungary (while other tried to limit *perestroika*, *glasnost* and *demokratizatsiya*)?

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**20 The Cold War in Asia and the Americas 1949-75****(a) Assess the reasons why the USA intervened in Korea from 1950 to 1953.**Focus: Evaluation of American motives.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to evaluate the causes of the Korean War in relation to the decisive role of the USA in initiating action and going to war. The broader perspective of the development of the Cold War will need to be applied to some degree – this might include consideration of the roles of, for example, the UN, the USSR, China in relation to the USA on events and intentions in Korea. Both Russia and the USA had withdrawn their troops in 1948-49. Dean Acheson did not in 1950 include Korea among the countries that the USA would automatically defend against communist aggression ('Defence Perimeter' speech). Even when North Korean troops invaded the south in June 1950, it was far from certain that Korea would become a Cold War conflict zone. During 1950, however, US policy was modified. Containment in SE Asia was judged not to have been very successful. China had been 'lost', Communist popularity and strength in Indochina were growing. That was the context in which Truman reacted to the invasion of South Korea. Military aid went off immediately. In the UN Security Council, taking advantage of the Russian boycott, the USA secured a resolution for military action by the UN. Nonetheless, US action needs explaining. For one thing, Truman believed that the North Koreans had acted only on the prompting of Stalin. America feared 'domino theory' would kick in with an already unstable SE Asia. A firm response was thus essential, and not just for the defence of SE Asia. Such action would 'show' American determination to resist communism anywhere. Once war had begun, of course, the Americans had no choice but to press on. Withdrawal would have been interpreted as a massive and humiliating defeat. Truman decided to invade North Korea in October 1950, but he sacked Mac Arthur in April 1951 for endangering everything by threatening the Chinese, refused to use atomic weapons in Korea (heavily influenced in this by the British) and peace talks began as early as July 1951. Truman only fought a limited war in Korea.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.

**(b) Assess the reasons why the USA reacted so strongly to Castro's revolution in Cuba.**Focus: Evaluation of American motives.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to evaluate why Castro's takeover of Cuba in 1958-59 was so unacceptable to the USA. Cold War realities and containing the communist threat will probably loom large in most answers. But Cuba can also be set in terms of 'America's backyard' – the Munro Doctrine had established US determination to dominate the Americas. The Rio Pact and the Organisation of American States made plain that 'international communism' was incompatible with 'American freedom'. American influence in Cuba was strong. America controlled the sugar industry and owned much land and many businesses. The US had a key naval base at Guantanamo Bay. Key points that can be made early in any assessment are that, initially, Castro's regime looked to the USA for assistance and that Castro was not himself a Communist. Only when Eisenhower rejected him (1959) did Castro begin to take anti-American actions. At that point, for economic reasons alone, America might have been tempted to react imperially to Castro's socialist revolution with its

'threats' of land and economic reform. Castro's declaration of neutrality in 1959 was an overt rejection of US influence over the island. Trade agreements with the Russians and Chinese, and starting to nationalise the economy, escalated tensions considerably in 1960. By now, the CIA was helping opponents of Castro. Eisenhower authorised an invasion – eventually the disastrous Bay of Pigs (1961). Can it be said that, as late as 1960, the Cold War had little to do with the US's reaction? Very possibly, but the Cold War cannot be separated out of US thinking and as Castro moved ever closer to the Soviet bloc from 1960, Cold War politics took over. Kennedy continued Eisenhower's determination to get rid of Castro, but everything was changed by his decision to accept the stationing of Russian missiles on Cuba – itself a direct consequence of the ever-greater threat posed by Kennedy. The Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) lifted Cuba from a 'local' problem to the centre-stage of the Cold War, taking the world to the brink of nuclear destruction. What mattered to the USA in 1962 were Soviet missiles sited within 20 minutes striking range of most of mainland America. Such a direct threat, right under America's nose, was unacceptable. Yet candidates might question whether, at the end, the USA did react so strongly? Contrary to much of the advice he was given, Kennedy did not order a nuclear strike. The Missile Crisis was defused.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question.



**Mark Scheme 2587  
June 2005**

**Charlemagne****1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D about the quality of Charlemagne's government. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Both these historians are highly critical of Charlemagne's administration, though in rather different ways. Collins in Passage **D** argues that the structure of government was inadequate because it was often illiterate and poorly supervised. Ganshof in Passage **B** is not concerned with the system of government but with the way in which it acted. These views are not necessarily contradictory, as some candidates may point out. However, Collins is saying (Passage **D**) that the structure was always inadequate, while Ganshof is saying (Passage **B**) that it was applied in this way because of special conditions at the end of Charlemagne's reign in the period 800-814. Passage **D** agrees Charlemagne failed, but suggests he tried to remedy the evils. Passage **B** suggests that nothing was done and that the Capitularies cite continued abuse in government. The focus of Passage **B** is on ordinary people and of Passage **D** is on the counts.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Charlemagne made no significant improvements to the structure of his government. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The Passages show diversity of opinion over the structure of government under Charlemagne. In Passage **A** (the *Aachen Capitulary*) we see complaints which have come to the attention of the king about local officers abusing their power to seize the lands of the poor, in 811. Hence, from that date, the structure has not improved. This supports Ganshof in Passage **B** in his view that administration at this time was weak, and candidates should know that other capitularies of the late period contain similar complaints. Very good candidates may point out, however, that we have very few Capitularies from before 800 and therefore know less about that period. Collins in Passage **D** clearly suggests that Charlemagne made no improvements, but not from want of trying: the *missi* were effective representatives of the government. He argues that the structure of administration was weak and perhaps illiterate, while McKitterick in Passage **C** argues that it was sound and lasted a long time although recognising that much depended on the head, the smaller units were effective. Answers need to set the Passages in the context of governmental change and development (or lack of it) in the reign. From their own knowledge, candidates can, for example, bring into play issues such as: the use of the counts and the *vassi dominici* and the institution of the *missi*.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

## **2 To what extent did Charlemagne's wars of conquest exhaust his Empire? [45]**

Focus: the effects of war upon the Charlemagne's Empire.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates will show that many historians have argued that as a result of war, the Carolingian Empire suffered from internal discontent in the last years of Charlemagne's reign (800-14) - resulting in, for example, grave difficulties in raising armies and in the plundering of the countryside by local officials of the government. Others think that war really profited the Empire: it produced plunder and administrative posts for the upper classes and their followers. On this argument, it was the cessation of war in the later period that produced the difficulties, perhaps because Charlemagne had decided to stand on the defensive, a posture which meant that his government had to bear the costs of war without any of the profits collected earlier. It is possible to argue that local officials always had plundered the countryside in their own interests. The emphasis is inevitably upon the later period because that is what historians have tended to argue about – but there was discontent earlier, as witness conspiracies against Charlemagne before 800. The question can be interpreted as asking was it wars or other factors which exhausted the Empire, or did the wars exhaust or benefit the Empire.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**3 Assess the impact of Charlemagne's imperial coronation (800) on his policies during the rest of his reign. [45]**

Focus: An examination of the effects of the imperial coronation on the conduct of government.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Some historians have argued that the plethora of Capitularies and Law Codes produced after 800 is evidence of a new spirit and attitude to the tasks of government arising from the new title and a sense of what it involved. Candidates should be able to show knowledge of this view and of the evidence upon which it is based. Others have argued that government did not really change and that we simply see more of its workings in the later period. A key factor in this discussion is the provisions for the succession made in 806. Under these, no mention was made of the title of Emperor, and historians have been puzzled by this. Symbolic of the ambivalence on this matter is the fact that after the coronation Charlemagne used the imperial titles *Imperator et Augustus*, but also continued to couple with them his old titles *Rex Francorum et Langobardorum*. Moreover, the actual form of his imperial title was adjusted so as to enable him to come to terms with the Byzantines. It has been argued that the great spate of legislation that emerged in the early 800s is evidence of a new imperial view of monarchy, but this could equally be a result of an ageing ruler substituting exhortation for enforcement. Relations with the Church and papacy may also be discussed.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**King John**

**4(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D about reasons for John's rejection of the election of Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Painter (Passage **B**) takes the view that John trusted de Gray and was taking a stand simply on the basis of precedent and tradition which allowed the king to be the decisive voice in the election of an archbishop of Canterbury. Harper-Bill (Passage **D**) suggests, however, that the problem was that John's suspicions of Pope Innocent were raised because he approved of the annexation of the Norman church into France in 1204. Moreover, he was suspicious of Langton because, albeit English, he had been long resident in France (hence in John's mind the fear that Langton's ultimate loyalties were to the French court). At least in part because of these factors, Harper-Bill argues that an English candidate nominated by Innocent III proved unacceptable and Passage **B** argues that any candidate not chosen by John was unacceptable also. Neither Passage suggests Innocent intended to arouse John's ire – **B** explicitly, **D** by implication. Neither Painter nor Harper-Bill excludes the possibility that other factors might have been involved.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, evaluate the reasons why John's quarrel with Innocent III over the Canterbury election went on so long. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Candidates should be able to show that the dispute went on for a long time, and this despite the many diplomatic complications which it introduced for both sides. They should be able to point to the deep feelings on both sides – Innocent wanted reform, John had a defensible stance, and once a dispute began it was hard for either to back down, notwithstanding attempts to compromise. John could count on real lay support – as witness the generally hostile *Margam Annals* (Passage **A**), an ecclesiastical source - while Pope Innocent gradually eroded Church support for his enemy. John had some grounds for his reticence. Passage **A** refers to ancestral laws, **B** to practical necessity, **C** to the consent of the king, **D** to the importance of law and custom. Hence he was unlikely to give in easily. Passage **A** adds that he was strongly supported. Innocent resorted to Interdict (Passages **A** and **C**) as he did everywhere (Passage **C**) and could not afford to compromise as a realistic and prudent Pope (Passage **D**).

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**5 To what extent was John personally responsible for the loss of the Angevin lands in France in 1204 after war had begun? [45]**

Focus: an analysis of John's part in the loss of the Angevin lands in France.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates should focus on John's part in events. The question does not ask about the causes of the war – John's marriage etc. which might merit passing mention only – but about John's response to Philip's armed assault. Some contemporaries alleged that John was lazy and negligent, but others thought him merely unlucky. He was the victor of Mirebeau in 1202, yet threw away the fruits of victory and possibly failed to relieve Château Gaillard soon after that only because of bad luck. At the same time, he did leave Normandy at a critical moment. Modern writers have suggested that Normandy had already become very French and that its loss was inevitable, but this is not a universal view. It has been suggested that Philip Augustus's financial resources were vastly greater than those of John, although this is challenged by some. Others have argued that since John's brother, Richard I, had held Normandy without difficulty during the 1190s, why could John not? Perhaps leadership and military competence were crucial? Was John up to the task? These are the broad terms of the discussion needed.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**6 To what extent did *Magna Carta* fail to satisfy the needs of King John and the barons?[45]**

Focus: the reasons for the failure of *Magna Carta*.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

*Magna Carta* was a peace between the barons and the king and it should not be difficult for the candidates to point out that it failed. Clearly it failed to satisfy their needs – so what were their needs? This is a much more contentious subject. The king wanted peace after the wreck of his policy at the Battle of Bouvines (July 1214) had weakened his whole position: he had staked all on success and come away with failure. On the other hand, John did not want to write off the powers of Angevin kingship. He negotiated for peace, but asked Innocent III to release him from its terms. It is possible that this was, as some have argued, merely to enable him to back away from the more serious concessions and that he was pursuing a two-pronged strategy of concession and aggression? The barons were by no means united, and to that extent had different needs. All historians are agreed that there was a party of ultra-rebels, notably the Northerners and the Essex barons, who distrusted John deeply, but even they had some will to peace. The ‘ultras’ seem to have withdrawn from discussions rather than agree to anything. The king and his enemies were brought together by William Marshal and Stephen Langton, moderate men who wanted to find common ground, but who themselves leaned (to the king and to the rebels respectively). Many barons held aloof from the rebellion, and their support was an important prize for the contending parties. In the end it was not enough – feelings were too strong amongst the barons while John was too determined. There is likely to be more discussion of baronial than royal needs.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.





**Mark Scheme 2588**  
**June 2005**

**Philip II****1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D on the character of Philip II. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Candidates should mention the complementary nature of the two Passages as well as their contrasts. The substance of comparison centres on the justification in Passage D of the negative aspects mentioned in Passage B. Similarities: hard working; illegible writing / not intellectual; his character affected his role as king / administrative chaos; unwilling to attend council meetings or listen to spoken arguments / preferred to express himself on paper; slow decisions / fear of lost credibility if decisions rushed. Differences: typical of the era; enormous capacity for storing and using information / time wasting over trivia; divide and rule to control ministers / restrained the severity of officials; pathologically suspicious / not suspicious; in control, tranquil, reserved / unpredictable, angry, devious, vengeful; lonely and solitary / humour, enjoyed himself; 'smile and dagger' comment / not cruel. Passage **D** alone mentions justice and serious duty to God.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**1(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Philip II's character caused serious problems in his rule of Spain. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Philip II's character itself is a matter of disagreement, but its traits should be linked to his problems in ruling Spain. He is portrayed as authoritarian and in control, or weak, slow and indecisive. Some suggest his strategy was deliberately 'wait and see' to avoid hasty mistakes. He may have retained the big picture or lost it among the trivia, been 'prudent' and wise, or lacked insight. There is debate about the effects of his religious 'mission', and his effect on administrative systems – e.g. councils, factions, local forces. Traditionally, Protestant historians accepted the Black Legend, as expressed strongly in **A**, based on enemy propaganda. Spaniards and more recent views have balanced more positive traits as in **D**, and view systems and inheritance as more significant in aggravating problems. The two sides of the debate should be linked to use of the law in **A**; 'administrative chaos', factional rivalry and deviousness in **B**; effects of lack of insight and indecisiveness in **C** and slowness in **D**. Balance is possible with positive elements such as hard work and responsibility to God in **D** and high-mindedness in **C**. Candidates should evaluate the effects of a range of character traits within the Passages in the light of their knowledge. Brief references to provenance might be used to support argument, but should avoid over-emphasis on the Black Legend. Own knowledge could draw on the Morisco revolt, the revolt of Aragon, high taxes, the debate on the Inquisition. [**NB** The Netherlands is not in Spain so is not relevant]

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

## **2 To what extent was Philip II's foreign policy in the Mediterranean similar to that in Northern Europe? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of Philip II's foreign policy.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate centres on whether common threads can be detected in policy or whether it was confused and ad hoc. Views differ on whether Philip's foreign policy was planned or reactive, consistent or inconsistent, religiously motivated for conservation and prestige or aggressive expansion. There should be range and depth of examples used to evaluate Philip's policy - defensive, religious, political and economic. For the Ottoman Turks and Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean, points that might be used include: Djerba (1560), Lepanto (1571), the Holy League, his 1578 truce with the Ottomans. For France and England, discussion in the context of the Dutch Revolt: the Treaties of Joinville (Philip & the Catholic League in France 1584) and Nonsuch (England & the Dutch rebels 1585), the Armadas, three-pronged war of the 1590s against France, England & the Dutch. It is likely that the overall judgement of many answers will see prestige and defence of religious orthodoxy, dynastic, territorial and economic inheritance as common threads, but there should also be a balance of differences. These might include differences of supply / theatres of war, conflict with fellow Catholics in France, and expansion of *monarquia* in the North as opposed to defence. Judgement might accept *ad hoc* reactive decisions only. The acquisition of Portugal (1580) does not fit either category, but is relevant as a 'tipping point' for change.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

### 3 How far did Philip II fulfil his duties as the 'Catholic King' in his dealings with the Spanish Church and the Papacy? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of Philip II's religious policy.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Answers need to evaluate how far Philip was motivated by religious mission to fulfil the duties of the inherited title: by strengthening the church, enforcing orthodox belief and defending the faith against enemies inside and outside the church. The debate on the Spanish Church centres on its national character in a Counter Reformation age when Catholicism was consolidating internationally: whether the Tridentine decrees 'revolutionised Spanish Catholicism' by removing abuses, reinvigorating spirituality and reforming practices; the nature, role and effects of the Spanish Inquisition and Indices: whether they established orthodoxy, improved knowledge and morality or stifled thought and progress; whether orthodoxy was enforced among Moriscos and Conversos, the extent of Christianisation of the Spanish laity, Philip's fears of Jesuit infiltration undermining the Spanish national church. Relations with Rome centre on whether clashes with the Papacy undermined Philip's role as 'Catholic King': the impact of the case of Archbishop Carranza (1558 onwards) on the strength of the church; Philip's protection of the heretic Elizabeth I against excommunication; in foreign policy, the Holy League war against the Ottomans, Lepanto (1571) and the truce of 1578, the acquisition of Portugal (1580) closing the Spanish back door to heresy, clashes with England including war after 1585, involvement in the French Religious Wars and war against the Triple Alliance in the 1590s despite Pope Clement VIII's acceptance of Henry IV's conversion to Catholicism. But these issues need to be related to the papacy.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Elizabeth I****4(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages C and D on the seriousness of the Rising of the Northern Earls. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Both Passages agree that the Rising was unsuccessful. Passage **C** suggests that the Rising was dangerous, that it was a major threat to Elizabeth's regime and that Elizabeth was lucky to survive it. Passage **D**, however, suggests that while the Rising seemed serious to the government, it was not. Passage **D** introduces the factor of foreign involvement, and candidates may discuss how or whether this added to the seriousness of the Rising compared with the purely English plans mentioned in Passage **C**. The implication in Passage **D** is that De Spes, Ridolfi and the Scottish bishop were out of touch with the reality of Catholic support for the removal of Elizabeth. Passage **C**, on the other hand, does suggest enthusiastic support for the Rising among the Catholic followers of the Northern Earls.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the presence in England of Mary, Queen of Scots, posed a serious threat to Elizabeth. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Candidates might be aware of a range of issues; the succession question, the international situation, other plots concerning Mary, and the issue of conformity in religion. Candidates might elaborate on any or all of these to provide a wider context for their answer. They might also consider the context of Mary, Queen of Scots' arrival in England as a deposed monarch and Elizabeth's position on this issue. Passages **A**, **B** and **D** suggest that the Rising of the Northern Earls, the first rebellion/plot centres on Mary in England, was not a serious threat to Elizabeth, although this was not how it was seen at the time (Passage **D**). Passage **A** cites the succession issue as it related to Mary, Queen of Scots as one of the reasons for the Rising of the Northern Earls, but also points out that the Rising gave the government the excuse to clamp down on Catholics. Passage **B** explains the rebellion in terms of factional rivalries within the government who used Mary, but also refers to the opportunity it afforded the government to discredit the conservative nobility. Passage **D** introduces the potentially dangerous element of foreign intervention, but implies that foreign observers misjudged the potential of the situation and that their evidence is, therefore, unreliable. Only Passage **C** argues that there was the potential in 1569 for a successful uprising, implying that it was only because some of the plotters were discovered and hence others were forced prematurely into open rebellion, that Elizabeth was able to survive. The argument can be confined to the period to 1571 or may go beyond it.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

### **5 To what extent was the Court the centre of political life in Elizabethan England? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the roles of the Court.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates may interpret this question as requiring an analysis of the role of the Court, or requiring a comparison with the roles of other institutions that might be regarded as the centre of political life. Either approach is acceptable. The first approach lends itself less well to discussion of historical debate. Nevertheless the study of the Elizabethan Court has developed. Earlier historians focused on the institutions of the Household and the Chamber. Regarding the personnel, factional strife was the focus, although most examples stemmed from the 1590s. Revisionists examined the impact of political tensions on the dynamics of the Court, which was susceptible to these despite Elizabeth's efforts to de-politicise her immediate servants. Historical debate on the issue of where political life was centred discusses the importance of different institutions identified by historians. Traditional interpretations of the political history of Elizabeth's reign focused on crown-parliament relations, with the Court simply an arena in which Elizabeth could project the image of the Queen. The emphasis moved from central government institutions to the localities as the main focus of political activity, with historians recognising that parliamentarians had power bases in the localities, and that MPs were concerned principally with local issues. In central government Revisionists identified the Privy Councillors as key players not only as policy makers, but also in controlling parliament. Although these interpretations recognised that the Court contained the councillors and hence the politicians, Elizabeth was seen to keep her private and public personae separate. The queen exploited the barrier which her ladies-in-waiting created between herself and her (male) councillors. More recently the Court has been examined in greater detail and the suggestion made that it was of greater significance in the political life of the country than previously thought. The distinction between politician and courtier was seen to be blurred. Many of Elizabeth's personal servants from pre-1558 were rewarded with positions at Court on her accession. For example, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester's was given the position of Master of the Horse, requiring constant attendance on the Queen. However, despite his clear influence on the Queen he was not made a Privy Councillor until 1562. The extent to which the personnel of the Court reflected a range of political views has been debated. The importance for the Queen of keeping control over a wide range of the political nation afforded by their presence at court has been recognised, as has the opportunity for courtiers to exercise political influence by being at Court. Banishment from Court was used when Norfolk was disgraced in 1569. The consequences of Essex's banishment from Court may also be used to exemplify the importance of the Court in politics. Candidates may discuss the extent to which the Court was the main route to a political career and the relative importance of regional and central government in this.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

## **6 How far was co-operation between Queen and Commons the dominant theme of Elizabethan Parliaments? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the control and management of parliament.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The traditional view of Crown/Commons relations focuses on conflict, deliberate attempts at the extension of parliamentary privilege and challenges to the royal prerogative. Revisionist historians reinterpreted incidents of apparent conflict, dismissing them as being isolated and unrepresentative of the co-operation that they believed characterised Crown/Parliament relations. The emphasis was on MPs representing local issues and grievances, suggesting that there was no concerted attack on the Queen's policies. Post-revisionists have investigated the relations between Privy Councillors and MPs in greater detail, identifying times when the Councillors used MPs for their own ends, and also questioning the extent to which some vocal MPs really were controlled by the Council. Candidates will probably know the debate well. Better answers will evaluate the different interpretations according to their use of the evidence, rather than attempting to answer on the basis of the validity of their views of causation related to the breakdown of Crown/Parliament relations in the 1640s. Candidates should refer to Crown/Parliament relations throughout the reign, and will probably consider particular incidents where Crown and Commons (apparently) clashed. These may include issues concerning parliamentary privileges and royal prerogative such as Elizabeth's marriage, the succession, the fate of Mary, Queen of Scots, the Church settlement and suggested amendments, freedom of speech and monopolies. Candidates may show how these issues can be interpreted to illustrate both conflict and co-operation. They may also refer to more general points regarding the conduct of business in the Commons and Crown control of parliament by various means. For example, they may refer to the passing of subsidy bills, and the amount of legislation enacted, deflected and vetoed. Answers which only outline the debate, with little reference to evidence, are **unlikely to go above Band III**.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.



**Oliver Cromwell****7(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D on Cromwell's ideas about the role of Parliament. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

There are many similarities between the two Passages, but the emphasis is different. While Barnard, in Passage **B** emphasises Cromwell's belief that Parliament should be independent, freely elected and willingly co-operative with him, Smith, in Passage **D**, suggests that what was most important to Cromwell was the role of Parliament in fulfilling its obligation to the people by promoting a godly society. Both historians refer to the fact that Parliament was regarded as representative of the realm, although only Barnard mentions that Cromwell believed this to the extent that he did not interfere with elections. Both refer to co-operation with the Lord Protector, but while Barnard states that Cromwell expected this to happen willingly, Smith implies that Cromwell wanted to use the parliament to impose his godly agenda. Both Passages suggest that if parliament was unco-operative, Cromwell would not use it, although Smith (**D**) suggests an ideological reason for this - parliament failing to fulfill its obligations - while Barnard (**B**) is more practical - the Commonwealthsmen could undo what had been achieved. Both show Cromwell's belief that parliament had a role in promoting godly rule.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Cromwell was incapable of working with Parliament. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The word 'incapable' provides the key to this question. Cromwell clearly had difficulty with successive parliaments, but was this simply because there were particular issues of disagreement, or because he was fundamentally incapable of the co-operation and compromise needed for successful parliamentary government? Passages **B**, **C** and **D** all suggest that Cromwell was committed to the theory of working with parliament, and **A** shows Cromwell himself stating that Parliament had a key role to play in the constitution. Candidates can evaluate the interpretation puts on his actions, but they may be aware that, at other times, Cromwell berated Parliaments for their failure to follow his chosen agenda. In practice, relations between Cromwell and Parliament from 1649 to 1658 were strained. Only the second Protectorate Parliament achieved more and that was after what Cromwell regarded as destructive and divisive debate on the case of James Nayler. The explanation provided by David Smith in Passage **D** may be regarded as providing the key to the problem. Cromwell's agenda was so far removed from that of the political nation as a whole that he would never be able to find a parliament which shared his vision and with which he could, therefore, work. On the other hand, candidates may look at other issues, such as Cromwell's unwillingness to pack parliament or focus on what was achieved, thus challenging the view that he was *incapable* of working with parliament. Candidates may refer to Cromwell's relations with any of the Parliaments in which he sat or with which he was involved as Lord Protector. They may also refer to the Barebones Parliament. In general relations between Cromwell and Parliament were

strained, but there is evidence that he compromised on some issues, for example in reducing taxation, abandoning the Rule of the Major Generals and accepting the Humble Petition and Advice.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**8 To what extent was Cromwell's rise to power by 1646 a result of divisions within the Parliamentary side?** **[45]**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for Cromwell's rise (to 1646).

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates should have a clear understanding of the various explanations for Cromwell's rise. However, although they need to refer to the factor mentioned in the question, a good answer does not depend on including all the explanations mentioned here, nor is there a requirement to reach a particular conclusion. Candidates might refer to the divisions within Parliament before the war broke out or those during the war. The former allowed Cromwell's views to be received more sympathetically at Westminster, the latter allowed him to become second-in-command of the New Model Army. Historians have debated the extent to which he was self-made - the Victorians, to whom the 'career-open-to-talent' appealed, subscribed to this view and so do some later historians. Candidates might develop this view to include the role played by his 'military genius', or his natural talent in inspiring his men. Other older views include the idea that Cromwell rose as a representative of a rising social or religious class. However, these theories beset by problems of definition (either of social classes or religious groupings). Since John Morrill's work on his early life, this view has been largely abandoned, in favour of the idea that Cromwell's social ties influenced his election to Parliament in 1640 and the role he played in its committees. However, evidence supporting this view is often circumstantial, and based on suppositions. Nevertheless, marriage ties with Oliver St. John, John Hampden, and particularly the Rich (Earls of Warwick), certainly suggest a powerful and influential socio-religious circle. This would suggest that while the divisions within Parliament provided the circumstances in which Cromwell could emerge from relative obscurity, there were other, underlying, causes of his rise to power.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**9 'A reluctant Head of State.' To what extent do you agree with this judgement of Cromwell in the 1650s? [45]**

**Focus:** Evaluation of Cromwell's motivation.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Answers need to focus on whether Cromwell was ambitious for power or whether he accepted power reluctantly. Just as contemporaries were divided over this issue there has been significant debate among historians regarding Cromwell's motives. Cromwell was Head of State from December 1653, and candidates will probably discuss a number of instances when historians believe he could have seized power earlier but did not. They may consider why Cromwell, the hero of Dunbar and Worcester, made no attempt to take political advantage of his military successes. They may discuss Cromwell's reluctance to take action against the Rump until April 1653 despite army frustrations with it, as well as the circumstances in which he did so. They may discuss the way in which the Nominated Assembly was established and his instructions to it. All these events are now usually interpreted to suggest that Cromwell was not ambitious. There are other actions where the charge of ambition is more difficult to counter. These include the circumstances surrounding the Nominated Assembly handing power back to him. Candidates may also show how Cromwell's own statements about his preferences for particular forms of government have been interpreted in different ways. As Head of State, Cromwell has been accused of acting arbitrarily and as a military dictator, although recent research undermines this interpretation. Cromwell's style of ruling as Lord Protector has been re-assessed, with more attention paid to the role of his Councillors. The Lord Protector was more bound by his Council than earlier rulers had been. Candidates may also consider different interpretations of why he did not accept the offer of the crown in 1657.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Peter the Great****10(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D about Peter the Great's conduct of foreign affairs.****[15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Passage **A** is much earlier and represents a Russian, but non-Marxist view. Passage **D** is a very recent view. Passage **A** puts Peter's foreign policy firmly in the line of Russian tradition and sees his foreign policy as being limited in his success. Success in the West is more or less balanced by limited achievements elsewhere. Passage **D** makes passing reference to the Black Sea, but its main focus is on the Baltic struggle which was nearest to the interests of other European countries. It sees the Tsar's foreign policy as bringing about a transformation in Russia's international position and also promoting considerable internal change. As Passage **D** stresses, such achievements were to be praised in Russia by communist governments in the situation of a grave war.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Peter the Great achieved most of his aims in foreign policy.****[30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **A** states that Peter's aims were not particularly novel. Platonov contrasts 'unprecedented success in the west' with modest achievements elsewhere so that his overall success was partial. In Passage **B**, Grey interprets the Tsar's aims in a more complex way. It says little about his success but is useful to candidates in examining Peter's intentions. In contrast, Treasure in Passage **C** denies that Peter 'had a foreign policy' although he had several aims. Success was limited because of a lack of co-ordination and planning. Hughes in Passage **D** links Peter's aims in foreign policy with domestic planning; the former drove the latter. The aims in foreign policy itself were extremely ambitious. The beginning of the Passage sums up Hughes's views of his achievements as a complete transformation. Own knowledge needs to be used to focus on the two key aspects of the question: Peter's aims and the scale of his success. There is plenty for candidates to select from, including: his wars with the much stronger, established power of Sweden (1700-21) to break the barrier that held Russia in, preventing influence in the Baltic world, and beyond (success after initial defeats, Narva 1700 & Poltava 1709, the naval battle of Hangó/Hangut/Gangut 1714) leading ultimately to territorial gains in the Treaty of Nystadt 1721; war with the Ottomans to assert and extend Russian power to the South and establish Russian access to and a presence in the Black Sea, and beyond to/in the Mediterranean world (capture of Azov 1696, but his allies abandoned him and Azov had to be returned in the Treaty of Adriano 1713); war against the Persians to establish economic control over the valuable silk trade and to curb Ottoman influence (some territorial gains, but little control over the silk trade). Candidates may focus primarily on Sweden – that is fine, but candidates will not be answering the question if ignore everything but Sweden.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**11 Assess the view that the changes Peter the Great brought about within Russia were revolutionary. [45]**

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The broad debate on this is marked on one side the view that Peter achieved considerable changes within Russia, for example in his re-organisation of administration, the role of the nobility, the economy and religion. The extent of the changes he wrought can indeed be described as revolutionary. Against that, however, others doubt the significance of his achievement, seeing the changes he made as actually being markedly limited in their scope. Peter's aims and determination cannot be doubted, but the extent to which he achieved them was restricted. Did his reign represent more change or continuity? Some candidates can discuss what they understand by 'revolutionary' – that is fine, but it needs to be done concisely. If comparisons with other revolutions are made, that too is fine but it needs to be done concisely or such answers will be in danger of losing their focus on the question set.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**12 Assess the reasons why the establishment of St. Petersburg was important to Peter the Great. [45]**

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Peter's motives for founding St Petersburg reflect the debate over his ambitions for Russia. The main view on one side asserts that St. Petersburg was necessary to Peter the Great's aim of making Russia a major force not just in the Baltic but more widely in Europe. It would help to deliver the advantages for Russia that Peter saw in Westernisation. Against this, St. Petersburg has been seen as a massive burden inflicted on Russia by a tsar ambitious for his own personal glory. The new city was on a remote Russian coast, sited in a marsh – its building against all the odds demonstrated the dynamic leadership and epic qualities of the tsar. When things went wrong, he deliberately exaggerated the positive impact/benefit of St. Petersburg on/for Russia. The new capital city has also been seen as a below deliberately struck by Peter against 'old' Russia and for a new monarchy. St Petersburg was created on Western models - much of it was designed by foreign architects - and became a new centre of Russian administration and trade. It marked a total break with the 'old' Russia of Moscow and the boyars, but was that the intention in creating the city or only a by-product of the creation? The removal of government from a 'more' central Moscow to the fringes of the country has been seen as a major error with serious implications. The new capital city made administration more difficult because it was so far further removed from most of the provinces – and, with Russian communications as bad as they were, that was a serious drawback. Further, the expense of building St. Petersburg in terms of human, physical and economic resources was enormous for a county that was not rich.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.





**Mark Scheme 2589**  
**June 2005**

**Napoleon I****1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D on the relationship between the Napoleonic regime and the notables. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Candidates may make some of the following comments: both Passages B and D agree that the Napoleonic regime sought to win over the wealthy, propertied and the old nobility (B – ‘wished to base his regime on the support of the notables’; D – ‘courting the notables’); Passage B stresses the desire to win support whilst Passage D stresses Napoleon’s desire for a body of loyal administrators who would ‘implement the Emperor’s will’; Passage B suggests that Napoleon was only partially successful in winning support – ‘aristocrats ... preferred to keep a certain distance from the new regime’ whilst Passage D does not comment on this aspect; both agree that Napoleon wished to base his administration at both a national and local level on men of wealth and property; Passage B hints at a desire to rally both *ancien regime* wealth/property and position and those who ‘had risen to prominence during the Revolution’, Passage D does not necessarily disagree, but hints at a breach with the past – men ‘free of nostalgia for either the *ancien regime* or for the Revolution’.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Napoleon’s regime was based on popular consent. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Much can be gleaned from the Passages: Passage A argues that Napoleon’s regime was based on popular consent and support (‘Support for the new regime came especially from below’) and candidates may set this in the context of plebiscite results, lack of rebellion (beyond resistance to conscription in later years), and the popular support Napoleon experienced in the south and east of France on his return during the Hundred Days. However, the other three Passages, whilst not necessarily disagreeing with the idea of passive consent, tend to see the regime as rather more narrowly based. Passages B and D, for example, stress the aim of winning the active support of the notables and developing ‘masses of granite’ as the guarantee of order, loyalty and stability in France. Passage C meanwhile stresses the centralised authoritarian nature of the regime which required obedience and passive consent from the citizens, despite the apparent expression of popular consent via plebiscites. These views might be put in the context of Napoleon’s fear of peasant and urban rebellion, his emphasis on controlling the workers via such mechanisms as the *livret*, his orders to his prefects to report continuously on the state of public opinion, and his reliance on the notables with their conservative desire for order and peace.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

## **2 To what extent have Napoleon's abilities as a military leader been overestimated? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the debate over Napoleon's generalship.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The area of debate ranges from the unquestioning eulogists through to the sceptics who, whilst accepting that Napoleon was a good general in a number of ways, feel that his weaknesses and the advantages he possessed have been underestimated. Candidates will need to show a critical awareness of the range of interpretations and their strengths and weaknesses to score in the higher bands. Pro-Napoleonic literature tend to stress some of the following: Napoleon's campaign and battle record; his strategic abilities; his ability as a commander on the battlefield as well as on campaign; his tactics and ideas of warfare; his leadership qualities (e.g. in relation to inspiring the loyalty of troops). In support of such views candidates may point to the details in particular campaigns [especially his Italian campaigns (1796-97), the Ulm-Austerlitz and Jena-Auerstadt campaigns, and his defence of France in 1814]. Critics, whilst not disputing his record, stress the advantages Napoleon possessed (Commander-in-Chief and ruler of France, resources of the Empire, a veteran army, the organisational and tactical changes of the 1790s, the divisions and deficiencies of his enemies, the abilities of some of his Marshals – Lannes, Davout, Murat, Desaix, and so on). They also stress his good fortune, the mistakes he made, his decline after the peaks of 1805-07, the disaster in Russia. In addition, some question his supposed talents as a strategist and tactician – Barnett, for example, heavily criticises the high risk nature of his campaign strategies in 1800 and 1805 whilst Connelly views Napoleon's talent lying not in strategy but in 'scrambling' – reacting to events on the battlefield. There is much for candidates to get their teeth into – the key to success will be the degree candidates can critically evaluate different interpretations.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

### **3 To what extent was Britain responsible for the eventual defeat of Napoleon?**

Focus: Evaluation of interpretations of reasons for Napoleon's defeat.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

To score in the higher bands candidates must deal with the interpretations of Britain's role in the defeat of Napoleon, even if they wish to argue that interpretations which suggest other factors were more significant have more validity. One interpretation, presaged by Napoleon himself, who stressed the role played by the Peninsular War and Britain's constant opposition, is that British opposition to Napoleon played a crucial role, perhaps the decisive role, in Napoleon's downfall. Such interpretations stress not just Britain's active participation in the Peninsular, but her naval supremacy, her penetration of the Continental System and her diplomatic efforts supported by subsidies. On the other hand, other interpretations, whilst not denying that Britain's role was important, suggest that Britain was like an 'ulcer' (as in 'Spanish ulcer') debilitating, irritating but not fatal. Instead, such interpretations point to other factors: crucially the events of 1812, Napoleon's decline alongside that of his army. Others suggest that Britain on her own could not decisively defeat Napoleon and that if Napoleon was to be defeated it had to be on the continent and in battle – such interpretations stress, for example, the development of the coherent fourth coalition during 1813.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80****4(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C about the effectiveness of Gladstone as leader of the Liberal Party [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Passage **B** suggests Gladstone's leadership was crucial and vital, whereas Passage **C** clearly states that it was a mixed blessing. Both agree that he had popular appeal and both imply that his leadership succeeded in addressing a wide range of problems and uniting different interests. Passage **C** is more critical referring to his stubbornness and failure to note the views of others. Both Passages consider he was little concerned with party organisation and so less effective. Passage **C** mentions how his leadership was criticised by the party, but Passage **B** suggests he was a remarkably effective leader.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Liberal party won support from voters only because of Gladstone. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

All the Passages suggest that in some way, Gladstone did win support from voters. Passage **A** considers that his high moral sense was his main contribution. Passage **B** emphasises how he held disparate groups together and prevented the instability which had been prevalent before his leadership. Passage **C** supports this idea and further underlines the way in which he made Liberalism a vote-winning creed. Passage **D** backs this up in his ability to communicate with people and like Passage **C** refers to his stress on finance and administration. There are also hints that he did not always succeed in winning support. Passage **A** refers, unlike the other passages, to disregard of public opinion and Passage **D** suggests a selective use of the popular voice. Passage **C** indicates that other factors, beyond Gladstone's control, determined popularity and that he ignored party organisation, a means of winning elections. Passage **D** is the most critical, backing up the idea that he was authoritarian and imposed his own views regardless of their popularity in the party. Candidates could also refer to Gladstone's public image as the Peoples' William. The contribution of other groups such as the Reform League and Gladstone's relatively late commitment to the party, would suggest his role was less vital.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**5 How successful was Gladstone's legislative programme of 1868-74 in carrying out Liberal aims? [45]**

Focus: Debate about the degree of success of Gladstone's programme in 1868-74.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Some historians have acclaimed the reforms of this period as some of the most productive legislation of the nineteenth century. Others are far more critical and consider that nearly all the measures were flawed in some way. Candidates need to give some consideration to what Liberal aims were. On the positive side, the government's determination to promote the efficiency of the State, by modifying national institutions where necessary, can be noted. Army reforms, legal reforms, the education of citizens, secret ballot, civil service reforms and the Licensing Act, could all be cited to support this view. Irish measures can also be mentioned and the disestablishment of the Irish Church was one of the main promises in the liberal programme in 1868. Some measures such as civil service reform had been urged by Liberals for a long time. However, candidates should also be aware that the National Education League was highly critical of the Education Act and the temperance movement disliked the Licensing Act. Both these groups had considerable Non-Conformist support and they were further disappointed when the Established churches of England, Wales and Scotland, did not go the way of the Irish Church. Working class Liberals were unhappy with the Criminal Law Amendment Act and founded the Labour Representation League. The fate of the Irish University Bill would be a further example. In the longer view, while the Education Act is generally seen as a real milestone, the University Tests Act made little difference and the effectiveness of the army reforms is a matter of debate.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**6 How far were Disraeli's foreign and imperial policies as Prime Minister a reaction against those of Gladstone? [45]**

Focus: Debate about how far Disraeli had a coherent approach to foreign and imperial issues.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Some historians argue that Disraeli was, from 1868, committed to an assertive policy based on the imperial idea and saw himself as the heir to Palmerston. Others consider that he had no very clear notion of a policy beyond reasserting British power in Europe which Gladstone had allowed to decline.

Proponents of the first view argue that the 1872 speeches foreshadow Disraeli's imperialist aims and that the Suez Canal shares, the Royal Titles Act and the acquisition of Cyprus, illustrate his success. His firmness over the Eastern Question led to the achievement of his aims at Berlin. The second view can be supported by reference to his criticisms of Gladstone's weakness in his non-interference in the Franco-Prussian War and of his failure to uphold British interests over the Black Sea clauses and the Alabama arbitration. Very well informed candidates might suggest that Disraeli's policies were usually cautious and he might well have acted similarly but he seized the opportunity to berate Gladstone. The Eastern Question, it has been argued, was forced on Disraeli and his policy developed along with events. He was more motivated by the need for European stability than by sympathy for the Bulgarians and to an extent reacting against Gladstone. Furthermore the events in Afghanistan and South Africa, seen by Gladstone as a forward policy and thus supporting the first view, are also seen as a result of Disraeli's lack of control. It is also possible to argue that it was the popular appeal of a more aggressive foreign policy which most affected Disraeli and fuelled some of his more extreme pronouncements, plus the fact that the Queen favoured this.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-71**

**7(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D on the influence of the liberals on the 1867 constitution. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Passage B states that the liberals had a considerable influence on the 1867 constitution and in at least two important ways: achieving the secret ballot and gaining Reichstag approval for the army. Passage D states that the liberals had little influence over the new constitution. They failed to stop universal suffrage which secretly they opposed and they failed to gain the right for the Reichstag to approve the military budget. However, both Passages agree that the liberals had some influence over the new constitution, e.g. the secret ballot.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the North German Confederation was based on the principles of liberalism. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Answers may start by identifying the principles of 19<sup>th</sup> century German liberalism: responsible and representative (but not necessarily democratic) government with some constitutional protection of fundamental freedoms. The overlap between liberalism and nationalism should also be considered; many liberals wanted a unitary nation state, as mentioned by Passage D. Liberal principles can be found in the North German Confederation. Responsible government is mentioned in Passage C, representative government, via universal suffrage and the secret ballot, in Passage B. The very existence of a formal constitution met a fundamental liberal principle. However, liberalism had to take second place to conservatism; the various states of Germany did not want to be dissolved, least of all Prussia. (Passage A's point about the Prussian constitution is important here.) Thus 1867 can be seen as either the rejection of fundamental liberal principles, as argued by Passage A, or the granting of a sham liberal form while retaining conservative content, as shown by Passage C. Candidates' knowledge of the details of the 1867 constitution need not be great so long as they do consider the politics of the settlement of 1867. Even Passages which stress the liberal elements of 1867, such as Passages B and C, stress the central role and power of Bismarck, himself no great liberal. He made concessions to liberalism and the National Liberals because it helped strengthen a relatively fragile new state. However, these concessions did ensure that the Confederation did contain liberal features which were to influence post-1867 German politics and government.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.



Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**8 How far do you agree that Prussia's rapidly growing industrial power was the most important reason for Prussia's rapid rise to ascendancy in Germany? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for Prussian emerging strength and success.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The reasoning behind this interpretation is that Prussian industrialisation provided the resources for the Prussian army which gave Prussia a great advantage over the less industrialised, less militarised powers of Austria and France. The argument can be criticised in two different ways. Firstly, the gap between the industrial and military resources of the three states was not that great; more important in explaining Prussian military success was the superior quality of its military training and leadership, von Roon and Moltke being especially important. Secondly, crucial to Prussian military success was the diplomatic context, the isolation of Austria in 1666 and France in 1871. This context had nothing to do with Prussian industrial power and everything to do with Bismarck's diplomatic skills (and the lack of skill of counterparts in Austria and France). Thus there are two broad schools of interpretation, one which stresses the importance of 'underlying' economic forces, the other the greater significance of individuals.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**9 'Bismarck was responsible for the outbreak of war against Denmark and Austria, but not against France.' How far do you agree? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the goals and methods of Bismarck.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The best-known interpretation is that Bismarck planned all three wars. The opposite argument is that he was an opportunist, responding to events as they developed. In two of the wars, he was probably more opportunist than planner. For the Danish War of 1864, Austro-Prussian forces moved into Schleswig (part of Denmark) in January and Denmark proper in February 1864. They did so in order to try and make Denmark abandon its unilateral revision of the 1852 Treaty of London and to isolate the German nationalists of the Diet, who had sent troops into Holstein. More often than not, Bismarck was responding to moves made by the Danes or the Diet. The situation in 1866 was very different; from 1864 onwards Bismarck made the running. He wanted war with Austria. In 1870, though he probably wanted a diplomatic crisis, as shown by his encouragement of the Hohenzollern crisis, he was not planning on war with France. The question provides a fair amount of scope for different interpretations. Answers may well devote more space to 1866 and 1870 than to 1864 – that will be fine.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Roosevelt's America 1920-1941****10(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D on the effectiveness of the New Deal. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Passage A refers directly to relief. It mentions how effective several relief alphabet agencies dealt with aspects of the Depression. However, it also goes on to state that not everyone was cared for claiming that there was never sufficient money to deal with aspects of relief. Passage D also has doubts about effectiveness of the New Deal. It takes a much more extreme view. It provides statistical evidence to back up claim that New Deal did not get USA out of economic depression. However, there are references to some achievements regarding them as rather slender.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the New Deal brought fundamental changes to the USA. [45]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage A refers to the effectiveness of the New Deal in bringing some relief from economic depression, but it qualifies its view by referring to the limited amount of money available for relief. Passage D takes an even more extreme view that the New Deal did not bring fundamental change; unemployment remained high; personal national income did not rise to pre-1929 levels etc. In contrast, Passage B states that the New Deal did bring fundamental change in the role of the president, stating that balance between president and Congress was altered permanently. This view is supported by Passage C, which refers to major changes in financial controls, the creation of a welfare state and the role of federal government in regulating economy. However, at the end Passage C does state that USA was never really in danger of revolution so the achievements of the New Deal were not as great as they might first appear. Candidates might also mention the 100 Days which created a plethora of agencies which brought back partial recovery: such as, TVA, FERA, PWA, CCC, AAA, NRA etc. They could also mention the Second New Deal reform of the Social Security Act, the Wagner Act on trade unions and the creation of the Works Progress Administration (WPA).

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**11 Assess the view that the USA was isolationist power in foreign affairs from 1920 to 1939.**  
**[45]**

Focus: Assessment of ongoing historical debate on nature of US foreign policy.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates could mention that Harding, from 1921, brought back 'normalcy' in US affairs. This meant taking a detached view from European and international affairs. The decision by the USA not to join the League of Nations was indicative of this stance. The USA continued to remain aloof from European and Asian affairs for most of the period to 1939. In the 1920s, European affairs were dominated by Britain and France. In 1931 when Japan invaded Manchuria, the USA did not get involved; neither did it over Italy's invasion of Abyssinia in 1935-36. Finally, the rise of Hitler did not elicit an overt US response during 1933-39. Only after 1939 was the USA seen to be more actively involved, for example through: Lend Lease, the Atlantic Charter etc in 1941. The counter view would argue that the US was involved in Europe in 1920s through Dawes and Young Plans. Also, the Washington Naval Treaty of 1922 was an important milestone in international relations. Throughout the 1920s, the USA actively intervened in Central and South America in countries such as Nicaragua. Also from 1933, with arrival of FDR in White House, the USA became increasing active in foreign affairs. FDR was limited in what he wanted to do by Congress and by the Neutrality Acts but, nevertheless, from at least 1938 onwards, FDR was becoming clearly less isolationist in Asian and European affairs.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**12 'National Prohibition failed because of the involvement of organised crime.' How far do you agree with this view?**

Focus: Analysis of on-going historical debate on issue of prohibition.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates might mention how gangsters such as Capone and the Chicago mob helped to exploit prohibition by bootlegging, running speakeasies, bribing officials etc so that USA was supplied, albeit illegally by criminals. Clearly, this greatly undermined national prohibition. The campaigning to remove prohibition did suggest that prohibition had increased not reduced crime in USA. Other factors undermining national prohibition will also need to be considered, for example: the lack of enforcement of prohibition; the long coastline and borders of the USA through which illicit alcohol from Canada and Mexico could easily be smuggled; the failure to control supplies of industrial alcohol which were used to make home-made spirits; the mass refusal to obey the law – a refusal which went as high as White House under President Harding.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24****13(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C about the Kronstadt rebels. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

The author of Passage B states that the Kronstadt rebels were the revolutionary proletariat. However, she also shows that the Soviet media of the time portrayed the rebels as Russian exiles led by a White general. The author of Passage C also mentions how the rebels were labelled at the time, in his case by the Bolshevik leadership, though Figes states in C that it preferred to see them as coming from the rural peasantry. Passage C supports Passage B by also saying that the rebels were among the revolutionaries of 1917, though Passage C provides much more detailed information to support his case.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Kronstadt Uprising was a turning point in Bolshevik rule of Russia in the period 1918-24. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

There are two ways in which the Kronstadt Uprising could have been a turning point. Firstly, it was the first time that the revolutionaries of 1917 rebelled against their revolutionary government which, again for the first time, used force to repress the uprising. Secondly, the Uprising helped to cause the biggest shift in Bolshevik rule at the time, the abandonment of War Communism in favour of NEP. Part of the debate surrounding the first issue is the extent to which the rebels were former revolutionaries. Passage A maintains that they were not as, according to Passages B and C, did the authorities of the time. However, (and, ideally, part of candidates' evaluation), those authorities had a vested interest in making such a claim (which is also rather far-fetched?). Passages B and C do reinforce each other's view that the rebels were revolutionaries. Passage D assumes that they were and thus is little help on this issue. However, it is the most useful source for the second debate, the role of the Uprising in the establishment of NEP. Even here, Service does not make a causal connection between the two. However, he maintains that NEP was not the only significant policy shift of 1921, the other (often overlooked) being greater political repression, even within the party. Here there is a *prima facie* link between the Uprising and repression. Candidates can use their own knowledge – how much repression before 1921? – in order to evaluate the argument.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

#### **14 How successful was Lenin as leader of the Bolsheviks between 1903 and February 1917? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of Lenin's success in leading the Bolshevik party 1903 - February 1917.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

To answer this question effectively, candidates need to establish some criteria for success. These could include: outside the party, growing support, in terms of members and voters for the party in the Duma and growing influence of its ideas on working class movements in Russia, as shown by increased unrest; within the party, greater unity and acceptance of Lenin's ideas and leadership, not least in establishing an elitist party of dedicated revolutionaries. One specific point, relations with the Mensheviks, might be part of any assessment, judgement depending on whether Lenin is seen as wanting closer relations (as in 1905-06) or a complete break (as in 1912). He certainly showed great determination and skill in the ideological in-fighting which occurred with the wider Social Democratic movement. Interpretations are likely to range from those which see Lenin as a great success (refining revolutionary doctrine, keeping the Marxist flame burning, imposing his will on his party) and those which see him as a failure (declining support from c.1908 onwards, limited impact on revolutionary thought, tendency to factionalism, final split with the Mensheviks).

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**15 Assess the view that the 1917 October Revolution was more a popular insurrection than a Bolshevik plot. [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the nature of the Bolshevik 1917 Revolution.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

In other words, how far was it a mass movement and how far an elitist coup by a tightly-knit band of revolutionaries? The subject has raised a great deal of historical debate, the so-called liberal school favouring the latter and the Marxist, libertarian and revisionist schools the former. Each of the latter schools has a slightly different take on the subject. The Marxists put the Bolsheviks at the head of a proletarian mass body, the two united in some material and mystical manner while the libertarians see the (better organised) Bolsheviks as exploiting the popular insurrection and the liberals argue that the Bolsheviks succeeded because by October the Bolsheviks had managed to identify themselves closely with the increasingly popular soviets. Candidates should be familiar with the events and features of the October Revolution which they can use to evaluate some or all of the above interpretations. However, it is not essential that they refer to specific schools of history. The question can be successfully answered by defining the key concepts of insurrection and plot and developing an analysis based on these definitions.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.



**Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-39****16(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and C on the role of Halifax in British foreign policy in 1939. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

In Passage A, Butler supports Halifax's view that he led Chamberlain to make a 'revolution in foreign policy' in March 1939, a revolution which Chamberlain never fully agreed with. The unspecified revolution is presumably is the guarantee given to Poland. Passage C concerns a different issue, negotiations with the USSR following that guarantee. It shows Halifax following rather than leading and as unwilling to change the whole basis of British foreign policy. Thus the Passages differ in their view of the role of Halifax, though with regard to different (if related) topics. They agree that Halifax is central to the making of British foreign policy. Even over the military alliance with the USSR, it took the cabinet to overcome his opposition – and even then he dragged his feet.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that public opinion was the main reason for the change in British foreign policy in the spring of 1939. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The change in foreign policy was the taking of a stronger line against Germany which took two forms: initially, a guarantee of Polish independence and then negotiations with the USSR about an Anglo-Soviet alliance. The latter is the focus of the four passages. Passages B and C see public opinion as a causal factor of talks with the USSR. However, Passage B argues that the public was as much against the talks as it was in favour while for the author of Passage C public opinion is secondary to cabinet pressure on the prime minister. Passage D also stresses the importance of the cabinet. Passage A mentions neither the Polish guarantee nor talks with the USSR, talking more generally of 'a revolution in foreign policy'. The credit for this revolution, according to Passage A, came from Halifax. Thus the broad choice of factors is between government and the public. Candidates should refer to both. A key issue is how was public opinion expressed? One means is contact with MPs. Only Passage B mentions backbenchers and then only to say that Conservative backbenchers (presumably, the most influential) are against talks with the USSR. Another factor, probably the more important, was the press. Studies of the national press show some shift in attitudes in the spring of 1939. However, governmental factors were likely to be more important than political. These can include pressure from cabinet colleagues in general or the Foreign Secretary in particular. Finally, it could be the case that Chamberlain made the change on his own in response to events in Central Europe.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**17 How far do you agree that support for the League of Nations was the main reason why Britain made so few specific commitments to maintain the peace of Europe in the 1920s?**  
**[45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons why Britain opposed continental commitments in the 1920s.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Collective security, as provided by the League of Nations, could replace bilateral treaties and national armaments as the most effective means of maintaining national interests, which in the case of Europe were peace and trade. In the 1920s the League was a new and untested institution which seemed to symbolise the new and better world of international cooperation. Nationalism would be replaced by internationalism, the balance of power by international law. 'Informed' public opinion in Britain certainly placed a great deal of hope in the League. However, there is little direct connection between this pro-League culture and the one major commitment Britain did make in the 1920s, the Locarno Treaties of 1925. This resulted from a desire to settle the key continental relationship, that between France and Germany. This commitment was only a paper one. The British lacked the will and the means to enforce it. In this respect, the absence of effective commitments and the veneration of the League spring from the same source: the wishful thinking of the British, both politicians and public. Also important were: the traditions of British isolationism from the continent; a specific mistrust of the motives of France, which was Britain's main ally in the 1920s; the greater importance of the (expanded) British empire, especially given the increased demands of the Dominions. There are no schools of thought on this issue. Different interpretations concern the relative importance of the causal factors already identified.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**18 Assess the view that Chamberlain's main aim in following a policy of appeasement in 1937-38 was to buy enough time to enable Britain to rearm. [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons why Chamberlain followed a policy of appeasement.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

In other words, so the argument goes, the policy was a shrewd response to the political and economic constraints on British foreign policy. The public preferred (limited) government funds to be spent on social policy than on defence. Until the British armed forces had been built to at least the level of Germany's Britain could not stand up to Hitler's expansionist demands. This argument suggests that Chamberlain thought war would come, that he 'saw through' Hitler. It is part of the revisionist analysis which sees appeasement as more success and necessity rather than failure and choice. On the other hand, it can be argued that Chamberlain appeased Hitler – most obviously at Munich – because he believed it was the better way of ensuring peace in Europe, that Hitler's (reasonable) demands could be met without risking war. This suggests that Chamberlain failed to 'see through' Hitler, at least in 1937-38. Candidates have plenty of scope for discussion and debate.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Stalin and the Development of the Cold War in Europe 1941–55****19(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D on the Russian takeover of Eastern Europe after the Second World War. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Candidates may point out that in Passage A Howarth suggests that Truman felt that Europe was haunted by the spectre of communism, that the Iron Curtain had been ‘slammed down’ and that countries like Greece, France and Italy may have been vulnerable to the communist threat. In Passage A, Howarth does state however that ‘*such a view of a world in peril from the Russian menace was not altogether accurate*’. In Passage D, however, although Oxley does state that ‘*The Americans believed that they detected the hand of the Soviet Union in almost every trouble spot around the world.*’, and refers to Churchill’s Iron Curtain speech, he argues that the main reason for the USSR’s control of eastern Europe was their need for security. For example, he states ‘*It is not difficult to understand why Soviet troops stayed on in Eastern Europe after 1945. German armies had invaded Russia twice in 27 years.*’. Passage A also contains a reference to Stalin’s justifiable concern for security.

**Band I** answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

**Band II** answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

**Band V** answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the USA misinterpreted the communist takeover of Eastern Europe. [30]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

This question asks for an overall assessment as to whether the Americans misinterpreted the communist takeover of Eastern Europe. Passage C suggests that one reason for the emergence of communist regimes in Eastern Europe was sympathy with and support for communist Party policies and actions. It does, however, state that ‘*it would be misleading to exaggerate the level of support*’. Passage D makes the case that the USSR took over Eastern Europe and tightened its control for security reasons. It implies that the Americans did misinterpret the USSR’s motives: ‘*The Americans believed that they detected the hand of the Soviet Union in almost every trouble spot around the world.*’. This view is broadly shared by Passage A which describes Truman’s alarm at the threat of communism yet ends with ‘*such a view of a world in peril from the Russian menace was not altogether accurate*’. However, that also implies that Truman’s fears were not altogether false, a view that would certainly be supported by Conquest in Passage B. Conquest suggests that Stalin ruled Eastern Europe with a rod of iron. He was brutal, dictatorial and, by clear implication, paranoid.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**20 Assess the reasons why Stalin was in dispute with his wartime allies from 1941 to 1945.**  
**[45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for the disputes between the USSR, the USA and Great Britain during the Second World War.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

An understanding of a variety of reasons for the wartime disputes between the allies must be displayed. Candidates should be well informed as to how the USSR endured the brunt of the suffering against Nazi Germany and the extent of Stalin's frustrations in relation to the timing of a second front in the west. Candidates may argue that during 1942-44 this was the most important cause of disputes. Following the launch of Operation Overlord's invasion of Normandy in June 1944, however, this was a declining area of dispute. Candidates can contrast this cause of disputes with others, such as: arguments about the future of Germany, the increasing unease of the allies at the Red Army's actions in Eastern Europe (most especially in Poland). Candidates may, however, argue that the 'Percentages Agreement' between Churchill and Stalin suggests that Churchill was happy with the creation of 'spheres of influence' in Eastern Europe - as long as Britain 'got her share'. Reference to disputes over the atomic bomb should be linked to US failure to share their knowledge. Candidates may demonstrate an understanding of how disputes about the shape of post-war Germany became more critical in 1945, and will be likely to refer to one or both of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences. One valid line of argument would make the case for the causes of disputes changing and evolving over time, in line with the fortunes of war. Equally validly, the deep-seated differences between the west and the USSR could be seen as having united such unlikely partners in a stormy relationship. Candidates should try to discuss the relative importance of reasons. The dates in the question mean that the Passages set for Q19 cannot be used relatively.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**21 Assess the reasons why Germany became a major focus of Cold War rivalry in the period from 1945 to 1949. [45]**

Focus: Analysis of the factors that caused Germany to become a major focus of Cold War rivalry from 1945 to 1949.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

An understanding of the main factors influencing the emergence of Germany as a major focus of Cold War rivalry from 1945 to 1949 should be displayed. An understanding of why Germany became a focus of Cold War rivalry from 1945 to 1949 must be displayed. How and why the crises in Germany and Berlin were both caused by and, in turn, fuelled the escalating Cold War needs to be demonstrated. Many candidates are likely to refer to the discussions over post-war Germany at Yalta and Potsdam and the decisions that were made. Answers are likely to consider the post-war splitting up of Germany and Berlin into sectors, and many may refer to the arguments that developed over Germany between Britain, France, the USA and the USSR, for example over reparations. Many may refer to the major fears of the USSR over its own security from Western invasion and how the creation of 'Bizonia' and 'Trizonia', along with the generous application of Marshall Aid' encouraged Russian fears to grow. Berlin's position within the Russian Zone of Germany, the currency crisis and the events of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift may play significant parts in answers.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Mark Scheme 2590**  
**June 2005**

**Themes in History 1055-1796****England 1066-1228****The Government of England 1066-1216****1 To what extent did Angevin kings depend on the work of their Anglo-Norman predecessors in developing English central government?**

Focus: Assessment of the relative importance of the work of their predecessors compared with other factors in Angevin kings' development of central government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

By the death of Henry I in 1135, Anglo-Norman government had reached its height with the exchequer, systematic control of finance, justiciar etc. The determination of Henry II (1154-89) to restore this might suggest that Angevin government owed much to the Anglo-Normans. However, Henry II and the later Angevins went beyond this foundation developing, for example, the chancery, the office of chief justiciar and the use of assizes.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**2 'In the period from 1066 to 1216, England's military needs were never completely met by feudalism.' To what extent do you agree with this judgement?**

Focus: Evaluation of the role of feudalism in meeting England's military needs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

If feudalism were ever to have answered England's military needs it would have been in the years following the Norman Conquest when England was the most feudal kingdom in Western Europe. However, even William I (1066-87) supplemented the feudal host with mercenaries. Although it remained possible to do military service throughout the period, increasingly kings relied less on the host and more on paid service. Henry I (1100-35) decreased the length of knight service, Henry II (1154-89) hired mercenaries for preference and by John's reign (1199-1216) feudalism was predominantly a system of land-holding rather than the solution to England's military requirements.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**3 'The main consequence for English government of the crown's continental possessions was the development of the office of chief justiciar.' To what extent do you agree with this judgement on the period from 1066 to 1216?**

Focus: Assessment of the importance of one effect of the continental possessions of the crown in relation to others.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The continental possessions of the crown led to the need to create a form of government which could function even while the king was abroad, and the development of the office of chief justiciar was a major component of the attempt to meet that need. However, this should be set against other effects such as the rapid growth of feudalism early on; the attack on the whole system of Angevin government in John's reign (1199-1216); and the need for large sums of money to defend the Norman and Angevin lands which produced systematic, centralised means of raising revenue.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228**

**4 'Papal intervention was the main reason for the changes in the relations between archbishops of Canterbury and other archbishops and bishops.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the period from 1066 to 1228?**

Focus: Explanation of the changing relationship between archbishops of Canterbury and other members of the episcopate.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Relations between Canterbury and York were often influenced by the primacy question. While Lanfranc's personal primacy was recognised (archbishop 1070-89) there was no unequivocal settlement of the issue. Papal determination to reduce archiepiscopal power and so enhance papal authority also played a part as popes balanced Canterbury against York, for example during the Becket affair. By the end of the period the heat had gone out of the rivalry between York and Canterbury as both were suffering problems with their own bishops. The political situation could also affect relations: Becket's relations with some of his bishops (e.g. Foliot of London) declined during his quarrel with Henry II, as did his relationship with York over the crowning of Young Henry. Exile or suspension of the archbishop also affected relations with other bishops.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**5 'The main impact of the papal reform movement in England was on relationships between kings and their archbishops of Canterbury.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the period from 1066 to 1228?**

Focus: Assessment of the importance of one effect of the papal reform movement compared with that of others.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Relations between kings and their archbishops were to some extent soured by the papal reform movement: the relationship of Henry I with Anselm (1093-1109) was initially affected by the Investiture Contest; the quarrel of Henry II with Becket (1162-70) was the result of ideas about ecclesiastical freedom arising from the reform movement; Innocent III's interventions in John's reign, stemming from the increased power and authority of the papacy, led to strained relations with Langton (1207-28). However, not all relationships between kings and their archbishops were so affected, for example the harmonious relationship of William I with Lanfranc (1070-89). Moreover, there were other effects which might be seen as at least as important. Papal reform eventually resulted in increased freedom from royal control, but also in more papal control over the church – seen, for example, in increased appeals to Rome, attempts by popes to weaken primatial authority or Innocent III's placing England under an interdict (1208-14).

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**6 To what extent did the reasons for monastic development in England remain unchanged during the period from 1066 to 1228?**

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for monastic development.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Some factors played an important part throughout the period. Royal or noble patronage, inspired by the need for salvation, was behind the foundation and endowment of new houses. However, from the reign of Henry I (1100-35), new orders began to reinvigorate English monasticism and were a major contributor to its successful flowering. These derived from the papal reform movement and the particular patronage of the pope. Later, economic considerations were also important, especially in the foundation of Cistercian houses. Some answers may note the arrival of the friars at the very end of the period (1220).

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**England 1485-1603****Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603****7 How effectively did Tudor governments deal with the problem of rebellion?**

Focus: Assessment of effectiveness of government's responses to rebellions.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to focus on 'effectively'. The speed with which governments responded to a disturbance, its length, was it contained or did it spread, how far was it from a city, especially London, whether they negotiated or raised troops, could nobles be trusted to combat the rebels, did the government have to make concessions or keep to them, did government measures deter future threats?

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**8 Assess the role of factions as a cause of rebellions in Tudor England.**

Focus: Evaluation of factions as a cause of rebellion.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Political factions were responsible for several rebellions. Factions sometimes led them (e.g. Lincoln, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, Northumberland and Westmoreland) or encouraged them (e.g. supporters of Aragon, Mary Tudor, Mary Stuart); and some hoped to remove or embarrass a principal minister (e.g. Wolsey in 1525, Cromwell in 1536, Somerset in 1549, Northumberland in 1553, William Cecil in 1569, Robert Cecil in 1601). Of course, rebellions had multiple causes and answers will look at other factors alongside faction - but this is a question about faction and candidates must make it central to their argument for Bands I and II.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**9 To what extent did Tudor rebellions fail to achieve any of their aims?**

Focus: Evaluation of rebels' achievements in the light of their aims.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

On the face of it, all rebellions ended in failure and yet, as the more discerning candidates will demonstrate, some rebellions achieved some of their aims, and others came close. The best examples are the protests against taxation (e.g. Cornish Rising, Amicable Grant) which resulted in no further charges after 1497 and withdrawal of the tax in 1525), the demand for more political representation in the north of England (e.g. 1536 and 1569), which saw reforms to the Council of the North. Some protests led to a change in policy (e.g. Henry VIII held back from further 'Protestant' reforms after the uprising of 1536). In general, however, most Tudor rebellions failed to achieve their main aims.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603****10 Assess how far changes in England's religion altered the conduct of Tudor foreign policy.**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of the English Reformation on foreign affairs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Changes in religion had an important bearing on Tudor foreign policy. Until the 1520s, the Tudors had developed policies based upon dynastic, political, economic and personal factors: Spain and the Netherlands were England's trading and political allies, France remained an enemy at bay (more interested in Italy and Burgundy than in recovering Calais) and Scotland presented a diminishing threat. The English Reformation changed these relationships, initially in the 1530s when the Papacy implored Catholic Spain and France to turn against Henry VIII, and more seriously in the 1550s when, first Edward and his Protestant ministers went to war with Scotland and France, and second, Mary and her Catholic advisers restored close ties with Spain. These wars, however, were not caused by religious conflict. The Protestant church established by Elizabeth led to her intervention in Scotland in 1559-60 and to worsening relations with Spain after 1570. An argument can also be made that the English Reformation was only one factor, and not necessarily the most important, in determining the course of foreign policy.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. Answers should look at the factors governing foreign policy making under Henry VII and Wolsey, contrast this period with the effects of the Reformation after the 1530s, and examine its long-term impact against other influences.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays may set the English Reformation in the context of other factors and give greater attention to the latter, perhaps overlooking the increasing importance of religion in Elizabeth's reign. Essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** will probably be less adept at discussing the changes brought about by the Reformation and, at a lower level, be dismissive of its importance. They will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**11 To what extent did the personalities of the Tudor monarchs affect relations with foreign powers?**

Focus: Assessment of the impact of monarchs' personalities upon foreign relations.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Tudor foreign policy and relations with foreign powers were to a great extent influenced by the character and personality of the rulers. Yet, at the same time, some elements remained constant (e.g. need for security, trade considerations). Candidates should evaluate each reign and link policies and developments to the rulers' personality.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**12 Which was more important in determining Tudor foreign policy: relations with France or relations with Spain? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Comparison of France and Spain's influence upon foreign policy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should compare the influence of both France and Spain before making a judgement. Any who only examine one country without reference to the other cannot score above Band III. Rivalry with France exercised a major influence in the early part of the period, and marital and trade links with Spain, though important, were of secondary significance until the 1520s. Each of the Tudors went to war with France, but only Henry VIII did so more than once. The loss of Calais and the outbreak of the French Civil Wars (1562) reduced the threat of invasion of England and made France more amenable to détente and by 1559 it was clear that Spain had eclipsed France as the leading power in Europe. Indeed, Elizabeth, like the Valois kings and Henry IV, was consistently aware of the growing power and presence of Philip II. If candidates largely dismiss France or Spain in favour of (say) Scotland, they will have a ceiling of Band V.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period. Answers should examine both France and Spain to justify their selection. The quality of their argument may be reflected by their interpretation of 'influence'.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change. Essays may lack sustained comparative points or devote too much time to either France or Spain but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**England 1558-1689****The Development of Limited Monarchy in England 1558-1689****13 To what extent was parliament essential to the government of the country from 1558 to 1689?**

Focus: Evaluation of the relationship of the crown and parliament in this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The key to this question is 'essential' and how candidates handle this description will probably determine their mark. Some may look at periods when parliament did not meet, most notably in 1614-21, 1629-40 and 1681-85, and examine how well the country was governed. Were laws upheld, taxes collected, local issues resolved? Others may look at the crown's relationship with parliament and determine whether effective government depended upon parliament and, if so, why?

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should focus on what made for a successful government and consider through a variety of examples drawn from across the period the crown's relationship with parliament.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change. Essays may have a less firm grasp of what parliament brought to government and how this changed during the period but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**14 Assess the role of religious factors in limiting the authority of English monarchs from 1558 to 1689.**

Focus: Assessment of how and how far the Church limited English monarchs' authority.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Ostensibly supportive of the monarchy as long as monarchs supported the Church as established in 1559, the Church of England in the course of this period came to play an important part in limiting their authority. It supported legislation against Roman Catholics and resisted attempts by Puritans to compromise Elizabeth and James's authority. In each case, the monarch's authority was strengthened and that indirectly alienated the Commons. Charles I's support for Arminianism and Laud's endorsement of the personal rule rendered the possibility of an absolute government and paradoxically was central to limiting the crown's power: parliament condemned the bishops, abolished the House of Lords and executed the king. By dominating the Church at the Restoration, Anglicans made it hard for Charles II and James II to establish a latitudinarian church and when the Stuart kings tried to establish greater toleration, the Commons and Lords united against them, limited their authority and ultimately supported the Glorious Revolution. Other factors (e.g. financial, political) may be considered but they are not essential for Band I. If answers do not discuss religious factors, they will have a ceiling of Band V.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should focus on and assess the Church's role throughout the period, and explain how its support for the monarchy fluctuated.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support. Responses will show some awareness of the effects that the Church had in limiting the monarchs' authority.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**15 'Failure to solve financial problems was the main reason that explains the decline in political power of the monarchy during the period from 1558 to 1689.' How far do you agree with this judgement?**

Focus: Assessment of financial problems as a reason for decline in the monarchy's political power.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Limited revenue, rising expenditure and (until 1694) making the monarch responsible for the nation's debts, ensured that financial problems were a constant restraint upon monarchs during this period. This became more evident in the 17<sup>th</sup> century due to the imprudent management of royal finances by the Stuarts, although Elizabeth was not entirely blameless. Parliament consequently grew in self-confidence during James's reign until it came to control the purse strings. 'Redress before supply' was a key factor in conditioning the crown's power but other factors also played their part. Some candidates may wish to consider other factors. That is fine but to access Bands I and II, every candidate must address the issue of 'solve financial problems'.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689****16 Assess why groups which rejected the Church of England caused many political problems for governments from 1558 to 1689.**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons why religious groups other than the Church of England caused political problems for the government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Catholics, Puritans, non-conformist Protestants and reactionary Anglicans all caused problems for the government. They either sought to reform the Church through Parliament or through unlawful means, which meant challenging the political establishment. A minority of Catholics threatened Elizabeth's life through conspiracies (as they did James I's in 1605); Charles II's life was threatened by protestants in the Rye House Plot 1683. Separatist Puritans threatened the unity of the state but she successfully kept religion out of high politics. The Stuarts' greater religious tolerance and less assured handling of Parliament led to more serious difficulties: religious groups grew in confidence and frustration in equal measure. Calvinists, Catholics, Quakers, Baptists and Presbyterians, all created problems for the Stuarts at one time or another.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should show how political problems were frequently linked to these groups at various stages during the period. They should explain why problems deepened as the 17<sup>th</sup> century advanced.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period or dwell on only one or two religious groups (e.g. Catholics and Puritans); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**17 How far did government attitudes towards Protestant non-conformists change in the period from 1558 to 1689?**

Focus: Comparative assessment of changing government attitudes towards Protestant non-conformists.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates will recognise that government attitudes did change towards Protestant non-conformists in general and radical sects in particular. The Elizabethan government embraced Puritans and most were tolerated until the 1580s; thereafter, separatists were not. James I was willing to tolerate Puritans but not Presbyterians, and Charles I turned against any Puritan who did not conform to increasingly High Church practices. Civil war, the collapse of Arminianism and the abolition of bishops (1646-60) changed the prospects of non-conformists. They grew in number and ambition. Thereafter, the later Stuarts could not ignore them although the Restoration again saw them on the defensive. Presbyterians, Quakers, Baptists and other minority sects were persecuted by parliament and the Anglican Church (Clarendon Code etc.).

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**18 'The Church of England was stronger between 1660 and 1689 than at any time since the Elizabethan settlement of 1559.' How far do you agree with this judgement?**

Focus: Comparative assessment of the strength of the Church of England over time.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Hopefully, the majority of candidates will compare the period 1660-89 with 1559-1659, but some may produce a chronological account. How candidates assess 'stronger' will probably determine the quality of their answer. Defender of the monarchy, guardian of the Protestant faith, upholder of moral standards, increasing involvement in high politics were all strengths but set against these developments were continuing low salaries of the lesser clergy and an excessive work load. Some candidates may compare Anglicans with Protestant non-conformists and Catholics; as the Church of England grew in influence, other faiths declined.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Europe 1498-1610****The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610****19 How far did the reign of Francis I mark a turning-point in the development of the French nation state from 1498 to 1610?**

Focus: Evaluation of the reign of Francis I in the development of the nation state.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to see how the reign of Francis I (1515-47) affected the development of the French nation state by examining his inheritance (1498-1515) and legacy (1547-1610). Francis I's reign was by far the longest during this period and much was accomplished. However, it will be important that candidates establish the conditions in 1515 and 1547 to show in what respects France 'turned' or simply continued in its development. Political, foreign, economic, social, religious and perhaps cultural affairs could be assessed but keep an open mind for different approaches to this question. Indeed, some candidates may suggest an alternative turning-point, which is fine, provided they first assess Francis I's reign.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should focus on Francis I's reign and discuss with selected examples how far the nation state continued or changed between 1515 and 1547, and whether this pattern was maintained between 1547 and 1610.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change. They may be less focused on 'turning-point', give undue attention to Francis I and events in his reign but, at the top end, still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**20 Assess why civil war was so prominent in the second half of the sixteenth century but did not occur in the first half of the century.**

Focus: Explanation for contrasting domestic developments of war and peace over time.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to compare the period 1498-1562 with the civil war years (1562-1598) to explain the different sets of circumstances i.e. weak and strong rulers, subservient and dominant nobles, monolithic Catholicism and assertive Calvinism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should explain the differing developments before and after 1562, and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period. They may focus on forces of unity and disunity.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**21 Assess the importance of religion in the development of France as a nation state from 1498 to 1610.**

Focus: Evaluation of religion in the development of France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Although Protestantism only emerged in France in the 1520s, candidates should assess the condition of the Catholic Church between 1498 and c.1520, referring to its strengths/weaknesses, the appeal of humanism and the importance of religion in France. Thereafter, Lutheranism and then Calvinism became sources of political, social and religious strength to thousands of French people, but to millions of Catholics Protestantism was the enemy at the gate. From 1560 to 1610 (and beyond), Protestantism and Catholicism played a key role in fomenting the wars of religion, which undoubtedly slowed down, even retarded, the development of France. Candidates who largely dismiss the importance of religion without serious examination of its role and instead write about other significant developments should have a ceiling of Band III.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. Answers should chart and evaluate Protestantism's impact, commenting upon key moments, and perhaps upon the problems they presented the Catholic kings. Other important developments may be considered but are not essential for these or any other Bands.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account of the years 1562-98 with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support. They may focus on the development of Protestantism but fail to link it to political, social and religious issues.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**The Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century****22 'The achievements of the new religious orders by 1600 have been greatly exaggerated.'****How far do you agree with this statement?**Focus: Assessment of the work and successes/limitations of the new religious orders 1500-1600.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are required to assess the work of the new religious orders in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and to examine their achievements by 1600. How they evaluate 'achievements' will be central to their mark. Countries visited, political contacts, numbers of conversions, their educational and social work may all be considered. The slow nature of effective progress, the hostile reception from some secular rulers, opposition from Catholic males to female orders and envy felt towards the Jesuits, may be cited as reasons for their limited success by 1600. Most candidates are likely to focus on the Jesuits, but Band I and II essays should cover a range of new orders (eg. the Capuchins, the Oratorians) and many answers may include consideration of female groups (eg. the Ursulines, Theresa of Avila and her Discalced Carmelites). Some may consider the work of orders outside Europe – Jesuits and others. Effective answers should interrogate the statement in the question and offer evidence for and against it.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period – for example good factual accounts of the Jesuits with partial explanations of other groups); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**23 Assess the importance of the Council of Trent to the origins and development of the Catholic Reformation during the sixteenth century.**

Focus: Assessment of the Council of Trent's contribution to the Catholic Reformation.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The Council of Trent played an important part in the 16<sup>th</sup> century Catholic Reformation: it defined Catholic doctrine after years of uncertainty and challenges from the Protestant faith, rejected any compromise with Protestantism, re-asserted papal authority which would be vital to its unity, stressed the future role of bishops and underlined the value of education in the training of priests and spiritual development of the laity. Yet, by 1563, the Catholic Reformation was well underway and much progress had been made. How far the Council complemented other factors already at work and to what extent it was successful by 1600 are issues that answers awarded Band I or II should be expected to consider. Reward candidates who demonstrate continuity of reform as well as changes brought about by the Council.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas. They may focus entirely on Trent or dismiss Trent in favour of assessing other factors. They will not know much about the effects of Trent post-1563.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**24 To what extent was the Catholic Reformation merely a response to the growing appeal of Protestantism?**

Focus: Evaluation of origins and development of Catholic Reformation in relation to the appeal of the Protestant Reformation.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Some candidates will agree with the title and point to the reaction by the Catholic Church to advances made by Lutheranism and Calvinism – the attraction of biblical humanism, a more enlightened approach to education, the appeal of salvation by faith alone, double predestination and utraquism, improvements in clerical discipline, the rejection of the sanctity of priests and celibacy. These and other issues challenged the Catholic Church and some Protestant ideas were copied e.g. the consistory and the appeal of the sermon. However, the Catholic Reformation was not merely a reaction to Protestantism. For instance, the new orders and Jesuits owed little or nothing to the appeal of Protestantism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should examine the origins of the Catholic Reformation, and explain the interplay between Protestant and Catholic ideas as well as their separate developments.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. For example, they are likely to argue that there was a Catholic revival before 1517, consider factors operating after Luther and Calvin, but show little appreciation as to how the Counter Reformation differed from the Protestant movements. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Europe 1598-1715****The Decline of Spain 1598-1700****25 How successful were Spanish monarchs and their ministers in overcoming financial problems in the seventeenth century?**

Focus: Evaluation of Spanish governments at solving their financial problems.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main financial problems were: an inherited and rising capital debt, interest payments and *juros* that accounted for most of the annual revenue, a debased currency (*vellon*) which led to inflation, a corrupt and inefficient administration, an inequitable tax system, limited sources of revenue, an over-reliance on American silver, a failure to expand trade and industry thereby leading to an imbalance between imports and exports, an increasing expenditure on the court and royal household, and rising costs of administering and defending a world empire both in peace and war-time. These were formidable problems. Although attempts at reform were made, most notably by Lerma, Olivares, Haro, Medinaceli and Oropesa, little was achieved. Candidates should examine some of the problems - it is unlikely that anyone will cover them all - and attempted solutions before reaching an assessment. Band I answers should assess most of the financial problems, refer to a range of ministers across the three reigns and offer an explanation for their limited successes.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**26 Assess the importance of war with the United Provinces in causing the decline of Spain in the seventeenth century.**

Focus: Assessment of war with the United Provinces as a cause of Spain's decline.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

War with the United Provinces ran from 1621 to 1648, and continued the conflict with the Netherlands after a temporary truce in 1609. When Spain finally acceded sovereignty in the Peace of Munster (1648), observers recognised that considerable damage had been done to its reputation as an invincible power. Military and naval defeats encouraged the French and English in their wars against Spain; Dutch independence inspired Portugal in their struggle; the treasury was again exhausted and economically valuable trade and resources had been lost forever. Some candidates may argue that the United Provinces not only contributed to Spain's decline domestically and internationally but actually ensured it would continue after 1648. Nevertheless, not everyone believed Spain's decline was terminal: peace with the Dutch released Spain to concentrate on defeating France and securing Portugal, and military and naval successes in 1652-56 confirmed this optimism. In fact, it was a false dawn and, over the next 40 years, Spain failed to recover. Band I answers should examine how the war affected Spain and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period. Other factors (e.g. the role of kings and ministers, the rise of France, domestic revolts, economic difficulties) are likely to be assessed to set the Dutch war in context.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**27 To what extent was Spain stronger in the 1650s than at any other time in the seventeenth century?**

Focus: Evaluation of Spain in the 1650s in comparison with other decades.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

How candidates address the question of 'stronger' may well determine their mark. On the positive side, Spain was freed from its Dutch commitment to focus on its wars against France and Portugal; more money was found to refortify the army and navy, victories were achieved in Catalonia and north Italy, Haro ably advised a determined Philip IV, France was beset with civil war, and Spain ended the decade with minimal territorial losses at the Peace of the Pyrenees (1659). That said, problems remained economically, financially and militarily, and, once the Fronde had ended in France (1653), it was business as usual. Candidates may argue that the most propitious period was between 1609 and 1619 when there was no war, a degree of financial stability, and Spain's empire and reputation still held firm. Band I essays should compare the 1650s with other periods in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, ideally early and late periods, and critically appraise Spain's strength at each selected moment. We do not expect candidates to cover all angles, but we do expect a fair range of coverage.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change. They will be less secure on the 1650s but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715****28 Assess the contributions of French ministers to the ascendancy of France from 1610 to 1715.**

Focus: Evaluation of the work of several ministers in contributing to the ascendancy of France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

We should expect candidates to assess at least two ministers for Bands I and II to be accessible, and it is likely that Band I essays will examine at least three. The most likely individuals to be considered in answers are: Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert, Louvois, but others are possible. Certainly, coverage of ministers across much of the 17<sup>th</sup> century will be required for Bands I and II in order to demonstrate their comparative achievements. There is more than enough material here in order not to expect a discussion of other factors, although some candidates may do so and that will be valid.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a focus on only 2 ministers; a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven - for example, having a focus on one minister in some detail but be less informed about others and so making few comparative judgements. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**29 To what extent did the minorities of Louis XIII and Louis XIV hinder the growth of absolute monarchy in France from 1610 to 1715?**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of the minorities of Louis XIII (1610-17) and Louis XIV (1643-53) on the development of French absolutism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

In 1610-17 and 1643-53, royal authority was exercised by regents, Marie de Medici and Anne of Austria. Both periods witnessed noble factions fighting among themselves and with the crown for political power. The 1614 States-General revealed the selfish ambitions of leading aristocrats and the need for a strong ruler. Louis XIII and Louis XIV recognised the advantages of not convening another one. Louis XIII's minority may actually have advanced royal absolutism although the spectre of nobles interfering in central and local government remained a feature of French politics. Richelieu consolidated and extended royal authority between 1630 and 1643 and candidates may well point to these years to show that Louis XIII's minority was long forgotten. However, the minority of Louis XIV did weaken royal authority and the growth of absolute monarchy. Anne of Austria, Mazarin, Gaston, Condé and de Retz vied for power and the struggle spilled over into the Fronde. In time, Mazarin assisted the king in restoring royal power over the Paris *parlement* and nobles, and Louis went on to create Versailles well away from Paris. These were important steps in establishing absolutism. However, the Fronde (1648-53) also taught Louis that he needed to exercise restraint in the future when dealing with the nobles and law courts. The lessons learned may therefore have hindered the growth of absolutism. Band I answers should examine these two periods of minority rule and assess how they affected the development of royal power in the context of absolute monarchy across the whole period. Did Louis XIV's rule reflect limitations as a result of his minority?

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas. Essays may be less knowledgeable about Louis XIII's minority but be very sound on Louis XIV and set these events in the context of developing royal power.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support. Responses are likely to know how the Fronde affected Louis XIV.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**30 Assess the importance of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) as a turning-point in the development of France as a European power from 1610 to 1715.**

Focus: Assessment of Westphalia as a turning-point in France's development as a European power.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to focus on the territorial and political results of Westphalia to suggest that France influenced the terms of the treaty such that she gained lands (while Spain did not) and was well placed to continue its war with Spain to a successful conclusion. We can expect candidates to look at France's position in Europe before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War (1618-48) and in the sixty or so years following it. Some candidates will suggest alternative turning-points, such as: the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) or Louis XIV's wars. That is fine, provided they offer a substantial evaluation of the Treaty of Westphalia itself.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Europe 1661–1796****From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661-1796****31 How similar were the challenges to absolutism in Russia during the reigns of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great and in Austria during the reigns of Maria Theresa and Joseph II?**

Focus: Assessment of the opposition to absolutism in two countries over an extended period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The specification requires candidates to have studied the reigns of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great in Russia and Maria Theresa and Joseph II in Austria. Candidates might consider the strengths of noble groups that were predominantly conservative. Religious and secular institutions tended to be against change. Candidates may be less aware of resistance from the lower orders, but reference to that will, of course, be fine. It was difficult to change, and often control, secular and religious institutions. Rulers had to rely largely on their own initiatives and personal strengths, probably more difficult for Catherine and Maria Theresa. Both were women and the circumstances of Catherine's accession meant that, for a while, her hold on power was perhaps less secure. There were differences that might be considered, especially in the social structures of Russia and Austria. Some candidates might point out that, whilst there were broad similarities, there were differences of degree, for example in the effects of the social resistance to change.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**32 Why did Louis XV and Louis XVI find the maintenance of absolute monarchy more difficult than Louis XIV?**

Focus: Analysis of political problems in France over an extended period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The question asks 'Why...?' and examiners will look for an analytical approach in answers that are awarded marks in **Bands I-II**. Candidates might consider the personalities of the kings. Louis XIV took pains to represent the full panoply of his absolute powers. For example, candidates might consider his rule at Versailles. Louis XV also believed in absolutism, but was weaker personally and provided ineffective leadership. Some candidates might note the natural weakness of an absolute monarchy during his time of minority (1715-23) when France was ruled by the Regency. The King's professions to rule well were undermined by his tendency to give in to pressures from special-interest groups and mistresses. Louis XVI shared some of these tendencies: good intentions that were not put into practice to maintain a stable absolute rule. Candidates might examine the changes in the nature of the opposition. There was criticism of aspects of the monarchy under Louis XIV but these were carefully controlled and did not represent a very important section of opinion, even in his last years. His successors faced more varied and influential opposition. The wide-ranging criticism of intellectuals such as the *philosophes* affected the reputation of the kings and hence their place as absolute monarchs. The court that had maintained Louis XIV helped to discredit his successors. Absolute monarchy became discredited by association with increasing financial problems.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**33 Assess the claim that the Roman Catholic Church was ‘unenlightened’ during this period?**

Focus: Assessment of a judgement about the Roman Catholic Church over an extended period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should be able to discuss ‘unenlightened’ as the converse of ‘enlightened’, which they will have studied directly. The Church became associated with an intolerance that was at odds with the Enlightenment’s admiration of tolerance. The appeal of Reason threatened many of the existing tenets of the Church and its claim to particular authority. Credit should be given to candidates who seek to modify the claim in the question. Enlightened thinkers were often religious rather than atheistic and one of the reasons for the unpopularity of the Jesuits in some quarters was their willingness to embrace new ideas. But the Church’s association with privilege, for example Church courts and their widespread tax exemptions, increased its reputation for being unenlightened. The specification does not mention individual countries in the paragraph on the Church. Elsewhere France occupies a major part and Austria and Russia appear (the last obviously not relevant to this question except that some candidates might make a valid point about the Orthodox Church as a direct or implied comparison but this is not necessary). It would be reasonable to accept for **Band I** answers in which good arguments are supported by examples only from France. Austria would be a bonus, for example the resistance to reforms under Maria Theresa and especially Joseph II, and relevant material drawn from other countries should be given full credit. At the beginning of the period, the Church was closely aligned with Louis XIV’s absolute rule and he was strongly supported by Bossuet. Some candidates might consider the significance of the Jansenists. It might be argued that they were an enlightened group; on the other hand, their persecution by the state and by the Church at large would point to a generally unenlightened tendency.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (eg. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**Mark Scheme 2591**  
**June 2005**

**Britain 1793-1921****Britain and Ireland 1798-1921****1 How far would you agree that Parnell was the most effective nationalist leader in Ireland during the period 1798-1921?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative effectiveness of the leadership of Irish nationalism 1798 to 1921?.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A focus purely on the leadership of constitutional nationalism is fine - the relative effectiveness of O'Connell from 1823-45, Butt from 1873-79, Parnell 1879-89, Redmond 1889-1918 and Dillon 1918-19. Comments on Butt and Dillon can be brief. Some candidates may define nationalist leadership more widely and include some of the revolutionary leaders – perhaps Tone, Davitt, Griffiths, de Valera and Collins. The focus should be on effectiveness in mobilising support and in the attainment of aims – in O'Connells' case Catholic Emancipation and Home Rule, for other constitutional leaders Home Rule and reform within the Union (on issues like land). O'Connell achieved emancipation, Butt founded what became the Irish Nationalist party, Parnell gained a Liberal commitment to Home Rule and substantive Land reform, Redmond secured Home Rule but not its implementation, whilst Dillon threw in his lot with Sinn Fein. If some revolutionary leaders are considered then Tone created a myth but was clearly ineffective, Davitt was unusual in crossing the revolutionary/constitutional divide with Parnell whilst Griffiths and de Valera were very effective in creating a grass roots party, but only after 1916, with Collins as an effective military commander. All were effective in different ways. Candidates should pay particular attention to Parnell ('most effective') who created a very disciplined Parliamentary party with effective tactics (obstructionism) and almost complete control of the Irish political process outside Ulster ( a significant improvement on Butt who was prepared to act only as a wing of the Liberals). He dealt very effectively in negotiations with both the Conservative and Liberal parties in 1885-6 and was one of the few leaders who linked to revolutionary nationalism (Davitt's Land League and Fenian money) to harness popular feeling in the Land War via the New Departure in 1879. O'Connell kept out of land issues and his relations with Young Ireland were fractious. Parnell also knew when to dump the League over the Plan of Campaign once the Liberals were committed to Home Rule. Both he and O'Connell were considered by contemporaries as uncrowned 'Kings of Ireland'. O'Connell did gain emancipation by very effective tactics in the 1820s (the Catholic Association and its mobilisation of Ireland), focussing electorally on the Irish Freeholders in the O'Clare by-election (1828) and raising the 'ungovernability' factor for the first time. He too created a parliamentary grouping in the 1830s and did successful deals with the Whigs over patronage (the Lichfield house Compact). As with Parnell in 1886 he withdrew from the brink in 1843 over Clontarf. However, O'Connell was broken by imprisonment, whereas Parnell used it to his advantage in the Kilmainham Treaty (1882). The latter went on to undermine his achievement through personal scandal. Redmond is usually seen as ineffective, presiding over partition and the collapse of the party built by Butt and Parnell. He was certainly less dominant and O'Connell and Parnell, inheriting a divided party from the latter. However like both before him he became dependent on the fortunes of Liberalism. This seemed effective between 1910–16 when the 3<sup>rd</sup> Home Rule Bill became due for the Statute Book but unlike his predecessors he had to face a mobilised Ulster that raised partition and exclusion and was beyond his power to deal with. He fought for temporary exclusion but was less able to control Irish events than O'Connell and Parnell, especially after 1916 when the British government over-reacted and De Valera and Griffiths moved to destroy the Irish Nationalists in the 1918 election. Most candidates are likely to see O'Connell and Parnell as the most effective leaders. Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

## **2 To what extent was Catholic Emancipation in 1829 the most important turning-point in the development of Irish nationalism during the period 1798-1921?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of Roman Catholic Emancipation in the development of Irish nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Emancipation needs to be balanced with other major moments in the development of Irish nationalism in the period. Possibilities might include the Wolfe Tone rising and the Act of Union 1798-1801, the former setting the tone of the blood sacrifice and the methods for revolutionary nationalism, the latter something to react against economically, religiously and politically for all nationalists. The Famine could be considered as a factor promoting a cultural myth of holocaust, discrediting the British government and in creating support from ex-patriots in the USA (money, refuge and increasing US pressure) although in other respects candidates could downplay its impact. Home Rule after 1886 and Ulster's reaction to it might be considered. The former had long been campaigned for but its substance was not great whilst Ulster's reaction pointed to partition and an Ulster variant of Irish identity. Similarly the First World War and the aftermath of the Easter Rising could be used to argue that Ireland moved definitely to partition and effective independence of the South as a consequence of militarisation and the impact of war on the British government. These could all be used to highlight the relative importance of Catholic emancipation in 1829. Here candidates could point to a key blow being struck, by the government itself, to the Protestant Ascendancy, its Irish ruling class who defined their identity as a religious one. Although not intended as such by O'Connell it was in practice an implicit catholic triumph, as Peel's later gestures to placate Catholicism might suggest. It associated catholics with Irish nationalism and would eventually lead to partition and division on religious grounds. It made possible the growth of a successor class to the Ascendancy- the Irish Catholic Tenant Farmers, a group that formed the electoral basis for the politics of Home Rule. It enabled catholics to hold office, of immense significance when this became a reality between 1836 and 1900. Of particular significance were the means by which this was done-O'Connell's mobilisation of popular feeling behind constitutional methods (the Roman Catholic Association). Its impact on British politics was considerable- it was seen as a potential turning point. Nonetheless, if candidates elect to minimise its importance they could point to its limited initial impact given the accompanying electoral punishment (40/- freeholders, abolished 1850) and governments' grudging concessions on patronage and reform

before 1869, done more to prevent a repetition of the 1823-29 mobilisation. It could be argued that Irish nationalism needed more than just emancipation to develop- its own identity (in itself divisive), the discrediting of Westminster government, foreign backing (money, war and diplomacy), its own party with majority support (the turning point here was the Irish Nationalist Party's development in the 1870s) and economic conditions encouraging alienation from the Union (1830s, 1840s and 1880s).

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**3 Discuss the view that the Irish gained more from Whig and Liberal governments than from Tory, Conservative and Coalition governments in the period 1798-1921.**

Focus: A comparison of the relative importance of gains from Whig/Liberal or Tory/Conservative/Coalition governments.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might choose to proceed chronologically, although better answers will be able to impose a pattern here, with the first three quarters of the 19<sup>th</sup> century seeing more minor or unsuitable changes, often to do with the law ( for example, over land tenure) and frequently conceded to prevent more substantive change occurring. The exception would be catholic emancipation in 1829. Both types of government engaged in this. By the 1880s substantive change and gain were experienced with Home Rule proposals and specific land and economic reforms, the latter from both parties. Another way of approaching the question would be to look at specific types of 'gain'- political and constitutional, religious, economic and financial. One stance might be that the Irish gained more political and constitutional concessions from the Whig/Liberals (Municipal and Patronage matters in the 1830s, Irish Disestablishment in 1869, proposed University Reform in 1873, three Home Rule Bills from 1886, Parliamentary Reform in 1850, 1867 and 1884-85 and the Secret Ballot 1872) than from the Tories/Conservatives. In contrast it has been argued that far more economic concessions came from the latter- the Act of Union itself, Peel's land proposals and his initial handling of the Famine in the 1845-46 and the various Land Purchase Acts of the Balfour-Wyndham period after 1886. However it could be argued that politically and religiously the Tory concessions on catholic emancipation in 1829 was huge as was their devolution of local power

the 1880s and 1890s and Lloyd George Coalition's Government of Ireland Act in 1920 which granted Home Rule to both Ulster and the South, closely followed by the Anglo Irish Treaty which conceded an Irish Free State with Dominion status. All were Tory/Conservative/Coalition moves. At the same time Whigs and Liberals conceded much on the economy and land reform – on tithes in 1838, on effective Land Reform in the 1880s and on economic development and rationalisation under Birrell's Chief Secretaryship to 1916. Both political groupings frequently resorted to coercion - the Whigs establishing an extensive police force in the 1830s, the Liberals coercing in the early 1880s, the Tories from Pitt and Peel through to Bloody Balfour in the later 1880s. It is thus often difficult to see any precise pattern- Peel's coercion was matched by his action over the Famine, whilst Russell's Whigs appeared relatively indifferent to any particular action over the Famine. Both groupings talked to terrorists- Gladstone and Parnell in the Kilmainham 'Treaty' (1882), Lloyd George and his Tory Coalition partners to Sinn Féin and the IRA prior to the Anglo-Irish Treaty (1921). All were wedded to the Union and any Irish 'gain' was seen by them as a means of making the Union work until 1920-21. In terms of fiscal generosity the Balfour/ Wyndham Land Purchase Acts and Birrell's extension of Edwardian welfare provision saw a change in this balance of Irish contribution and British reinvestment. Politically local concessions in the 1830s and 1880s proved more valuable than promises of Home Rule which saw little power being devolved until 1920. Candidates can thus argue there was little to choose between the groupings regarding types of gain, although Irish constitutional nationalists found it easier to deal with the Whigs/Liberals. Lloyd George might be seen as a special case.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**War and Society in Britain 1793-1918****4 To what extent was the defence of the Empire the major role of the British army and navy in this period 1793-1918?**

Focus: An evaluation of imperial defence as the major role of the army and navy 1793-1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Reference is expected to both the army and navy but can be slanted towards one or the other. If one is totally missing, such an answer will have a **ceiling of Band IV**. Other roles must be examined to assess whether the Empire was the major one, and better candidates could argue particular roles assumed importance at different times. **Home security** (involving both the army and navy) could easily be deemed the more vital at particular times. There was always the fear of 'a bolt from the blue' e.g. French steam warships from the 1840s-1860s. This would involve the issue of a **continental commitment**, largely army based, to wage large scale land war in Europe, particularly at the beginning and end of the period (the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars and First World War were clearly about defending the UK and waging effective continental war, at least 1803-1815 and 1916-1918). **Internal security** (the Army) could also be argued to be important in the first half of the period given radical, Chartist and Irish problems. The defence (and promotion) of Empire could be seen as the major role in the intervening era of the Pax Britannica 1815-80: of the 13 wars waged plus 150 small campaigns all, except the Crimean War, were imperial and even the Crimea had much to do with imperial trade routes, taking the form of a colonial army fighting a European war. The army and navy were a force to impose and protect trade: on the Marathas, Burmese, Afghans, Egyptians, Chinese, Sikhs, Zulus and Boers. The Empire expanded an average of 100,000 sq. miles per annum. Prior to 1870, communication difficulties required large numbers to be kept on the spot. Only after 1870 did self-governing dominions develop their own defence forces. Post Cardwell the army became an imperial police force, but both later and before it was seen as an expeditionary force working in conjunction with Allies (France in the Crimean and First World Wars) used as such at the beginning of both the Revolutionary and First World Wars. This would suggest a European and defence role were more important than an imperial one. But without allies this would not work. Britain sent the army to the Caribbean after 1795. The navy was used to protect trade by suppressing piracy and the African Slave Trade and to bombard smaller European and overseas powers. (Piraeus and Canton). To 1808, the navy's bluewater strategy was imperial in the Caribbean, Eastern Mediterranean (Egypt) and Africa/Asia (Cape of Good Hope, Ceylon, Malacca) where the Dutch Colonial Empire was fair game after they joined France in 1795. This was mirrored in the First World War when the navy moved rapidly to mop up German naval forces around the world before focusing on food supply (convoys), blockade and amphibious operations (Gallipoli). Both Trafalgar (Franco-Spanish fleet) and Jutland (German fleet) were to destroy or bottle up the rival fleet. Better candidates will detect a variety of patterns and roles and could well argue that empire, security, trade and involvement in Europe are not easily separated out.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**5 How far would you agree that the Second Boer War (1899-1902) was the major turning-point in British thinking about War and Society in the period 1793-1918?**

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of the Second Boer War in British military and related social thinking from 1793 to 1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Focus should be on the Second Boer War as a major turning point in military thinking. Good candidates will integrate this by comparing to other possible turning points, such as: both the **French Wars** 1793-1815 and the **First World War**, European rather than colonial, clearly had a huge impact in changing Britain's priorities towards a European land war. The **Crimean War** saw scandals as did the Boer War but unlike this it saw the fall of a government. However the issues it raised were soon glossed over and forgotten (reform was slow in coming). Turning points could also be seen in **events elsewhere** e.g. in Europe and the US between 1859 and 1870, which had implications for military and social thinking (the resurgence of revisionist powers in Europe; the new Germany). The Second Boer War was more of a wake-up call than any other war between 1815 and 1914. It proved to be a colonial war that was very costly and could not be won easily. It demonstrated that a bluewater policy could not defend Britain or her Empire-the focus needed to be more on the army and on allies. Manpower demands far exceeded expectations and the home forces had to be depleted. The army needed to be co-ordinated and expanded from a colonial to a European one- in the war it lacked a plan of campaign, trained staff officers, new weapons and clearly demonstrated the Cardwell system of recruitment could not supply sufficient men (not a problem in other wars, despite misgivings in the Crimea). Conservative and Liberal governments after 1902, especially Haldane and Fisher, were forced to make the armed forces more efficient, prompted by German threats. Fears that Britain could not afford a defence policy led to new ways of trying to square the financial circle. The war also had wider lessons: e.g. the fitness of recruits sparked a debate on health, issues of racial survival that focused on youth (Baden Powell's Boy Scouts and the move towards volunteer organisations to create a defence reserve) – these fed much social reform to 1914 which had been little in evidence previously. The methods of the war were very divisive. Although Radicals had pointed to earlier outrages (Opium Wars), the 'methods of barbarism' and concentration camps used to overcome the guerrilla war divided the British into pro and anti Boer after Black Week in 1899. The need for allies was also clear, hence the Ententes, something before only entered into during war (the Coalitions in the French Wars; with France in the Crimea).

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

### **6 How effectively did British governments use the resources of an industrialising society in waging war in the period 1793-1918?**

Focus: An evaluation of the effectiveness of government in harnessing all the resources of an industrialising society for war from 1793-1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The resources of an industrialising society were a mixed blessing and could create more problems than they solved. Up to the 1860s Britain had a clear industrial lead but even after that her relative wealth remained great. Yet despite the ability to spend and the effectiveness of loans, debts and income taxes when applied at the beginning and end of the period, governments faced huge pressure to reduce expenditure throughout. An industrialised society demanded laissez faire and low taxation. Ministers throughout (e.g. Cardwell, Haldane) approached their task as primarily to cut defence estimates. Wealth could not very often be effectively tapped. An industrial population could be a considerable problem- its diversity, its vulnerability to urban disease and the dilution of labour involved in large-scale war (First World War). Industry focused on domestic and export markets rather than army or naval need. To 1850, the need to use the army to control and police industrial change created rather than solved problems. Recruitment in such a society was problematic. Britain's industrial population, whilst expanding, did not do so relative to other countries and conscription was resisted, despite schemes from the 1890s onwards to conscript both men and resources. Communications were revolutionised from the 1830s by the steam engine and were used appropriately by governments for internal security, in Ireland and the Crimea and the First World War but they could just as easily be used against Britain, thwarting her amphibian expeditions, reasserting the primacy of land warfare and, in Europe, mainly benefiting Prussia. The telegraph was used very effectively but trying to co-ordinate bureaucracy and inter service contributions remained difficult even up to the First World War. Equally Britain could be as vulnerable to blockades as her enemies as both the Napoleonic and First World Wars demonstrated. Technology was not effectively used before the 1840s. Both army and navy remained traditional in its weaponry and management with little technical innovation but after 1840 it did shape tactics. The navy often allowed its technological lead to slip (to French ironclads in the 1840s and 1850s, over the dreadnoughts after 1905 and to U boats after 1914). Guns and artillery for both army and navy only made a considerable difference after the 1870s. Even in the colonial wars Britain won more because of discipline and organisation. All too frequently technology merely imposed a quick and costly obsolescence when waging war. The opportunities to mould an industrialising society for war were used very effectively by most governments of the period from cartoons and loyalist rallies in the 1790s and 1800s, through the popular press and education from the mid century to film post 1900 in channelling jingoism and war emotion. Britain's Home Front 1914-18, despite shell shortages and conscientious objectors, remained more effective in sustaining war than its rivals. Industrial society's resources had to be approached in different ways



and better candidates will be able to judge which were subject to constraint, either practical or ideological.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Britain 1834-1996****Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948****7 How far was social unrest the most important influence on the treatment of the poor by governments during the period 1834-1948?**

Focus: An evaluation of the influences on the treatment of the poor.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might start by considering the influence of social unrest before looking at the relative significance of other factors. There are plenty of examples that they might pick from, including: the Anti-Poor Law movement (which led to a watering down of the New Poor Law), later Chartism, trade union campaigning in e.g. the 1880s and 1914–18, particular incidents e.g. the riots of the 1840s, riots in the East End of London during the early twentieth century, the hunger marches of the 1930s (not just Jarrow). Answers will need to consider how government responded to such pressure. More able candidates may point out that ‘correlation is no proof of causation’ and/or perhaps also that social unrest occasionally followed changes to policy aimed at the poor. Answers must also consider other possible influences and assess their relative importance, such as: changes in ideology (e.g. laissez-faire individualism to state interventionism), the role of individual reformers (e.g. Chadwick, Booth, Lloyd George), the impact of groups (e.g. charities, the churches), the impact of economic change/hardship (e.g. the Depression driving Labour’s welfare state of 1946-48), the impact of wars and/or the fear of war (the debate over the decline in national fitness prior to 1914). Overall, answers need to reflect a balanced discussion and not simple agreement with or unsubstantiated rejection of the focus in the question.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**8 'The First World War (1914-18) was the major turning-point in the provision of better quality housing for the masses'. How far do you agree with this judgement on the period 1834-1948?**

Focus: An evaluation of World War One as an influence on housing policy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Lloyd George's promise of 'homes fit for heroes' and the subsequent 1919 housing legislation drafted by Addison would give some weight to an argument suggesting the war was a turning point. However, although Addison made a brave attempt to provide high quality housing for the working class, his policy was soon curtailed by the Geddes Axe. Many candidates may start by discussing these issues and might then go on to argue how there were further attempts to improve provision, demonstrating how governments attempted to provide more housing in the 1920s and early 1930s, with a change to improving housing quality in the mid-to-late 1930s primarily through slum clearance. There is, however, a strong case for arguing that the poorest in society were not catered for until Bevan's council housing schemes after World War Two. There should be some attempt to show how there were attempts to improve quality before World War One, although this was patchy, parochial and due largely to work of individuals. In fact, it would be unusual for candidates not to show how, before the end of the nineteenth century, most people rented rather than owned houses and quality was largely in the hands of landlords and private builders. Weaker candidates may spend too much time on describing how poor early housing was and how this was linked with public health problems.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**9 How far was the 1902 Education Act the most important reform in providing education for the poor in the period to 1944?**

Focus: an evaluation of the relative importance of the 1902 Education Act.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may argue that the 1902 Balfour Act was a development but not the major development in educating the masses. It did lead to a more co-ordinated system of education and expanded secondary provision. However, the majority of children from poor families were restricted in progressing despite the scholarship system introduced by the Liberal government soon after. Free secondary education for all was not introduced until the 1944 Act (anticipated by the Hadow Report in 1926) and many candidates may use this as evidence to challenge the assertion in the question. There is also plenty of scope for discussing earlier events as significant turning-points, such as e.g.: the work of the Privy Council, the factory and mines acts in ending child labour, the introduction of teacher training colleges, the impact of Forster's Act of 1870, the 1918 Act establishing universal free primary schooling, the raising of the school leaving age. More able candidates may take a broader contextual view of the influences on education, including discussion of religious influence, economic factors and political developments such as the expansion of the franchise and the rise of the Labour party.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

### **The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992**

#### **10 How far was the expansion of the franchise during the period 1868-1992 due to pressure from the labour movement?**

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for the expansion of the franchise.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may take a broad view of 'labour movement', although many are likely to focus on trade unions and the Labour party. There should be an attempt to show links between expansion and pressure from the labour movement, although it is likely that better answers will show how reasons were varied and changed over time. The 1884 Parliamentary Reform Act was undoubtedly influenced by working class demands, particularly through the trades union movement (by that time moving into the phase of general unionism). However, this Liberal reform was perhaps more a result of Gladstone's need to rally disparate groups within the party (Whigs, radicals, special interest groups) and to land a blow against the Conservatives. The Labour party had a significant say in the framing of the 1918 Reform Act, but the suffragette movement, the effects of 1914-18 War and the role of National Government under Lloyd George were also significant. The 1928 Equal Franchise Act was the work of a reforming Conservative government wishing to stay in power (women would vote Conservative in disproportionate numbers), but with Labour now waiting in the wings as the second party. The 1969 extension of the vote to those aged 18 was the direct result of Labour party policy and, perhaps, a direct bid for popularity in the context of the 1960s. Generally, discussion of reforms should be placed in context, with an emphasis on a changing population, social structure and party politics.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

#### **11 Assess the impact of changes to both the House of Commons and the House of Lords on the development of democracy during the period 1868-1992.**

Focus: an evaluation of impact of changes to the Commons and Lords on democratic developments.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many candidates may argue that changes to the Lords were more significant than those to the Commons, but there were also other factors influencing the growth of democracy. It would be valid to argue that the composition of the Commons changed through electoral reform (extensions to the franchise, redistribution of seats, 'secret' voting, the payment of a salary to MPs) and that such changes had a positive effect on democracy. Other developments in democracy were more contentious, such as the televising of parliament (the Lords first, it might be noted). These issues should be compared to the major reforms made to the Lords (the Parliaments Acts of 1911 and 1949, the Salisbury Convention of 1945-46 whereby the Lords agreed not to block government bills implementing manifesto pledges) with some overall judgement being made with respect to judging their 'impact'. It would be perfectly acceptable for candidates to discuss parliamentary reform in the context of other democratic changes, as long as such material is linked together, e.g. the expansion in the number of working class voters, the Liberal welfare reforms and the 1910-11 constitutional crisis.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**12 Assess the role of women in the development of democracy during the period 1868-1992.**

Focus: an evaluation of the role of women in the development of democracy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many candidates may argue that democracy never truly developed until the vote for women was seriously considered, and that this only happened as a result of pressure from women themselves. However, other factors played a role in extensions to the franchise in 1884, 1918, 1928 and 1969 such as war, changing economic and social circumstance, changing ideology of political parties. More able candidates may broaden discussion of the development of democracy by looking at changes that were linked to female suffrage, such as those relating to education, the media, the law. Some may consider the painfully slow rise in the number of female MPs and ministers; some may focus on the role in the development of British democracy of Mrs Thatcher as the one female Prime Minister during the period. Overall, there should be focus on evaluation of a range of issues and avoidance of a narrative about how women got the vote. Other answers may look beyond

voting to consider developments in democracy more broadly, such as: the loss of power by the legislature to the executive, the rise of a 'presidential' prime minister, the rise of a party-based political system, the emergence of unions. Such an approach will be fine, as long as such developments are linked to consideration of the role of women in bringing them about.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996**

**13 How far would you agree that, in the century from 1896 to 1996, the popular press changed in response to the development of the other mass media (radio and television)?**

Focus: evaluation of the reasons for change in the popular press.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Successful answers to this question will require not only to show awareness of how the press changed in response to the challenge posed by the development of rival mass broadcast media, but also the ability to balance this against the other explanations for changes in the press, such as technological developments, the agenda of owners and governments, changing expectations and needs of the public, social and economic factors etc. Clearly, in the earlier part of the century before the broadcast media came into being, there must be alternative explanations of the changes which undoubtedly occurred. Nonetheless, examiners should be prepared to be flexible and regard favourably both answers which spend much of the time on the impact of the other mass media, and those which shift their emphasis to other influences. Possible structures for the essay are either to identify changes and then for each change argue the causes or to build answers around the causes of change, starting of course with the other mass media.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**14 'The industrialisation of the press had a greater impact on the mass media than did the influence of techniques and programmes from the USA.' How far do you agree with this view of the period 1896-1996?**

Focus: Relative evaluation on the media of the industrialisation of the press and of the growing influence of American techniques and programmes.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The key to success here is for candidates to recognise that a direct and simultaneous comparison is being asked for and to find an effective structure which will allow this to be achieved. This may be done by breaking down 'impact' into various elements (e.g. popularity/circulation; balance of types of content and aims; reflection of popular culture; sophistication or going 'down market') or alternatively taking different developments within the mass media, and using these as criteria for discussion. Although this question sets up a comparison of the influence of two key factors on the mass media in this period, this should not preclude the possibility that candidates may wish to argue that another factor or factors entirely had more impact, so examiners should be prepared to be flexible. 'Industrialisation' may be interpreted in its limited sense of the mass production techniques which emerged in the later 19<sup>th</sup> century, or more widely to include the way in which the media saw themselves as an industry.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**15 How successfully did governments respond to the growth of the mass media from 1896 to 1996?**

Focus: Evaluation of the success of governments responses to expanding new media.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The emergence of mass media and new forms of communication posed a huge challenge to politicians and governments who had hitherto found it comparatively easy to manage the information available to the public. The challenge was made all the greater because of the coincidental extension of the franchise and improvements in mass education and literacy. But the challenge was not simply to control or influence the media: they also had to contend with a public that was better informed (or differently informed) and which was changing socially due in part to the media. Nonetheless, answers that choose largely to focus on the issues of control will be taking an equally valid approach, provided they are well informed across the period. Either way, successful candidates will need to establish a secure analytical framework, likely to be based on criteria for judging 'How successfully...?' Some may also consider how governments, in turn, responded by seeking to use the growing media, in peace and in war, to promote themselves, their policies and their election chances.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Europe 1792-1919****The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1918****16 'Planning & preparation were the key to a successful military campaign throughout the period 1792-1918.' How far do you agree?**

Focus: Relative evaluation of factors creating successful campaigning.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The question requires candidates to focus on 'campaigns' rather than battles. Campaigns are a series of battles linked in time (usually a discrete region forming part of the larger war) and space (often a year, especially when campaigning was limited to the summer). The distinction is, however, not always clear-cut, e.g. the battle of the Somme in 1916 could be classed as a campaign, as could the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. Clearer examples might include: the French invasion of Russia in 1812 and Sherman's March to the Sea in the US Civil War. In developing their analysis, candidates have a choice of approaches. They could consider examples of planning and preparation which succeeded (e.g. Prussia in 1870) as well as those which failed (e.g. France in 1812, the German Schlieffen Plan in 1914). They could consider examples of successful military campaigns where there was little planning (e.g. the Anglo-British campaign on the Western Front in 1914). They could argue that as all armies planned and prepared to some degree, the issue was not planning in itself but other criteria, e.g. thoroughness. They could consider whether the need for planning was greater at the end of the period than at the start, mainly because warfare was increasingly industrialised. They could question how far planning of whatever kind was the key to military success, by analysing other influencing factors, e.g. leadership, resources (finances and/or equipment), chance.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**17 How far did developments in weapon technology change the nature of land warfare in the period 1792-1918?**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of developing weapons technology on land warfare.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

'Weapon technology' focuses on weapons of the infantry (from inaccurate muskets via more accurate rifles to the rapid-firing machine gun) and the artillery (from small smooth-bore muzzle-loaders firing shot over short distances to the large rifled breech-loaders firing high explosives over much longer distances). It could also include new weapons, of which the most obvious is the tank, first used in 1916 – and even then not used effectively. The other technological changes did revolutionise warfare, at least when it came to battlefield tactics. The limited technology of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century meant that battles of the Napoleonic Wars were fought at close quarter – and were usually over in a few hours. They also gave primary roles to infantry and cavalry. The advanced technologies of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century kept the armies much further apart, hence the concept of no man's land – and fighting for days and weeks without a break. These new technologies meant the end of the cavalry and the predominance of the artillery. They also meant that warfare was less mobile, more attritional than the brief campaigns of Napoleon – or even the elder Moltke. This change in warfare was also a result of new industrial production techniques as well as improved logistics, which kept First World War armies continuously supplied in ways which had not been possible before. However, the new weapons technologies were not the only cause of change in battlefield tactics; new communications technologies also helped, e.g. railways and wireless radio. Furthermore, the new technologies did not really affect the strategies of land warfare. Here the Napoleonic model prevailed into the 20<sup>th</sup> century: either amass ones forces at certain points on the battlefield to achieve a breakthrough of enemy lines or outflank and/or encircle ones opponents. Only with the stalemate on the Western Front (if not the Eastern) did both sides try to find ways of fighting which were more successful, as well as less wasteful of resources. Thus candidates should be able to make some useful distinctions about the impact of changing weapons technology on the nature of warfare.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**18 How important was the support of public opinion in the winning of wars in the period 1792-1918?**

Focus: Evaluation of the significance of public opinion in bringing victory.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

'Public opinion' is the expression of the views of the mass of the population. That expression can be either formal, via elections and newspapers, or it can be informal and spontaneous, via riots and demonstrations. Public opinion was likely to be more important in liberal democracies, such as Britain and France, which allowed greater freedom of expression, though even they limited such expression in wartime. The question requires candidates to focus on the victors of various wars and many may focus on the influence of the public on their own national governments. However, it is possible to argue that the outcome of some wars was affected by the attitude of the public of another, non-combatant state, as for example British sympathy for the causes of Italian and German nationalism in the 1860s. Perhaps the only clear example of public support helping to win the war is the support of the American public for US intervention in the Great War in 1917. Had the USA not intervened, the allies would not have won the war in 1918 and the USA intervened in part because American public opinion had shifted away from neutrality towards intervention. Otherwise, it is hard to argue that German public opinion was important to the Prussian victories in the 1860s or British, Prussian, Austrian and Russian public opinion to the allied victories in 1815. If anything, the opposite might be true. There was considerable anti-government unrest in the UK in 1811-12, which diverted some of the government's energies away from winning the war in order to ensure that domestic disorder did not lead to a British revolution; at one stage, there were more troops in northern England than there were in Spain and Portugal, fighting the French. If some candidates might be hard pressed to think of many examples of the support of public opinion for the victors, presumably they could consider the converse, namely that hostile public opinion might explain why the losers lost. A good example would be Russia in 1917. Firstly, the Tsarist autocracy was overthrown by public demonstrations and then the fledgling liberal democracy's attempt to stay in the war was undermined by the withdrawal of public support. Finally, those who move on from the support of public opinion for the victors to consider other reasons why the victors won, such as resources and leadership, will be given credit, even if they do so pretty quickly.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

### **The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815–1919**

**19 Bismarck's appointment as Minister President of Prussia (1862) was the most important turning-point in the course of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919.' How far do you agree?**

Focus: Assessment of the relative significance of the appointment of Bismarck to the post of minister president of Prussia as a turning point in the course of German nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the phrase '**most** important turning-point' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the appointment of Bismarck as the most important turning point, but they must do so comparatively in the context of other possible turning-points. What follows is not an exclusive list, but obvious consideration could be given to some of: 1815, 1848-49, 1866, 1870-71, 1888 (and/or 1890), 1914 and 1918 (and/or 1919) as alternative possibilities. Candidates may of course choose to exemplify the importance of Bismarck by reference to the defeat of Austria in 1866, victory in the Franco-Prussian War 1870-71 and the creation of the Second Reich. The most able candidates will demonstrate a breadth of vision and a good understanding of various moments that shaped the destiny of German nationalism. Answers that are limited to the importance of Bismarck alone, however full and accurate, will not have answered the question and will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**20 How far would you agree that the effects of industrialization hindered the development of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919?**

Focus: An evaluation of the role played by industrialisation in the development of German nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on 'the effects of industrialisation' and 'hindered' in their answers. Candidates need to consider the impact of industrialization on the development of German nationalism, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and, consequently, Prussian leadership of Germany. This also had a limiting effect on the development of German nationalism however, as Prussia was able to exclude Austria, first from the Zollverein and then from Germany. Many candidates are likely to show how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the Prussian military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870-71 and the creation of the Second Reich. Military strength depended upon industrialisation: 'Coal & Iron' rather than 'Blood & Iron' could be usefully debated. The impact of the extraordinary developments in the German economy after 1871 should also be discussed since the question goes on to 1919. Many candidates may well argue that the quickening pace of industrialization led to urbanization and the development of increasingly radical socialism. Socialism gave the working class an alternative loyalty to patriotism and nationalism. This, in turn, led Kaiser Wilhelm II to embark on a foreign policy aimed at distracting the workers from their grievances.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**21 To what extent did the aims of German nationalism change significantly from 1815 to 1919?**

Focus: An evaluation of the extent of continuity and change in the aims of German nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on 'the aims of German nationalism' in their answers and should analyse the extent of change, continuity and diversity in those aims during this period. Candidates will probably demonstrate understanding of the debate about *Grossdeutschland* or *Kleindeutschland* in the period 1815–71 and the development of more radical nationalism in the remainder of the period. The impact that the establishment and nature of the Second Reich had on the aims of German nationalism may be demonstrated. The extent to which the aims of German nationalism had changed significantly towards the end of the period as Kaiser Wilhelm II grasped at 'world power' may be considered. Answers are not required to have dealt with all such issues, but they are required to have demonstrated sustained judgement. If answers consider how the aims of German nationalism changed, but do so by reference only to a limited timespan (e.g. 1815–48), they will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**Europe 1855–1956****Russian Dictatorship 1855–1956**

**22 How far does a study of living and working conditions in the period 1855 to 1956 suggest that the Russian peoples lost more than they gained as a result of the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917?**

Focus: An assessment of living and working conditions before and after 1917.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on ‘living and working conditions’ and whether the Russian peoples ‘lost more than they gained’. Life under both regimes had similarities, with grim living and working conditions for peasants and the urban proletariat being the norm. A comparative approach is liable to be more successful than a chronological one. Candidates may choose to illustrate their answers with a detailed comparison of the lives of the peasants before and after 1917 and the living and working conditions of the proletariat in the same periods. The extent to which collectivization was ‘the second serfdom’ is an interesting example. Clearly, one very significant difference is that whilst a substantial urban proletariat had developed by 1900, the urban/agrarian balance was transformed under Stalin. Changes in education, the role of women and the role of the Orthodox Church after 1917 could usefully be considered. Candidates may want to point out that conditions were not uniform either before or after 1917, making distinctions between periods and/or rulers. Answers are not required to have dealt with all such issues, but they are required to demonstrate sustained judgement.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**23 'There was more change than continuity in the ways in which Russia was ruled in the period from 1855 to 1956.' To what extent do you agree with this view?**

Focus: An evaluation of the similarities and differences between the ways in which Russia was governed, both before and after 1917.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the similarities and differences between the ways in which Russia was governed in this period. Candidates may well choose to predominantly concentrate on a comparison between the Tsars and the communists as rulers, but the most successful answers are likely to involve comparisons within each period. For example, there was little in terms of continuity in terms of how Alexander II governed Russia to 1866 (beyond his desire to uphold the principle of autocracy) and Alexander III's approach to government was in significant contrast to his father's. On the other hand there was a great deal of continuity between the reigns of Alexander III and Nicholas II in intent (though rather less in terms of outcome!). In terms of the communist period, the most interesting debate for candidates is the extent to which Stalinism was Leninism's baby; did Stalin take the government of Russia down different paths to those being cut by Lenin? Candidates may consider the period of Lenin's rule and to what extent he aimed to set up a harsh dictatorial regime. In terms of arguing that there was more change than continuity in the ways in which Russia was governed across the whole period, arguments might include the fate of the old elite & the Orthodox Church. The regimes ruled in similar ways, but there were considerable differences of scale (e.g. in terms of economic progress, urbanisation & the use of terror). A case could be made for arguing that the communists were a more ruthless and efficient Twentieth Century variant of Russian authoritarianism. Arguments in favour of continuity might include autocratic/ dictatorial government, the use of terror & centralized control of the economy. Comparisons could be made at a personal level, for example between Alexander III and Stalin. Both regimes tended only to reform under pressure. Answers are not required to have dealt with all such issues, but are required to have demonstrated sustained judgement.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**24 'Lenin was the ruler who did most to transform Russia in the period 1855–1956'. How far do you agree with this view?**

Focus: An evaluation of the extent to which Lenin did more to transform Russia than other rulers.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on a comparison between Lenin and other rulers of this period: Alexander II, Alexander III, Nicholas II, Prince Lvov, Kerensky, Stalin and possibly Khrushchev. Clearly an answer need **not** refer to all of these, but a breadth of vision should be displayed across the whole period. Answers that are written entirely about Lenin will be seriously flawed, and will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Candidates that narrowly and exclusively compare Lenin with one other ruler, for example Stalin, will have a **ceiling of Band II** however detailed and analytical they may be. Candidates will need to focus on the extent to which Lenin and any of the other rulers transformed or changed Russia. Candidates who do not restrict themselves to a narrow definition of 'transform' are likely to be more successful! Candidates could argue that Lenin did the most to transform Russia because he led the Bolsheviks to victory in 1917 and then consolidated their power up to 1924. Candidates may argue that because of the difficulties and circumstances that he faced (Civil War; famine) Lenin was ultimately unable to transform Russia as he had wished, for example needing to restore capitalism through the NEP. Candidates may use their knowledge of the debate as to whether Lenin paved the way for Stalin to inform their judgements. Some may argue that Stalin did more to transform Russia, for example by focusing on the impact of the Five Year Plans, collectivization and the purges. Candidates could successfully argue that both Alexander II and Alexander III did a great deal to transform Russia, though in very different ways. It could also be argued that the mistakes and folly of Nicholas II doomed Russia to the events of 1917. Candidates may clearly opt for any ruler as having transformed Russia the most as long as they are able to justify their conclusion. Answers are not required to have dealt with all such issues, but they are required to have demonstrated sustained judgement.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**America 1763-1980****The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877****25. To what extent was slavery the most important cause of sectional conflict within America from 1787 to 1877?**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for sectional conflict.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will be expected to analyse reasons for sectional conflict. They may mention that the Constitution of 1787 largely avoided any direct reference to issue of slavery. From 1787 the balance between Free and Slave states became a major issue in the sectional conflict between North and South. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 offer some respite. So did the Clay's 'Compromise' of 1850. However, during the 1850s the slave issue dominated US politics and it was at least a major symptom in, if not the major cause of, the Civil War in 1861-65. Counter arguments to the assertion made in the question might, for example, include: the economic rivalry between industrialising North and predominantly agricultural South, the conflict over State Rights (raised as early as 1799 by Jefferson but raised on different issues at different times, e.g. individual liberty in 1799-1800 but tariffs in 1832), the rivalry between different concepts of liberty (freedom to own slaves v freedom for all so that nobody could be a slave). Also, some candidates may argue that from 1865 to 1877, following the abolition of slavery, the role of African Americans within southern society was itself a major issue of sectional conflict, resulting in the Hayes-Tilden Compromise of 1877.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**26 'The Bill of Rights (1791) was the most important turning-point in the development of the US Constitution in the period from 1787 to 1877? How far do you agree?'**

Focus: Assessment of the importance of a turning point in constitutional history.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The Bill of Rights can be regarded as a major turning point. Without the Bill of Rights, the US Constitution would not have been ratified by all thirteen Colonies. The Bill also laid down the basis of the individual rights, including freedom of speech and assembly; the separation of church and state; the right to bear arms; the right to a fair and speedy trial; the right not to suffer cruel and unusual punishment, etc. Since 1791, the Bill of Rights has remained the bedrock of individual constitutional rights in the US. Candidates may offer alternative views and consider the relative merits of alternative turning-points. For example, they may consider the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and/or Clay's 'Compromise' of 1850. Many may argue that the Civil War (1861-65) and the three subsequent constitutional amendments of 1865 (abolition of slavery); 1868 (equal protection of the law); 1870 (guaranteed voting rights) were more important as turning-points. The roles of Marshall and the Supreme Court, and the doctrine of judicial review, may be considered by some.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**27 'The political power of the Presidency was expanded at the expense of Congress and the Supreme Court in the period 1789-1877.' How far do you agree?'**

Focus: Analysis of the development of the role of the presidency and separation of powers within the US Constitution.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates can mention the importance of individual presidents in the development of the office, perhaps the most likely will be: Washington (1789-97); Jefferson (1801-09); Jackson (1829-37), Lincoln (1861-65). They may refer to specific examples of the extension of presidential power, such as: Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase in 1803; Jackson and the Second Bank of USA crisis - use of the presidential veto to help equalise society; Lincoln and the crisis of Civil War. In

assessing the development of presidential power, candidates should consider the balance of power within the Federal government: Congressional power still remained strong during the period, in particular, in monetary matters. From 1865 to 1877, Congress played the major role in Reconstruction, especially during the Radical Reconstruction phase, which involved the attempted impeachment of President Johnson in 1868. Some answers may mention the development in the power of the Supreme Court, in particular, under Chief Justice Marshall. Supreme Court cases such as *Marbury v Madison* (1803) or their decision in the case of the slave Dred Scott (1857) could be used as exemplars of Supreme Court power.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980**

**28 Consider the view that the development of African American civil rights in the period 1865-1980 was mainly due to the action of African Americans themselves.**

Focus: evaluation over time involving the role of an ethnic group against other factors influencing developments.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to assess the role of African Americans in their developing civil rights. During Reconstruction (1865-77), individuals such as Hiram Revels became national politicians (Senate). For the 1880s-early 1900s, reference could be made to role of individuals such as: Booker T Washington who tried to advance African Americans socially and economically in an era of political segregation; W.E.B. Du Bois helped create NAACP (National Assoc for Advancement of Coloured People) in 1910. Later, Marcus Garvey tried to advance African American self sufficiency during 1920s. A Philip Randolph attempted, with partial success, to persuade FDR's government (1933-45) to end discrimination against African Americans in federal employment. Martin Luther King and others in SNCC and CORE pushed African American civil rights to the front of the national political agenda in the 1950s and 1960s. To balance this view, candidates need to consider the presidential role of FDR and Truman in ending discrimination in federal employment, Eisenhower at Central High School, Little Rock (1957) where he used Federal troops to enforce school desegregation, Kennedy helping to desegregate the Universities of Mississippi and Alabama, Johnson pushing through the Civil Rights Act (1964) and the Voting Rights Act (1965). Some may consider the role of the US Supreme Court in declaring segregated public schools and buses unconstitutional in 1950s.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**29 To what extent was the 1920s the major turning-point in the development of labour and trade union rights in the USA from 1865 to 1980?**

Focus: Assessment of a given turning-point against other possibilities in effecting labour & union rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to consider how far the 1920s were important in trade union/labour development. The period 1920-29 saw a major assault on trade union rights by big business. Federal and State courts upheld 'yellow dog' contracts (no strike contracts). Also, Federal and State economic legislation aided the growth of 'big business'. In addition, trade union membership in the USA fell between 1921 and 1928. Candidates might consider the impact of Wall Street Crash (1929) on trade unions. Although mass unemployment was a massive feature of the early 1930s, the catalyst for this development was the Wall Street Crash of October 1929. Acts of the New Deal era were very significant. In contrast, candidates could consider other possible turning-points, such as: the creation of the American Federation of Labour (AFL) in the 1880s by Thomas Powderley; the strikes of the 1890s (the Homestead and Pullman strikes in particular) or 1955 with the merger of AFL and CIO. Also, candidates might consider how trade and labour rights diminished with the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**30 Compared to Native Americans, Hispanic and Asian Americans faced only minor discrimination in civil rights in the period 1865-1980. How far do you agree with this view?**

Focus: Comparative evaluation of civil rights discrimination between different ethnic groups.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may explain that Native Americans were not allowed to become US citizens until 1887 with the Dawes Act. Even then, this was applied just to Plains Indians. Only in 1924 did Congress allow all citizenship to all Native Americans. After that date, Native Americans still suffered social and economic deprivation on reservations and social discrimination in rest of USA. Asian Americans faced restrictions on immigration with the Asian Exclusion Act of 1882. Japanese Americans faced discrimination during the 1930s working in California and then mass imprisonment in camps during World War II. However, Native Americans gained more control over their affairs with the Indian Reorganisation Act of 1934 and the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1974. By comparison in social, economic and political terms, Asian Americans (Chinese, Japanese and Koreans) only really made advances since the 1950s. Hispanic Americans were denied voter registration, housing and employment rights, most notably in California, and discriminated against until the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I and II** answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

**Band I** answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

**Band II** answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

**Band III** essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

**Band IV** responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

**Band V** essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/ continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

**Band VI** answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

**Band VII** essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.



**Mark Scheme 2592 & 2593  
June 2005**

## Units 2592 &amp; 2593

## Marking Notes for 2005's Board-set questions

**Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.**

**1 The Arts and History**

**'The spirit of an age is defined more by "commonplace objects" than by its "great works" of art or architecture.' Using examples, discuss with reference to any period you have studied.**

**[note: "commonplace objects can be things such as fashion, posters, interior design, engineering such as the Forth railway bridge or 'street architecture' such as Parisian *art nouveau* metro stations]**

This question gives candidates an opportunity to consider the contribution of works of art and architecture – great and small - to our understanding of the history of a period or place. Whilst candidates are directed to write about works of art or architecture, it is recognised that it can be difficult to distinguish between the two; indeed, it may be necessary to refer to examples of both in the answer. The meaning of 'great works' should be fairly obvious. Guidance on 'commonplace objects' is provided. Candidates will have to engage with the term 'spirit of the age' in order to provide a structure for their essays, and make critical use of sources (including visual sources, perhaps?) in order to develop their arguments.

More successful candidates are likely to provide a well-informed, balanced argument showing how much each type of object can contribute to our understanding of the 'spirit of the age'. For example, they might explain how the Crystal Palace, as both building and exhibition, was a celebration of achievements in engineering, manufacture and empire – all arguably central to the 'spirit' of the Victorian age. Some may go on to show that both types of object are important and that the notion of 'spirit of the age' embraces both the monumental and the mundane. Source material will be used critically throughout.

Less successful candidates are unlikely to examine the term 'spirit of the age' in its complexity, taking it instead to mean something akin to 'Elizabethan England' or 'Victorian Britain'. They may then present examples of great and/or small objects, making valid inferences about what they can tell us about the society that produced them but failing to address directly the issue in the question. Source material may be used for illustration purposes only.

## 2 Economic History

**How significant have long-term economic factors been in explaining the occurrence of any major event chosen from your period of study?**

This question invites candidates to demonstrate their understanding of the explanatory power of (long-term) economic data. They need to select an appropriate event, such as the Peasants' Revolt, The French Revolution or the Bolshevik Revolution. They should then identify and analyse the causes of the event – both short-term and longer-term (in this case, including economic trends). For example, candidates explaining the rise of Hitler might set the long-term decline of *Mittelstand* against the short-term effects of unemployment. Alternatively, answers might set long-term economic causes against social/political/intellectual factors, e.g. the French Revolution. It will then be a matter of assessing the *relative importance* of each of these causal factors, and isolating the one factor without which the event in question could not have happened (or at least, not in the way in which it did). This may, or may not, turn out to be the long-term economic factor.

More successful candidates will relate their evaluation back to the question, discussing (for example) why the economic factor was or was not the key factor in explaining this particular event (noting the phrase, “*How significant.....?*” in the title question). If they decide that a combination of factors was responsible, they will need to explain why that particular combination was relevant. Either way, their answer will justify with judgement. They will incorporate critical use of source material into the explanations they offer.

Less successful candidates may assume significance and, for example, focus only on the economic cause, explaining in detail why it brought about the event in question. Alternatively, they may go on to list a number of factors and state that they were all somehow important. Or, they may assert the overall importance of the economic factor without justifying the judgement.

## 3 The Individual in History

**Assess the historical significance of any individual you have studied.**

This question is designed to enable candidates to communicate a critical understanding of a historical figure they have studied. It provides an opportunity for candidates to consider how and why the actions or achievements of an individual might be defined as significant. This in turn may require candidates to decide how historical significance can be defined or measured - for example, what was the nature and impact (immediate and longer-term) of the individual's achievement? How many people/places were affected? Was he/she considered important at the time, or only later? In order to present a balanced argument, candidates will need to make critical use of conflicting evidence, or adjudicate between the competing views of historians. Needless to say, ‘significance’ is morally neutral - there is no reason why the chosen individual has to have been a ‘good guy’.

More successful candidates will make critical use of the available evidence to produce a balanced assessment of the chosen individual, taking account of criteria for determining ‘significance’ as a means of structuring their argument.

Less successful candidates are more likely to choose someone with conventionally heroic qualities and write what amounts to a confirmation of the individual's achievements. They are likely to structure their account within a descriptive, chronological framework and include source extracts as a means of illustrating the narrative.

#### 4 Local History

**How far did developments in any locality you have studied reflect national trends?**

**[note: 'locality' can be an individual building, a hamlet, a town, a county or a region]**

The purpose of the question is to enable candidates to investigate and interpret a local historical site in its wider or national context. For example, candidates might study a building (e.g. a castle, monastery, or workhouse), compare it with similar buildings nationally and *explain* the similarities and differences (e.g. in terms of particular conditions that made the local example either typical or non-typical). Alternatively, they might choose to study a development (e.g. the coming of a canal or railway, or the way in which a locality experienced world war) and explain why this proceeded in a way that was typical or untypical of similar developments elsewhere. There are many interesting distinctions that might be explored, e.g. the medieval hamlets of the Welsh 'englishry' like Cosmeston; vernacular domestic architecture in virtually any part of Britain; the living and working conditions of textile workers in different factories or mills; church architecture and decoration during the religious changes of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century, etc. Whatever the topic chosen, candidates must make extensive and critical use of source material (including the site itself), either when constructing their own investigations or when testing interpretations offered by local historians.

More successful candidates will make critical use of evidence to investigate the site or development and build an argument, explaining to what extent, and why, the chosen site or development is typical/untypical of similar buildings/developments elsewhere, or in a national context.

Less successful candidates are likely to produce studies that are generally more descriptive, or that focus excessively on the site or the national context but do not explore links between the two. Alternatively, they may succeed in noting examples of similarity or difference between the local and the national, but not *explain* these by reference to the history of the locality in question.

#### 5 Military History

**With reference to any military conflict, assess the relative importance of chance in explaining the outcome of that conflict.**

The purpose of this question is to enable candidates to explore the importance of chance, or unexpected contingency, as a facet of causal explanation. In this case, 'military' can be interpreted in its broadest setting – on land, on sea or in the air. Note that candidates are invited to "*discuss* the importance of chance". This means that chance was *not necessarily* the determining factor – it may still be a matter of opinion. For example, the gale that blew Medina Sidonia's Armada to eventual destruction around the north and western coasts of Britain came at exactly the right time and in the right direction to wreak maximum damage. However, were longer-term factors more important to an explanation of Spanish defeat? Was the Armada already defeated before the gales arrived? Was the invasion plan unworkable? Was the whole project wrongly conceived? Candidates need to provide a military example of their own, identify a range of factors (including one apparently random, or contingent, factor) and assess their *relative importance*. The chance factor may *or may not* emerge from this discussion as the determining factor.

More successful candidates will provide a sound causal explanation, incorporating critical use of evidence, of the outcome of their chosen battle etc. In doing this, they will identify and assess the *relative importance* to the explanation of a range of causal factors, including the chance or unexpected factor. They will address directly the need to find out which factor was more critical to the outcome than all of the others and offer a valid justification of their choice.

Less successful candidates are likely to present a more descriptive narrative of the battle etc., from which causal importance might be deduced. Some may go on to identify and list a range of causal factors, but assume (in line with the implication of the question) that the contingent or chance factor is most important and assert this with confidence.

## 6 Political History

**With reference to any major uprising against political authority, assess the relative importance of the reasons why it was either successful or unsuccessful.**

This is another question requiring a causal explanation. Candidates need to begin by choosing an example of either a successful or an unsuccessful rebellion. For the purposes of the question, the term, “rebellion” can be interpreted fairly generously to incorporate incidents as disparate as the Pilgrimage of Grace, the Jacobite Rebellion, or the Bolshevik Revolution. Certainly, there is no need for interminable discussions of dictionary definitions. Having chosen their ‘rebellion’, candidates then need to construct a multi-causal explanation of its success or failure, incorporating critical use of a range of primary and/or secondary source material. Some candidates may stop there, satisfied that the question has been answered. However, what they have done is demonstrate that a number of factors caused the event, which does not fully answer the question because not all causal factors were equally crucial to the outcome. So the candidate needs to assess the *relative importance* of the various factors identified in order to complete their answer. They should address this directly, looking, for example, for a factor on which all the rest depended, or the one without which the outcome would almost certainly have been different. Having said this, a candidate may validly claim that a combination of factors brought a successful or unsuccessful outcome. In this case, the candidate should demonstrate why *this particular combination* was more important than any other.

More successful candidates will carry out most or all of the moves described above, underpinning their analysis by critical use of source material.

Less successful candidates are likely to offer more descriptive accounts of the chosen rebellion, from which causal factors may, or may not be discerned. Some may go validly beyond this, providing a multi-causal account but either failing to assess relative importance, or simply asserting that one or other factor was the most important.

## 7 Religious History

**With reference to any period studied, assess the extent to which religion has been used as a pretext for political action.**

The key word in this question is ‘pretext’, meaning excuse, or false justification. With this in mind, candidates are invited to choose one or more examples of conflicts that were justified in religious terms but may in fact have been motivated by political, dynastic or military ambitions (the term ‘political’ may be broadly interpreted here). There are plenty of examples to choose from – the Crusades, the French Wars of Religion, Henry VIII’s Break with Rome, the English Civil War, the Conquistadors, Catholic Emancipation etc. However, these are not examples that prove the point, but ones that will allow candidates to examine *the extent to which* is true to say that religion was used to justify political action (of one kind or another). Whichever example is chosen, candidates will need to produce an argument based on critical use of primary and/or secondary sources that explores the delicate divide between rhetoric and reality. Some may reach for a synthesis at the end, for example one that attempts to resolve the apparent conflict in the wording of the question.

More successful candidates will do most or all of the above, making appropriately critical use of primary and/or secondary source material. They will additionally recognise that at least part of this question will involve discussion of the distinction between stated and hidden intentions (the idea of a ‘pretext’). In some cases, where evidence is insufficient or conflicting, it may be necessary to *infer intentions from the actions of those involved*.

Less successful candidates may offer no more than descriptive narratives of the chosen event, characterised also by face-value interpretations of source material and/or unfounded assertions about the motives of protagonists. The interplay of religious and political motives, stated and un-stated intentions may be only dimly seen.

## 8 Science, Technology and History

**With reference to any period you have studied, assess the relative importance of the factors that tended to advance or impede scientific and/or technological progress.**

This question tests understanding of the relative importance of different causes. In particular, it invites candidates to demonstrate techniques for determining the relative importance of factors that have advanced progress in respect of any scientific or technological endeavour. This might refer to a specific discovery or invention, or to a broader development (e.g. the industrial revolution being made possible by social mobility, intellectual freedom, political liberty, etc.). Candidates need to identify a range of factors and assess their relative importance (i.e. show why one factor was more or less important than others) in an explanation of the causes of progress. Judgement about relative importance may be based on common sense reasoning (one factor was more important than the others because they all depended on the first factor (e.g. the availability of coal to the process of industrialisation), or counterfactual reasoning (of which one factor can it be said that the development in question could not have occurred without it?).

Answers might consider social/political factors as well, e.g. the Industrial Revolution being tied in with social developments, intellectual freedom, mobility of class structure, political liberty etc.

More successful candidates will respond to the challenge in the wording of the question not only to identify, but also to prioritise causal factors and use this analysis to produce an explanation of scientific or technological progress, making appropriately critical use of source material.

Less successful candidates may produce a largely descriptive account of the development they have chosen to study, or go on to list a range of causal factors but fail to assess or demonstrate their relative importance. Alternatively, they may simply assert that one factor is the most important.

## 9 Social History

**'Differences of class, rather than of gender, have provided the main obstacle to the development of women's rights.' Discuss with reference to any period you have studied.**

This question invites examination of the hypothesis that progress towards women's rights has been held back by prejudice against women as inferior social beings, rather than against women as *women*. It suggests that lower class women have been held back by centuries of social repression, and have consequently lacked the education, awareness or inclination to demand equal rights. Candidates can *either* take a long view of this topic (e.g. looking at the development of women's property or marital rights from the Middle Ages onwards) *or* choose a specific period/ episode from the longer story – for example the period leading up to, and including, the First World War. In their response they will need to develop both sides of the argument and reach a balanced judgement, either agreeing or disagreeing with the proposition contained in the question. Particular care will be needed when handling primary sources dealing with men's opposition to women's rights. Do they indicate prejudice based on gender or class? Or both? Do they say one thing but mean another?

More successful candidates will produce a coherent argument that incorporates critical use of evidence. The argument will examine the importance of both social class and gender as obstacles to the achievement of women's rights and arrive at a judgement favouring one or the other as the dominant factor. Some candidates may go on to search for a synthesis, based, for example, on an argument that men made no conscious distinction between the two factors, or that class differences were more important in an earlier period and gender differences more important in a later period.

Less successful candidates are more likely – in the example shown above – to produce an account of how women achieved the vote, an account in which only a very small part (? the conclusion) attempts to address the question. In the account, sources will be used to illustrate points being made rather than to advance the argument in any relevant sense.



**10 World History**

**'On the whole, the influence of European civilization on other parts of the world has been beneficial'. How far is this true of any period you have studied?**

This question, effectively, presents candidates with an opportunity to assess the impact of western imperialism on other parts of the world. Taking a suitable example from any period they have studied, candidates need to present a balanced view, giving equal weight to benefits and drawbacks. They may also need to develop a sense of period when interpreting contemporary sources – since these may attempt to justify imperialist activities in terms that are no longer seen to be acceptable. Candidates will also need to be careful when making judgements – arguably, there were benefits and drawbacks for both sides (though not necessarily evenly balanced) and these will need to be distinguished.

More successful candidates will provide a careful, balanced assessment of the benefits *and* drawbacks of imperialist activity in their chosen country. In doing so, they will make critical use of source material in order to reconstruct contemporary attitudes, ideas and beliefs, and to set these within the context of a wider historical debate.

Less successful candidates are more likely to produce largely descriptive accounts of imperialist activity in one or other part of the world, in which judgements about the impact of such activity are 'bolted on' to the end of the essay. Alternatively, they may develop only one view (based, perhaps, on current attitudes to former imperialist activity) that fails to develop a sense of period or a balancing contemporary perspective. In this account, sources may be used to illustrate points being made in the text, rather than to advance the argument in any relevant sense.



# **Report on the Units**

## **June 2005**

## Chief Examiner's Report

### PREFACE

Advanced Subsidiary History has now run for five academic years. OCR's innovative specification has created a new landscape for History teachers, offering an ultra-flexible structure allowing modules to be combined as best suits the interests of each school/college, and taught comfortably within the limited time available to Sixth Form study.

### **OCR's specification offers teachers more choices from a broader range of historical topics and periods than any other Board's AS/A2 specification.**

With 136 options ranging from the 8<sup>th</sup> century to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, each department can fashion the course that best suits their particular circumstances:

- broad investigation of several periods or focussed study within a specific era.
- study of a single era in the round through its social, economic and cultural characteristics or through a traditional course in high politics.
- a primary focus on developments within one country or a comparative study to bring contrasts into relief.

The choice rests with the teachers in each History Department.

### **Four landmark decisions underpin OCR's Curriculum 2000 History specification:**

- the content overload of legacy History was rejected. Each option is designed to be taught in 40 contact hours.
- the imprecision that was a legacy syllabus was done away with. Clearly identified 'Key Issues' accompanying defined content show exactly what is required for examination, thereby defining (and limiting) both teaching requirements and what may be set on question papers. The specification shows teachers precisely what OCR requires.
- the lottery that too often was a legacy exam paper was eliminated. Every paper tests a substantial part of the specification.
- the use of only two-thirds of the mark range was repudiated. In 2004 for example, 10% of candidates scored 90% or more in their coursework.

Unlike an old A Level course, OCR's specification 'does exactly what it says on the tin'. After the summer 2005 exams, the Head of History in a Centre that moved to OCR in September 2004 told us the following:

*"I could not have asked for a fairer set of papers. They tested what the children had been taught, with no tricks, no catches and absolute accessibility.  
Thank you once again - I did the right thing in switching boards."*

## **INTRODUCTION**

This Report should be read in conjunction with the attached Markschemes. Centres are encouraged to discuss the biannual Reports in Departmental meetings as well as in class. Teachers are urged to read sections on options/topics in the group of units they have not taught because much of the advice is of general application. The biannual Reports offer an extraordinarily rich resource to inform effective classroom preparation and practice. Please remember that Reports are also sent to Centres on CD-ROM so extracts may easily be used on centre intranets and interactive whiteboards.

By definition, this Report must concern itself primarily with detailing weaknesses and offering guidance for their rectification. The Report must, however, be interpreted as indicating that examiners have seen only problems and failures. Quite the contrary. This summer they have seen much good work and read a significant number of excellent answers. There is much to praise in the work of whole Centres and individual teachers as well as individual candidates.

Examiners are constantly reminded that no set answer is looked for in questions. History is a matter of judgement and historians can be expected to differ on major or minor aspects of all topics. Examiners are instructed to be aware of valid alternative explanations or arguments. Sections on the individual Units in this Report give guidance about acceptable alternative explanations. The basic tests of any answer in a History AS/A2 assessment are (1) is it relevant? (2) does it demonstrate the historical techniques required in a particular Unit? (3) is the argument reasonably supported by accurate knowledge? (4) is the answer expressed clearly? Except in Units 2587-2589, which are specifically about Historical Interpretations, and to some extent Units 2592-2593 Independent Investigation, Candidates are not expected to show knowledge of historical debates and interpretations but all Units invite Candidates to consider alternative explanations of developments or problems. Their priorities and judgements can differ but the most successful examine a range of factors and explain which are the most important. Within these broad limits that are fundamental to our discipline, questions might be tackled in a variety of ways. Yes/No questions are never set.

Many answers showed a lack of planning, reflected in anarchic paragraphing. These candidates wrote answers that considered a series of points in an unstructured way, making no links between them. The most effective answers are invariably well planned (usually with the evidence of a plan on the script although this is not marked). They dealt first with the most important issues and then the less significant. Most effective answers focus immediately on the Key Issues in Questions.

The guidance about techniques offered in this and previous Reports is important because this is usually the key discriminating factor between moderate and good answers. The major difference tends not be the accurate recall of knowledge. Few candidates, either at AS or at A2 Level, make serious factual errors. The very poor Candidates who know little usually lack other qualities as well. However, the more successful Candidates can use their knowledge to frame a convincing argument, undertake an effective analysis, construct a valid comparison, etc. The less successful tend to record knowledge without much understanding or much application of it to answer the question. The recall of knowledge is important; skills and techniques do not exist in an abstract historical world, but more important is the understanding of what the facts mean and how they can be used in an argument. When reading scripts for remarks, it is not uncommon for senior examiners to understand why a Candidate might be disappointed in a result. The script might contain accurate knowledge, but it might not be used sufficiently well to answer a Question. For example, in Units 2587-2589 Historical Interpretations, an essay might be knowledgeable about the foreign policy of Phillip II or the events around Chamberlain at Munich but it might lack any consideration of alternative explanations. In Units 2590-2591 Themes in History, there might be an accurate account of early Tudor rebellions or of Russia before the 1917 Revolutions but the Candidate's argument may not stretch across the required extended period of about a hundred years. Such answers will not be able to gain a mark in a high Band.

There were few rubric infringements across the Units. The small number of Candidates who answered too many Questions usually represented those who apparently found difficulty in answering any of them. However, Centres are requested to ensure that Candidates complete the necessary information on scripts, including Centre and Candidate numbers, Unit number and Question number. Candidates are not 'penalised' for omitting any of this information but it helps to identify scripts when they are marked and checked. Occasionally examiners have to work out which Question is being answered, especially in the AS Period Studies Units 2583-2586. Some Centres do not put scripts into numerical order within envelopes for despatch to examiners. A few post envelopes to the wrong examiner. These are not major problems and OCR is aware of the administrative pressures that examinations put on Centres but the board, like its Centres, is anxious that all scripts can be tracked and assessed accurately.

## STANDARDS

Awarding bodies work within the mandatory Code of Conduct laid down by the QCA:

[http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/pdf\\_code\\_of\\_practice\\_2005\\_06.pdf](http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/pdf_code_of_practice_2005_06.pdf)

The aims of the Code include the equivalence of standards between subjects in the same examination board and 'comparability between boards. The QCA itself takes an active role in scrutinising the work of Boards – the scrutineer sent by the QCA to monitor OCR's AS/A2 History's this year was a headmistress.

The final publication of results is the outcome of a long process that begins at least two years before an assessment period with the preliminary preparation of examination papers and markschemes.

Decisions about grade boundaries depend fundamentally on the judgement of the six Principal Examiners, who will have marked their own scripts and checked those of team leaders and assistant examiners. Statistics are used to confirm judgements or to point to further discussion of judgements that have been reached but they are secondary.

For the Code's regulations that control awarding, see section 6 (pp.33-38).

OCR gives serious consideration to any complaints from Centres about Questions. Each is formally considered at the meeting that decides grade boundaries. They also form part of the continuous discussion of papers that is used to advise examiners about marking standards. Complaints are very few - and fewer each year as the Curriculum 2000 Specification has settled in.

### **New edition of the Specification**

The 3<sup>rd</sup> edition ['Revised edition for teaching from September 2005'] was despatched to centres in July 2005 and put simultaneously on OCR's website:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Specifications%2c%20Syllabuses%20%26%20Tutors%20Handbooks/AS\\_A\\_Level88481.pdf](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Specifications%2c%20Syllabuses%20%26%20Tutors%20Handbooks/AS_A_Level88481.pdf)

This new edition has been produced to reflect the changes to the exam requirements of Units 2580-2586 and Units 2587-2589, together with the introduction of entry sub-codes across most of the A2. All these changes were flagged up in *Newsletter 1* in summer 2004 and formally announced in the Notice to Centres sent to Exams Officers and put on OCR's website in May 2005:

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/newsandupdates/ShowQualNewsDetail.do?server=PRODUKTION&site=OCR&oid=2047&newsitemoid=23057>

The opportunity has been taken to develop the guidance and explanation provided for teachers. The aim is clarification. No changes have been made to specification content. No alterations have been made to teaching requirements.

### Support Materials

The Board has prepared the specification and other material to be as 'candidate-friendly' as possible. Centres are encouraged to make their candidates aware of all the material that is published by the Board, such as the Key Issues, the associated specified content of Study Topics and banding definitions.

Apart from question papers, markschemes and reports, OCR's published documents are immediately made available on OCR's website - click on the 'Publications & Materials' tab near the top of AS/A2 History's homepage:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/QualPubs.do?qual\\_oid=2047&site=OCR&oid=2047&server=PRODUKTION](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/QualPubs.do?qual_oid=2047&site=OCR&oid=2047&server=PRODUKTION)

Here can be found, among other documents, the E-Resource Lists for every teaching module (now on their 4<sup>th</sup> edition), relevant Notices to Centres, the annual Board-set questions for Units 2592-2593 and the two volumes of Teacher Support Notes.

Newsletter 3 was issued to all Centres in Summer 2005. So too was a revised Specification ('Revised edition for teaching from September 2005'), which was required because of the changes in summer 2006 to Unit 2580-2582 question paper formats and the introduction of some A2 entry sub-codes. The opportunity has been taken to develop the guidance and explanation provided for teachers provided in the specification. The aim is clarification. No changes have been made to Specification content. No alterations have been made to teaching requirements.

**CUP textbooks:** Remember also that nine paperback textbooks, written specifically to cover parts of the OCR AS specification, are published in *Cambridge Perspectives in History* series - see the e-Resource Lists p.4 or CUP's History catalogue. AS options supported by these books are:

Unit 2581: Wars of the Roses; German Reformation; English Civil War.

Unit 2582: Origins of the French Revolution; Condition of England; Italian Unification; Nazi Germany.

Unit 2583: England 1450-1509; England 1603-60.

Unit 2584: England 1780-1846.

Unit 2585: Europe 1498-1560; Europe 1598-1661.

Unit 2586: Europe 1789-1849; Europe 1825-90; Europe 1890-1945; Europe & the World 1919-89.

## INSET 2005-2006

OCR's History programme is the most comprehensive to date and no other Board can match the range or scope of the professional training offered. INSET booklets went to Exams Officers and were put on OCR's website in June 2005:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Training%20Booklets/Training\\_B78162.pdf](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Training%20Booklets/Training_B78162.pdf)

OCR Training may be contacted on 0121 628 2950 (fax 0121 628 2940).

The major focus this season is on AS Documents and A2 Historical Investigations. There are also half-day meetings devoted to the coursework and meetings specifically for teachers and centres new to OCR's specification. Following feedback from teachers, we are using several new locations in order to bring meetings closer to you.

Centres are strongly encouraged to take advantage of the Board's INSET. These provide an opportunity to:

- think about what you do in the classroom and question your practice
- discuss with experienced examiners how they prepare their students
- meet fellow practitioners who also teach the same course

### Teacher Study Days

We have also expanded our programme of Teacher Study Days. Each offers subject-specific professional development organised jointly with the education department of a national institution. Each includes a lecture by a don and sessions with museum staff (some including object handling) as well as consideration of relevant OCR exam scripts with a senior examiner.

**Alfred the Great** at the British Museum, London.

**The English Civil War & Protectorate** at Peterborough Cathedral.

A senior coursework examiner will also consider how such a site may be used to make a successful local History coursework study for Unit 2592 or 2593

**The Poor Law** at the Workhouse, Southwell, Nottinghamshire (The National Trust) for 'The Condition of England 1832-53' option in AS Unit 2582 as well as the **synoptic theme in Unit 2591**. The lecture will address content issues on 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century education (i.e. addressing content paragraph three of the 2591 theme '**Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**').

**The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1918 & War & Society 1793-1918** at the National Army Museum, London.

Course details will be found in History's 2005/2006 INSET booklet & on OCR's website.



### BECOMING AN EXAMINER

Our 330 examiners marked almost 90500 scripts this summer. All are volunteers. All are historians. The role of examiners and their professional commitment to delivering accurate results cannot be underestimated. Our system of 16-19 education depends upon external examiners. So too does the entire admissions process to further education. Examining is a highly skilled job. The UK's GCSE and GCE examiners work to exacting professional standards recognized by the independent McGaw Report as delivering the most reliable assessment anywhere in the world:

[http://www.gca.org.uk/downloads/mcgaw\\_report2004.pdf](http://www.gca.org.uk/downloads/mcgaw_report2004.pdf)

OCR is always pleased to receive applications from teachers to act as examiners. Of course examiners gain deeper insights into the requirements of assessment and thus the needs of exam candidates. But the direct academic and professional benefits do not end there. By seeing the work of students on other schools and colleges, examining gives valuable insights into teaching and learning methods used by other teachers.

New examiners are given specific training. They mark a reduced allocation of scripts. Team Leaders act as mentors and help with any problems that may arise.

Please see the home page of OCR's website, under 'Examiners and Moderators':  
<http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/examiner/examiner.jsp>

### OCR History's e-Community could help YOU

Our e-community began in July 2004. Several valuable exchanges have taken place – most recently, about how to teach and resource 2591 Russian Dictatorship. The full potential of the community has yet to be realised. OCR's e-community could **help you in your classroom** - especially if you teach one of the less popular options that are not well supported by available resources, e.g.

everything **Medieval**

everything **17<sup>th</sup> century**

everything **social & economic**

2584 **British Foreign Policy 1939-63** or **Post-War Britain 1945-64**

2586 **Revolution & Repression 1815-49**

2588 **Oliver Cromwell** or **Peter the Great**

2589 **Napoleon** or **Bismarck**

2590 **England 1558-1689** or **Europe 1598-1715** or **Europe 1661-1796**

2591 **Britain 1834-1996**

The community unites classroom practitioners. Every message submitted is delivered to every other subscriber. Membership is free. To join or to obtain more information, go to:

<http://community.ocr.org.uk/lists/listinfo/history-a>

The more teachers join, the better it will work so, over to you ...

## GCE History - future change

The *14-19 Education and Skills White Paper* of February 2005 promises:

1. a reduction in the number of assessment units for most GCE subjects from six to four [paras 8.24-8.25]
2. the introduction of AEA-type questions in A2 for all GCE subjects in order to increase stretch and challenge [para 8.15]
3. a review of requirements for coursework at GCE level [paras 8.10-8.12 & 8.27]
4. a pilot of an extended project at GCE level [paras 8.16-8.17]

and specifically for GCE History

5. action to provide better progression [para 8.26]

Further, the QCA's *Futures: Meeting the Challenge. Subject Report in History* (2004) [http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/11462\\_futures\\_history.pdf](http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/11462_futures_history.pdf) identifies "continued disquiet over what is seen as the gradual narrowing and 'Hitlerisation' of post-14 History".

The QCA will also be reviewing the GCE criteria for every subject. These criteria determine the fundamental requirements that every specification in a subject must observe (e.g. a six-unit structure, the study of a minimum 15% British & a minimum 15% Foreign History and study of change over a period of at least 100 years, together with the precise text of History's three Assessment Objectives). The current History criteria will be found at:

[http://www.qca.org.uk/12687\\_1712.html](http://www.qca.org.uk/12687_1712.html)

Revised criteria will thus provide the basic building blocks with which all new AS/A2 History specifications will have to be constructed. Discussions will begin during autumn 2005 and we presume that new specification development will not begin until the new criteria are settled.



Doubtless, the HA's *History 14-19. Report & Recommendations to the Secretary of State*. (March 2005) [ [http://194.93.140.245/membersite/pdf\\_members/HA\\_CPD.pdf](http://194.93.140.245/membersite/pdf_members/HA_CPD.pdf) ] will play a part in shaping both agendas and discussions.

At the time of writing, no instructions and no timetable for any of this have been published by the DfES and the QCA. Whenever change comes, the 124 replies to our questionnaire distributed at the autumn 2004 INSET meetings, together with the 18 returned from *Newsletter 2*, will be exceedingly useful in guiding our thinking. Further, we hope that the QCA's timetable will allow for consultation with teachers during the development of the new specification.

This page is intended for teachers to copy and post as notices or to circulate among their students. It offers direct advice to candidates from the Chief Examiner:

## OCR HISTORY

### BEFORE THE EXAMINATION: CHECK!

	 <b>YES</b>	 <b>NO</b>
HAVE YOU LOOKED AT YOUR STUDY TOPIC IN THE SPECIFICATION?		
HAVE YOU GIVEN EQUAL TIME TO STUDY AND REVISE EACH KEY ISSUE?		
HAVE YOU STUDIED THE TYPES OF QUESTIONS IN DIFFERENT EXAMS?		
DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT IS MEANT BY RELEVANCE?		
DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE KEY INSTRUCTIONS SUCH AS 'COMPARE', 'ANALYSE', 'HOW FAR...?'		
HAVE YOU WORKED OUT A SCHEDULE FOR REVISION?		
DO YOU KNOW HOW LONG EACH EXAM WILL BE?		
HAVE YOU WORKED OUT HOW YOU WILL ORGANISE YOUR TIME IN THE EXAM?		

This page is intended for teachers to copy and post as notices or to circulate among their students. It offers direct advice to candidates from the Chief Examiner:

## OCR HISTORY

### BEFORE THE EXAMINATION: CHECK!

#### AS AND A2 LEVELS

	☺ YES	☹ NO
IN THE DOCUMENTS / INTERPRETATIONS EXAMS, DO YOU KNOW WHICH QUESTIONS WILL ASK YOU ONLY TO USE THE DOCUMENTS / PASSAGES?		
IN THE DOCUMENTS / INTERPRETATIONS EXAMS, DO YOU KNOW WHICH QUESTIONS WILL ASK YOU TO USE THE DOCUMENTS / PASSAGES <u>AND</u> YOUR OWN KNOWLEDGE?		
DO YOU KNOW HOW TO WRITE A USEFUL PLAN?		
IN ESSAY QUESTIONS, DO YOU KNOW HOW TO WRITE A GOOD INTRODUCTION?		
DO YOU KNOW HOW TO WRITE A GOOD CONCLUSION?		
IN THE HISTORICAL INTERPRETATIONS EXAM, DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT IS MEANT BY 'DEBATE'?		
IN THE HISTORICAL INTERPRETATIONS EXAMS, WHAT ARE THE MAIN DIFFERENCES OF DEBATE IN YOUR STUDY TOPIC?		
IN UNITS 2590-91 THEMES IN HISTORY, DO YOU UNDERSTAND HOW TO CONSTRUCT AN ANSWER OVER A HUNDRED YEARS?		

**Advanced Subsidiary & Advanced GCE History 3835/7835**  
**June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

	Unit	Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>2580</b>	Raw	120	91	81	72	63	54	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2581</b>	Raw	120	91	81	72	63	54	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2582</b>	Raw	120	91	81	72	63	54	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2583</b>	Raw	45	38	33	28	24	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2584</b>	Raw	45	38	33	28	24	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2585</b>	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2586</b>	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2587</b>	Raw	90	71	64	57	50	44	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2588</b>	Raw	90	71	64	57	50	44	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2589</b>	Raw	90	71	64	57	50	44	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2590</b>	Raw	120	90	81	72	63	54	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2591</b>	Raw	120	90	81	72	63	54	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2592</b>	Raw	90	72	64	56	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2593</b>	Raw	90	72	64	56	49	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

**Specification Aggregation Results: 3835 AS History**

Threshold marks (in UMS)

	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>3835</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total aggregating candidates</b>
<b>3835</b>	18.13	43.24	68.79	86.21	95.07	100	13674
<b>difference from June 2004</b>	+0.30	+2.27	+2.37	+1.39	+0.19	-	+251

The mean mark was 198.58 (out of 300) which represents a rise of 2.09 marks.

**Specification Aggregation Results: 7835 A Level History**

Threshold marks (in UMS)

	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>7835</b>	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total aggregating candidates</b>
<b>7835</b>	24.23	52.46	78.14	93.41	99.07	100	12468
<b>difference from June 2004</b>	+1.28	+0.98	+0.48	+0.15	+0.32	-	+196

The mean mark was 420.09 (out of 600) which represents a rise of 2.30 marks.

**Outcomes per Unit, June 2005:**

<b>Unit</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>Mean mark (max raw mark)</b>	<b>Candidates</b>	<b>Centres</b>
<b>2580</b>	35.17	61.67	77.67	90.17	95.83	83.67 (120)	600	79
<b>2581</b>	26.08	51.19	72.40	86.55	94.15	79.84 (120)	4601	299
<b>2582</b>	21.50	42.58	64.59	81.37	91.16	76.72 (120)	12543	655
<b>2583</b>	18.64	41.85	67.07	83.30	91.98	30.55 ( 45)	7708	434
<b>2584</b>	24.80	47.02	67.60	81.62	89.22	31.01 ( 45)	10336	539
<b>2585</b>	23.64	46.82	69.77	83.00	91.07	28.62 ( 45)	3930	242
<b>2586</b>	23.50	45.98	69.18	83.47	91.41	28.67 ( 45)	14292	706
<b>2587</b>	25.00	38.79	56.90	79.31	89.66	60.29 ( 90)	348	50
<b>2588</b>	24.64	41.95	62.54	79.25	89.67	60.79 ( 90)	3167	306
<b>2589</b>	21.77	38.35	59.34	77.97	89.23	59.66 ( 90)	7466	591
<b>2590</b>	24.09	39.39	59.52	77.46	89.02	75.88 (120)	3234	292
<b>2591</b>	23.65	39.54	59.10	76.07	89.03	75.95 (120)	8687	629
<b>2592</b>	26.51	48.01	70.27	86.13	93.87	62.41 ( 90)	11828	786
<b>2593</b>	15.31	29.80	50.82	74.08	86.74	56.95 ( 90)	490	84

**Candidates retaking Units in June 2005:**

<b>Unit</b>	<b>% retaking from June 2004</b>	<b>% retaking from January 2005</b>
2580	8%	10%
2581	9%	9%
2582	9%	11%
2583	10%	8%
2584	7%	4%
2585	10%	6%
2586	9%	7.5%
2587	0%	7%
2588	1%	11%
2589	1%	13%
2590	1%	6.5%
2591	1%	4.5%
2592	1%	n/a
2593	0.5%	n/a

**Very high scoring candidates**

<b>Unit</b>	<b>% candidates scoring full raw marks</b>	<b>% candidates scoring 90% or more (raw marks)</b>
2580	0.3	6.2
2581	0	2.6
2582	0.3	2.0
2583	3.1	9.4
2584	5.7	14.2
2585	0.3	3.5
2586	0.5	3.6
2587	1.5	8.0
2588	1.4	8.5
2589	0.7	5.8
2590	0	3.6
2591	1.0	5.6
2592	1.4	8.6
2593	1.0	5.0

## Units 2580/01-2582/01: Document Studies (AS)

### Reminder changes to Unit 2580-2582 question papers starting with the June 2006 exams

The formal Notice detailing these changes may be found at

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/newsandupdates/ShowQualNewsDetail.do?server=PRODUKTION&site=OCR&oid=2047&newsitemoid=23057>

An exemplar question paper of every option in the new format may be found at

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Specimen%20Assessment%20Materials/ASA\\_Level34722.pdf](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Specimen%20Assessment%20Materials/ASA_Level34722.pdf) ]

### INSET Units 2580-2582

The cycle of main INSET meetings returns to Units 2580-2582 this November & December (alongside Units 2587-2589). For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet pp.10, 11.

### General Comments

Performance across the units reverted to earlier patterns where Unit 2580 was clearly the best, Unit 2581 next and Unit 2582 the weakest. It was rare for candidates to score over 105+ at the top end and below 55 at the bottom, although 2582 did see over 1,200 receive below 54 (10% plus of the candidature for that paper, in comparison to 6% on 2581 and 4% on 2580). However, the lower performances on Unit 2582 may simply reflect the larger numbers and the greater spread of ability that this will bring. Another possible reason is considered below.

When you receive this report, with the generic and subject specific mark schemes, it is important to note that changes have been made to the **mark allocations** for 2580-82. **Centres should dispose of any pre-summer 2005 generic mark schemes.** This was adjusted to deliver a more effective distribution of marks thereby preventing excessive distortion when converted to UMS at the top and bottom. In effect the Bands are now more equal in the number of marks awarded, 3 marks per band on part (a), approx 6 marks on part (b) and 8 on part (c). The assessment criteria have **not** altered, nor have the Band descriptors. However, a **number of glosses** have been added, in italics, beneath these to aid a common understanding of the key requirements. For new examiners in particular it has helped to define comments such as "limited links to sources". We seek to build on the experience of candidate response over the last 5 years and this has proved useful for all examiners this summer. We hope these will also be helpful for teachers, who could, with profit, use these to direct their marking and feedback to candidates. We always advise using our marks and generic comments in this way so that candidates can progress during the taught course in a manner appropriate to the paper. Centres should also be aware by now that **January 2006 will be the last time part (a) will be set.** If you are preparing candidates purely for June 2006 then they will be facing just the existing part (b) and (c), re-itemised as (a) and (b).

We are very pleased to note that the advice in these reports and at Inset Sessions is feeding back into a more effective performance for many candidates. They are trying to use a more appropriate vocabulary to access historical information and seem more aware of what they should be doing.



Much of this report will be an update on how to deliver a source based paper in the classroom, building on the identification of key weaknesses in the last 3 reports (January 2004 p.8-10; June 2004 pp.14-21 and January 2005 pp.254-258). For example, centres have noted what was said about source grouping in part (c) and many candidates had a stab at this but there is a need to develop this. On its own it indicates just promise, not effective delivery. Examiners feel that there can be a very strong centre effect, perhaps showing that the way in which candidates are prepared for the examination is a strong determinant of their performance. For example in 2580 part (b) the trend has often been to stress provenance at the expense of content. On all 3 papers, as noted above, candidates provide an introduction for part (a) where there is a grouping which promises to provide a structure that will deliver Bands I and II. What follows then lacks the common threads and themes among the sources so grouped. In addition to using the reports at Departmental meetings to identify weakness this must be incorporated into lesson planning and teaching. **The skills required by this paper do need teaching and reinforcement.** They are valuable in themselves and vital to the historian's craft. It is worth spending a week's teaching, say 3 or 4 lessons, looking at these in abstract to make serious points about close and careful reading, revealing how comparison and use can be affected (or not) by provenance and attribution, and building the sense of a relationship to a debate. This does not require, at this stage, detailed own knowledge. That will come later in your course and will enrich candidate study. Centres can choose a past question capable of delivering this in the first teaching week and illustrating the qualities required for all three questions. After this, sources should be used for introduction, reinforcement and as a final diagnostic tool in most, if not all, lessons. Part (a) is particularly useful for rooting key concepts in candidates' minds and for consideration of how they may be viewed or used. Part (b) is ideal for introducing views, usually different, and explaining or reconciling that difference. Part (c) is the final 'diagnostic' for a key issue within the topic studied. These skills and techniques are important in achieving the higher grades. They should be interesting and rewarding (in a 'detective' like manner) but they cannot just materialize alongside a content-based course. The content is there to provide structure, alternative angles and an understanding of the key issues.

The sources challenge or confirm these and we expect candidates to focus here, extending the debate via own knowledge. They can only do so if appropriate strategies have been devised in the classroom to enable them to do this. All too frequently candidates fail to achieve an appropriate progression from GCSE. Stand-alone GCSE skills (reliability, utility, typicality etc) are often all we get. Candidates have not learnt to move-on. Centres should note that our questions **do not target one-off skills.** We ask general, open ended, questions about 'evidence for' and 'using all sources and your own knowledge'. This is designed simply to produce good history, effectively and thoughtfully delivered. We are convinced that we do provide excellent opportunities to demonstrate this at a higher- than- GCSE -'AS' level. To obtain Bands I – III is to develop a real competence in the subject, which we reward with pleasure.

One possible reason why 2582 had more middling and weaker candidates is the preponderance of Q7, Nazi Germany, on that paper. Answers to this constituted approx 80% of all responses. Whether or not one subscribes to the notion of Hitlerisation and its disadvantages in history, it is clear in 2582 that overall this depresses the result. Qs 1-6 produce the same spread of achievement one finds in the responses to all questions in 2580 and 2581. It could just be that weaker candidates want to study Nazi-Germany but we are convinced that the techniques referred to above, and later in this report, are especially weak here. Similarly, own knowledge is particularly vague, generic and frequently non-existent on the Nazi question. It is difficult to see why this is the case. Many, but not all, will have covered the basics at GCSE (in fact most examiners commented that there had been no progress here from GCSE type skills). Many may also be following the Nazis in 2586. Publishers focus especially on this topic, so a huge array of material is available, at every level. We feel that many Nazi Centres need to take particular note of how to deliver this topic as an AS **Source** paper and to deepen their candidates' conceptual understanding.

Own knowledge remains an area of weakness, not just confined to Nazi answers. In (a) it becomes a substitute for explanation, leading the candidates into description and towards what he or she

would like to have seen. In (b) it leads away from comparison instead of merely supporting it conceptually. In (c) even if used as an attempt to enrich, it will often be just a means of delinking from a source focus. Pieces of information become lodged uncomfortably in the flow of what should be an argument. It needs to be part of the evaluative process, to qualify or give further value to, the point of a source or to provide some alternative angles, which the source may or may not support. In the classroom adequate preparations by both candidate and teacher of key points and their reinforcement by using material is essential. If candidates know or understand little then inevitably they are forced back on to the sources as mere mines of information instead of as a set of views, comments and interpretations. This is when 'referencing' and 'addressing' of the sources (Band III and below) occurs. Centres are reminded that this has been specifically raised in the last two reports and is clearly addressed in the italic glosses for this year's Generic Mark Bands III, IV and V.

Whilst many candidates are a pleasure to read and make good use of vocabulary they are let down by poor grammar. Very irritating is to place a comma where a full stop should be. There is a lack of commitment to clear and formal expression (particularly annoying is the use of the historic present tense, no doubt encouraged by popular media history). Colloquialisms and clichés abound, indicating imprecise thinking, whilst modern terms do considerable disservice to the concerns of previous centuries. Some candidates' spelling is appalling, even when the correct ones are on the paper – on Q7 2582 there were many 'Mr Hiltons' and 'Hilters', his propaganda minister 'Gobbles'; on 2581 Q5, Louis' palace was frequently 'Versaille'; 2580 Q2 saw 'Odious of Bayeux' swing into administrative action. These were not just slips of the pen but constantly repeated. However, it matters less than applying a consistent 'text -argot' which misrepresents the period under discussion. Only by a formal but used in the source basic use of English are candidates likely to be able to handle interpretations and the **language used in the source**. There was some dreadful handwriting, a serious handicap in attempting to follow a candidate's argument. Some examiners spent over an hour trying to decipher such scripts, sending them on for other examiners to spend as long again, if not more. This will not do – if a candidate is known to have a problem Centres need to seek permission for an amanuensis or a word processor to be used. The QCA's regulations for all GCEs make it fully clear that the responsibility rests fully with the candidate to provide **legible** answers in whatever form is appropriate so that they make themselves clear.

**Timing**, fortunately, was not the issue it was last January. Candidates paced themselves well. If there was overindulgence with time it was on (a) or (b) where candidates either separated content and provenance and wrote lengthily on both or simply kept repeating themselves. As always (c) was the victim.

What follows are **the particular weaknesses** of a very large number of candidates across all questions. In many cases this will repeat points made in earlier reports but it will also seek to throw light on **how this can be tackled in the classroom**. It includes, along with the question specific comments, examples from scripts of both good and poor practice. Centres should pay particular note to parts (b) and (c) given that there is only one more sitting where (a) will be used.

#### **Sub-question (a)**

Improvement continued here but some candidates remain unsure of how to proceed.

- **Explanation** of the event, phrase or concept is the key, **not** evaluation. A minority, mainly of good candidates, are prone to divert into this. The focus is on the stated phrase or sentence. Frequently comment is very general (as on 2582 7(a) where most candidates wrote about propaganda) and will receive Band IV or Band V.
- If there is a **second element**, as there frequently is, then this needs some explanation as well (as on 2582 Q2a where 'permissive' required comment as well as the 1848 Public Health Act).
- There is still a widespread misunderstanding of what is expected of **linkage** - it is a comment on tone, context and possible contribution to argument (either the whole phrase or its role in the general thrust of the source's argument or view). It is intended that

candidates undertake some work in the exam to link to the source. Linkage is likely to be related to other material rather than simply part of an explanation. What is un-rewardable are detailed descriptions of causes or the background of an event referred to rather than valid linkage. (2581 Q1a and Q3(a) were cases in point; in the latter many candidates were determined to offload information on the causes of all rebellions in 1549). We do not expect much here, just a sentence linking it back to what it comes from eg in 2581 Q2(a) the obvious linkage to powerful supporters among the princes is the context of the Diet of Worms. The following answer gained a Band I:

*The reference is to the ability of Lutheranism to attract the political elites, namely the princes, by 1521. The Venetian Ambassador could be referring to Luther's own Prince, Frederick the Wise, who had already exercised his considerable power by this time, for example securing Luther's hearing by Cajetan in Augsburg as opposed to Rome. The comment is testimony to the decentralised nature of German politics that would become the central factor for the survival of Lutheranism, the cause being taken up later by Philip of Hesse and John Frederick in particular. Above all, even by the Diet of Worms in 1521 the support for Lutheranism among the Princes, who had both motive and opportunity, is clear!*

- Most are getting the **length** of (a) right (4 sentences of formal explanation and linkage, although most will need up to 6) but a sizeable minority still write at inordinate length. Answers (b) and (c) pay the price.
- Part (a), can continue to be of use in future teaching and can be of a Centre's own devising. They are ideal for focused thinking on key terms and concepts, as outlined earlier.

### Sub-question (b)

This question makes progress in some sessions, only to retrace its steps backwards in others. This summer saw a very wide pattern indeed. From next summer, with just (b) and (c), it is clearly important to get the skills for these questions clearly honed and tuned. Whilst many in Q(b) did produce focused and developed answers with direct and close comparison, picking up on key words and phrases, tone and provenance, it was rare, especially on 2582, to find a candidate who examined the appropriate range of criteria for content and provenance and even rarer to find one who focused sharply on the issue of using the source as '**evidence for**' as opposed to general comparison. When this report is used in Departmental discussion and as a tool for re-examining lessons and schemes of work, it is important to refer back to the last three reports to build a picture of what may be going wrong.

- **Sequencing** – always the bugbear of this question continues to undermine the middling to weak. It is still, alas, very common, if less so this summer on 2580 and 2581. A minority sequence throughout (Band V and below awaits) but the usual pattern of the guilty at this stage is to locate comparison either at the changeover point from one source to another or to sequence and comment on one source and then incorporate comparison when the second source is considered. A variant would be to compare **either** just at the beginning or at the very end. These common patterns will confine an answer to Band III at best. In class it is vital to consider 2 sources on a current teaching issue and identify the **issues** under discussion. Candidates require practice in this, both in class and in any prepared work for marking. Building points on to a board or OHP should involve everyone in this, otherwise candidates will seek the security of separate descriptions and paraphrase. The mindset must be changed.
- A variant on this is **mechanical and formulaic sequencing of provenance** where some Centres are teaching candidates to answer in a rather mechanistic fashion by referring to each of the qualities mentioned in the Band I descriptor. This probably emerged because Centres and candidates became increasingly aware that comparison required qualities other than content. However, this has, in some cases, developed at the expense of content where straightforward and obvious points are ignored whilst semi relevant or irrelevant

provenance are pursued at length. It can produce pointless comparison in relation to qualities which are not relevant to the sources in that particular question. The aim is not to run through a list of possible qualities for comparison but to access the sources appropriately as evidence. This may mean in some cases that a relevant issue is the **dating** of the two sources (as in 2582 Q3b on Italy and Q4b on the US; 2581 Q1b on the Wars of the Roses and 2b on Luther; 2580 Q1b on Alfred and Q2b on the Normans). In others the **authorship** may be the key issue (as in 2582 Q1b on the French Revolution; Q2b on the Condition of England, particularly in Q3b on Italy, Q4b on the US, Q5b on Ireland, Q6b on England in a New Century and Q7b on the Nazis, and all of 2580 and 2581). In others, the **language and tone** are the more important (as in 2582 Q4b on the US; 2581 Q3b on the Mid Tudor Crisis and on 2580 Q3b on the Crusades).

It is necessary once again to point out that comparison is always in regard to specific issues, **not** a generalised comparison of the sources. Please refer to the gloss for Band I in Qb where we make it clear that not all the qualities need to be there. It all depends on the nature of the source and what it has to say. Answers which list these point by point miss comparison, particularly of content. Their comparison becomes skewed. Responses could become long lists of paraphrased content, at worst without commentary. What follows are two (b) answers which demonstrate clearly the pitfalls of skewing towards provenance and how this can, despite considerable knowledge, completely divorce from the question and become repetitive. The first answer to 2580 Q1b on Alfred received a high Band V.

**Question 1b – How far do these Sources support each other as evidence for English methods against the Vikings?**

*Source B is written by King Alfred's biographer Asser. It has been extracted from Asser's Life of King Alfred, and is written in 893. Asser spent much of the 880s living in King Alfred's court and they are known to have had a great friendship. The time of writing in 893 was soon after the Anglo-Saxon chronicle became available, and Asser had access to it straight away. Asser's 'Life of King Alfred', is hagiographical and complimentary to Alfred, which is understandable as he achieved many great things. However, Asser's close relationship to Alfred may have seen a slight bias in his writings towards the King. The book was also published shortly after all the Welsh leaders had submitted to Alfred's overlordship. This may suggest the book's purpose was to target a Welsh audience and communicate the achievements of their new leader, making the Welsh more favourable to Alfred. This is also supported by the fact Asser refers to Alfred as 'King of the Anglo-Saxons', and he refers to the Vikings as 'pagans' and the English as 'Christians' making it seem a religious war and the Welsh more able to see themselves as fighting for a common religious cause. However this could well be coincidence and Asser was just on comparing historians who quite justly emphasised Alfred's great achievements, 'He destroyed the Vikings with great slaughter'.*

*Source C is written by Ealdorman Aethelweard a descendant of Alfred's brother. This may suggest as a relation there was a bias to Alfred's cause. Also it was written in the 980s, meaning Aethelweard would not have been present at the mentioned battle, meaning the details would not be as accurate as if written by a contemporary. The extract came from the Chronicle. This should not be seen as propaganda to support the uniting of the English under Alfred. Great effort went into summarising early Christian and Roman history in the Chronicle as a background for the main theme of the West Saxons. This suggests it was more a general attempt on English history that the King would have approved of. However it is likely the Chronicle came from the King's court as Asser had access to it as soon as it was published, this may indicate bias, but it does not mean that Alfred had anything to do with its writing.*

*Source B is likely to give good evidence of the English methods against the Vikings as Asser would have interviewed contemporaries and got an accurate account. However it may be slightly bias because of its purpose of raising support for Alfred amongst the Welsh and Asser's friendship and admiration of Alfred. Source C is likely to give an accurate account of Haesten's battle with the Ealdorman as the Chronicle is more historiographical, even though the writer was a relation of Alfred's.*

The next example is from 2582 Q7b which received a low Band III. **Question 7b: Compare these Sources as evidence for the ways in which Germans reacted to the pressures of war.**

*Source B is a description of the popular mood in Germany during the war, which focuses on a relaxed attitude towards the support of the Nazi regime, including information suggesting a betrayal of Hitler by members of the German public and party members through criticism and negative discussion about Hitler and the regime.*

*Source C is a description of the reaction of German people specifically to the bombing that took place in Berlin in 1943.*

*Source B is a secondary source, taken from an official summary of Gauleiter reports, which, given the governments policies on feedback from the public, (after the events of 1918), would be a completely honest and complete report.*

*Source C is a primary source as an extract from a reflection of a woman's experiences living in Germany during the war.*

*Source B can be taken as totally authentic, considering the policies about its truthfulness. Additionally, the report would be seen by Hitler, who would be happier to see a report which did not consist of information about people betraying him. Therefore the fact that this report is not ideal from a nazi perspective suggests that it is truthful rather than biased to please the Fuhrer.*

*Source C can also be assumed as authentic as it is a memory however it was written in 1968 therefore the information could have been looking back in a positive light, as if through "rose tinted spectacles". This could lead to the fact that it is not complete; information may be missing about how people reacted negatively to the bombings in addition to German reactions to other pressures of war not just bombings.*

*Source B is likely to be complete as it is an official report however it also may be missing information, for example information about support from the public during the war.*

*The sources cannot easily be compared in terms of consistency due to their differences in content, however they are consistent with expectations that are*

*Together, the sources are useful in providing an overall view on the variation preconceived about different effects of the pressures of war.of reactions of German people to the pressures of war. Both sources appear reliable and when used together they are at their most useful despite their differing content.*

*As an overall judgement Source B is useful in describing general doubt of Hitler's abilities whereas Source C is more useful in describing reactions of German people specifically to the Berlin bombings of 1943.*

**Stock Evaluation** is still, alas, common, especially on 2582. The evaluation of a source should always be in relation to what the source says with sensible speculation if appropriate. Here the short course mentioned earlier could provide examples of meaningless comment, the assumptions that candidates have about sources and the value that they assign to them. In Q7(b) [the Nazis], Source C written by Christabel Bielenberg suffered much at the hands of such stock evaluation.

Writing 20 years after the event many candidates claimed that her memory was shot to pieces or she was 'biased towards England', or that she had been indoctrinated by the Nazis one of whom was her husband. Others claimed she was romanticising or just out to sell more books.

Assertions that Source B, the Gauleiter's report, had to be biased because it was Nazi are not valid. A case could easily be made for the source being exaggerated to make others in the party hierarchy look bad and therefore unreliable but baldly to assert bias ignored the content. Likewise with Bielenberg in Source C, one does not easily forget being bombed. Candidates have to use their own judgement as to what it is legitimate to speculate about and what is not. Candidates need to ask themselves if there is anything in the source or attribution which would support any of these claims. On 2582 Q4b (US) a frequent comment was *'that it was written by a southerner so it is biased'* or *'this is only a small part of the sources so therefore not necessarily accurate'*. There may be some validity in these comments but candidates cannot claim something without first establishing it. On 2581 Q4b (The English Civil War) there was the comment that *'Charles I would not have lied to his wife therefore it is reliable'*. Possibly, but the candidate needed briefly to establish this. Another 2581 comment was *'... both sources are reliable because they are both contemporary writers...'* Again, candidates assume value, often at random (in this case contemporary equals good). Effectively discussed provenance in comparison can be very important, as it was in 2582 Q4b for Calhoun and Reagan, and for 2581 Q3b. A high band answer follows: **Q3b – Compare the attacks on Somerset in these two Sources.**

*Both sources A and B speak very harshly about the Lord Protector. Source A, a letter from William Paget highlights the feuds between Somerset and the council. This is strongly supported by the evidence of source B, which depicts the members of the Council moving against Somerset in an effort to overthrow him. Both sources agree that Somerset had alienated the Council with his support for the common people, what Paget calls "Your softness".*

*The sources both argue that it was Somerset's policies in 1549 that have endangered the stability of the country through "the recent uprisings that so disturbed the realm". It was the moderate religious reform and the slightly ambiguous social policies that caused the uprisings and both again recognise this fact. Paget instructs Somerset to "look carefully to see whether you have either low law or religion, and I fear you shall find neither".*

*The sharp contrast is in source B's belief that "He was ambitious and sought his own glory". The suggestion is that Somerset's policies were simply a method of self-preservation, his enclosure laws an attempt for posterity. However, source A has a different message concerning Somerset attempting to encourage action from the nobles.*

*Here we find the real difference between the sources, their purposes are opposite. The proclamation in source B is a justification for the ensuing coup d'etat and eventually the replacement of Somerset with the more politically devious Northumberland. On the other hand source A is information on the state of the country from Paget in an attempt to force action against the many revolts nationwide against not only religion and enclosure but also the terrible economic conditions as a result of devaluing the coin and the wars with both France and Scotland. Paget fears that the forming rebels will destabilise the country. Source B, written in the Chronicle is able to look back on the rebellions and shows the need to replace Somerset.*

**A failure to match the information accurately between two sources** – because candidates generalise rather than identify specific phrases or words they make many conceptual slips and miss obvious points.

- If the sources talk of different things with a common route (as in 2582 Q2b) then they need to **say so**.
- If the source content is largely similar (as in 2581 Q3b or 2582 Q4b) then again, say so. At this point candidates should look into the provenance to explain similarity or difference. That is where a candidate just looking at provenance, or just content, will seriously skew their response.

**A judgement is expected** for Bands I and II. Many candidates simply make no attempt to do this. Other candidates produce, out of a hat, a judgement at the end, frequently unsupported by what has gone before. Often both sources will provide useful evidence for and against or will corroborate to some extent the evidence of one or the other. In some cases candidates need to spot that they may be talking of different things. If this is the case, or they are of equal value, candidates need to say so but always give their reason for so doing (a good class exercise). A summative comment, linked to the comments already made about content and provenance, does help.

**Use of own knowledge** in part (b) is **not** a requirement, **not** necessary and certainly **not advised**. Quite a few candidates do this and it invariably clutters their response and obscures comparison. It can, and should, be used for 'light' context and provenance and to spot relevance (talking of a particular event rather than a more general point). It is for 'location' of a source only.

The above is an attempt to advise and warn against an all too typical response which seems to think that an opening sentence which reads along the lines of 'There are significant differences between A and B', followed by two paragraphs of sequential commentary was enough to secure at least Band III in terms of a limited comparison/contrast. Perhaps more frequently was the approach which linked two essentially sequential paragraphs with a connective phrase such as 'in the same way' or 'on the other hand' or a mere connective 'however' **or** 'similarly'. Whilst these imply comparison/contrast, candidates must understand that **alone** they will not reach Band III but may well end up in Band IV or even Band V.

### **Sub-Question (c)**

There is a very mixed picture here. There is evidence that candidates are increasingly being encouraged to group the sources and to incorporate their own knowledge but, to set against this step forward, candidates then listed sources and used them merely to provide brief quotations or references. They were over dependent on the core of information they provided. The essence of this question is **analysis** of the sources. If we wanted an essay on the statement offered for discussion we would not ask candidates to use the sources as well as their own knowledge, nor would this form part of a Document Studies paper. We do, however, expect own knowledge as well as analysis of the sources and this was too often missing. Sometimes, as in 2581 Q3 (c) [1<sup>st</sup> Crusade], 2582 Q1 (c) and 3(c) [War of the Roses and Tudor Crises], 2582 Q1(c) [French Revolution], Q4 (c) [US], Q5 (c) [England in a New Century], own knowledge may provide an important alternative explanation to the one offered in the statement.

There are many pitfalls for candidates and more will be listed later but the three main ones are **organisational** ("grouping" and what then follows), **evaluative** (the failure to use the source for anything other than a reference bank of information) and the failure to use much **own knowledge** (or to know how to integrate it). If candidates can achieve the former then they go a long way towards being enabled to do the two latter. Sources are insufficiently used in an evaluative manner and this prevents many candidates achieving Bands I and II. We are disappointed that we rarely see a script that combines a focused use of the sources 'as evidence' whose limitations are discussed which manages to integrate sources and own knowledge to produce an essay based on a combination of knowledge and source evaluation.

**Organisational Issues** have been dealt with before. Specific advice was given on ‘grouping’ in the January 2005 Report and it is pleasing to note that some candidates are attempting this successfully. However, **on its own**, in an introduction, the initial grouping is **not** enough. As a stand-alone introduction it doesn’t rate that highly in evaluative terms. There must be more than just a statement that, say in 2582 Q7(c) ‘Sources A, B and D show that Hitler’s unpopularity was growing’, followed by a description of the content of each. We suggested grouping as a key to unlock evaluation. Candidates must go beyond this and follow its **suggested structure** throughout the answer. This can take the form of three sources v one or it could be that the sources suggest a variety of hypotheses. What follows are three examples from each of the three papers with an introductory grouping **and** a suggested ‘follow on.’

**2582 Q7(c): Assess the view that Hitler’s popularity was seriously damaged by the effects of war.**

*Assessing Hitler’s popularity during the war years is problematic. The sources approach the issue from very different angles. Superficially A, B and D would, given their dating throughout the war (1942, 1943 and 1944), suggest serious damage, culminating in failed assassination in the July Bomb Plot of 1944. However, Bielenberg in C would suggest the German people were more united because of war. This may call into question serious wartime damage to Hitler’s popularity. However she does not mention Hitler or his role in it. There is the implicit suggestion that the type of Volksgemeinschaft or German unity involved here, a siege mentality based on survival regardless of ‘politics and belief’, are not the type Hitler had in mind. Three sources (A, C and D) come from Nazi opponents but there is little to doubt the sincerity of their comments. Even ‘B’, a Nazi Gauleiter Report, is honest in its comments on both party officials and public opinion. Hans and Sophie Scholl in ‘A’ and Treschow in ‘D’ however speak from minority viewpoints, some university students and a section of the junker-based officer class, both active or involved in opposition before 1939. One would expect them both to see the war as Hitler’s destiny and the source of his downfall. Both seek to rescue the German people from the consequences of this. In contrast sources B and C, the Gauleiter and Bielenberg, are more effective accounts of war and its impact on Hitler and popular opinion.*

This can then be developed. Various groupings have been established above, each one providing plenty of opportunity and structure to develop a focused answer that evaluates the sources and allows opportunities for own knowledge. There is A, B and D (serious damage) versus C (German Unity). Another option is one based on provenance – A, C and D (Nazi opponents) versus B (Gauleiter report), ‘B’ being used to add weight to the evidence of the other three for ‘damage’. A third possibility is A and D (untypical minority opinion) v. B and C (public opinion), the latter, a majority, showing some, but not serious, damage (thereby tackling the ‘seriously damaged’ aspect of the question which careful readers should have highlighted). Own knowledge could further develop the ‘minority’ status of the Scholls (A) and Treschow (D) citing army plotting and its fate before and during the war, Junker attitudes to Hitler, the fate of the White Rose and the execution of the Scholls just after the leaflet in A, (although opposition continued through other small groups – the Pirates and the Kreisau Circle). All this would point to minority status. Then candidates could turn to examining the differences between the evidence of B and C on Hitler’s popularity, perhaps with comment on Hitler’s ‘disappearance’ from public life to the Wolfe’s lair in East Prussia, the effectiveness of Germany’s Total War policies (Goebbels’ 1943 speech) in relation to the evidence of ‘B’, the impact of propaganda admitted to by ‘A’ – the German people ‘blindly follow their leader to ruin’ – and the fight to the end in Berlin. The Werewolves could be contrasted to the Scholls to suggest that the cult of Hitler remained to the end.



**2581 Q2(c): Assess the view that Luther's critics in the Catholic Church were mostly responsible for the failure to reach a settlement by 1521.**

*On the surface the sources do not provide a very balanced view of whose responsibility it was for the failure to reach a settlement between 1518 and 1521. Sources A and C are Luther himself, seeking to portray the Church's representatives as at fault rather than himself, to the two key authorities of the time, Pope and Emperor. Erasmus in D, a supporter of Humanist reform who remained Catholic and who writes a couple of years later from the vantage of a little hindsight, certainly sides with Luther as to unwise Church action against him. Contarini, the Venetian Ambassador at Worms in 'B', alone reports on Luther's failure to 'give ground', implying that such a stance could be taken with impunity given princely and printing press support. However, the two Lutheran extracts demonstrate that Contarini's allegations had considerable truth. Luther's extracts in A is from 'On the Liberty of a Christian Man', part of a series of books and pamphlets written to target key audiences, princely, ecclesiastical, intellectual and national. Together they provide a coherent message of reform unacceptable to the Pope and although 'On the Liberty' was dedicated to him its content here attacks his choice of representative, Cajetan, in very impolitic language and even pretends to know his orders. In C Luther unequivocally states 'sola scriptura', thereby openly attacking papal supremacy. This might suggest that Luther, rather than his Church critics, was mostly responsible for the failure to reach a settlement.*

Two groupings have been opened up here, although the answer's slant suggests one is more persuasive than the other. Both provide a structure that will encourage evaluation and the use of own knowledge. One grouping is A, C and D (Luther and Erasmus putting the blame on the Church, Luther focusing on Cajetan with Erasmus focusing on Leo X's 'horrible' Bulls) versus B (Contarini who sees a defiant Luther). This could be extended by comparing Cajetan at Augsburg in A with Eck at Leipzig, perhaps arguing that the Church merely wished to shut Luther up or trap him into historical Hussite heresy. Further comment on Luther's original intention in 1517 and how the Church handled him could set A, C and D into perspective. Another grouping would be A, C and B (Luther and Contarini) where Luther is clearly undiplomatic and assertive of sola scriptura versus D (Erasmus) who blames a Church that did not want to debate 'truth'. This might involve linking B and C, both relating to events at Worms, both pointing to agreement on Luther's failure to give ground. Own knowledge might support this with reference to the politics of Worms but could also qualify it given the Church's failure to give ground. Erasmus in D could be questioned. He is clearly concerned with Humanist writing, the need for light censorship and truth. Here the Church was the enemy and his comments reflect this. Another possible route could be to examine Luther's progress between 1518 and 1521, allowing own knowledge to fill in gaps (1517, Leipzig 1519, the Papal Bulls etc.) and condition the Sources which relate to Augsburg and Worms. The focus needs to be on Luther's developing theology and the Church's approach to it.

**2580 Q3(c): Assess the view that the First Crusade succeeded more through popular enthusiasm than through decisive leadership.**

*There is plenty of evidence for popular enthusiasm as the key to success in all the Sources. Much is said about 'martyrdom, marvellous deeds and religious inspiration'. Much less is said directly of decisive leadership, although its lack pervades B and D. Three of the sources are from accounts of those who went on the Crusade but Fulcher in C and Guibert of Nogent (D) in a near contemporary history refer generally to success achieved by enthusiasm rather than leadership, perhaps because this was the climax of their respective 'Histories'. Thus, A, C and D all focus on religiously inspired popular enthusiasm as the key, D referring to 'those without a Lord'. Only B stresses the importance of leadership through its account of a leadership quarrel over Antioch that delayed the march to Jerusalem, thus implying its*

*importance. Yet, popular pressure, according to B, Raymond of Aguilers, forced a settlement on reluctant leaders. However, A, B and D all suggest that leadership of some sort was important, if not decisive, for success. Raymond of Aguilers in B, a pro Raymond of Toulouse source, clearly observes that the 'people' did not just threaten to set out alone but felt the need to select a knight as leader. In A Fulcher of Chartres refers to several battles, the very nature of which would require leadership and the whole thrust of his comments are designed to secure papal leadership for the final march on Jerusalem. In D Guibert of Nogent clearly refers to 'past battles and great military enterprise' all of which would require conventional leadership. There are clear references to 'knights'. Only the extract from Fulcher in C refers to heroic martyrdom and the deeds of God and this might be an untypical extract if it is from a general historical climax where the convention was to assign equality before God whose divine hand was clearly given the credit for such Christian success.*

Again, 2 groupings are suggested here which can form an appropriate structure. Sources A, C and D (popular enthusiasm) versus Source B (the impact of leadership). These can be developed in relationship to provenance – Fulcher's stress on martyrs and pilgrims and Guibert's sense of Christian history which seems to deny any factor centred around ambition, money and lands despite their mention. Their accuracy could be questioned, especially when 'B' reveals a very partisan leadership dispute (in which he himself must have been involved). Popular enthusiasm is stressed, even in B. The examples of decisive leadership are missing and could easily be provided by own knowledge. A consideration of the People's Crusade, for example, could point to the problems when leadership was lacking. Popular levels of uptake could be considered. Another grouping could be based around comments in A, B and D which may be used to suggest the importance of leadership. Own knowledge could easily be used to strengthen these, especially as leaders are mentioned in D (Raymond, Bohemond and Godfrey). By stressing the potential untypicality of C and D and using the hints in A, B and D a good case could be made for decisive leadership if one wanted to. There are also hints which should lead candidates to consider other reasons for success, notably in C – '... we were surrounded by many powerful enemies'. This could easily be challenged by stressing Muslim division as the key to success, developed by own knowledge.

**Evaluation** of the sources is crucial to the higher grades in part (c). The majority of candidates use the sources for information and make fairly token references to them, either very generally or by quoting or paraphrasing them. This confines them to Band III and below. Some do try with a 'bolt-on' paragraph that impedes the argument and, in itself, does nothing to contribute to it. Others tend to evaluate just one of a set of sources identified as important to their argument whilst ignoring the others. This weakens the power of grouping. As is demonstrated in the three examples evaluation will follow naturally from a grouping and its structure for the answer. Candidates need to see how provenance, reliability and all the rest flows automatically from this and it will be considered lightly, naturally and as a matter of course. It will contribute to ongoing judgement. The following extract from 2581 Q1(c) shows how this can add to the value of an answer.

Assess the view that the restless ambition of Richard of York was the main reason for civil strife from 1450 to 1460.

*'Source A infers that York was power hungry and was in possession of an 'outrageous lust for power'. However, this was written by Polydore Vergil. He was in the pay of Henry VII and needed to make the era look bad so Tudor England looked better. On the other hand, York was perhaps the most overmighty of all English subjects and after tasting power in his protectorship he was loathe to relinquish it. Source B claims that Cade's Rebellion of 1450, the result of the murder of Suffolk and the plan to turn*

*Kent into a game park, was instigated by York. If this is true, then it would represent early evidence of York's ambition: ambition that would only grow with time. However, as this is a product of the Parliament of Devils, it must be seen as tenuous evidence at best and at worst Lancastrian propaganda.'*

Many seem unaware that the sources can give **evidence for different arguments**, e.g. Unit 2582 Q7(c), Hans and Sophie Scholl in 'A'; Unit 2581, Q2(c), Luther in 'A' and 'C'. Only a few were prepared to recognise the different interpretations that a single source can lend itself to.

Many neglect **context** which can be vital, e.g. in the Nazi question the White Rose was about to be eliminated; in the American Civil War question, Davis' tone in C is conditioned by the fact that he is speaking on the eve of secession.

Evaluation always relates to the **question asked**. Sources and knowledge should be discussed in relation to that. Many candidates are less than successful here and even quite able ones miss key concepts or phrases in the question, e.g. '**seriously** damaged' in Q7c Unit 2582 or **ambition** in Q1c and 3c on Unit 2581. It is always wise to encourage your candidates to use a question's key words in their answer.

When evaluating it is important to **consider very carefully what is said in the sources**. Many candidates misinterpret, read into a source what they would like to see there even when it comes to provenance. They are unable to spot subtle distinctions and this limits their appreciation of how they can contribute to different interpretations and impedes evaluation as they fall back on the 'stock' approach so often seen in Q(b). Question (c) is about argument and many candidates divert to **referencing** by their **use of language** (C says; B states etc.). If they were to use the word '**argue**' then it may lead them back on track, forcing them to see they are talking of arguments and interpretations that are open to question and that sources need to be assigned value and significance.

**The use and integration of own knowledge** remains very weak. Candidates seem to know little and certainly find it difficult to know how to deploy it other than as a separate 'bolt-on'. It is very limited, not appropriate, diverts the candidate from the question or is simply too vague, generic or even inaccurate. Instead of independent own knowledge candidates use the sources as the exclusive mine of information. What passes for own knowledge is generic material gleaned from the sources. As is made clear above, own knowledge is to be used to extend or qualify the points made by the sources in relation to the questions. It can provide key alternative explanations when necessary and provide the framework or grouping upon which to hang the sources and their evaluation. It should be integrated. The 'follow-on' exemplars given under 'grouping' show how this can be done.

Some centres and candidates have taken our advice about **sequencing** too much to heart. Our point is that a list impedes evaluation and argument. However, some have merely rearranged the sources to avoid an A to D list. Thus B, C, A, D can just as easily be sequenced if used in 'list' manner. Any random consideration without a clear demonstration of the thinking behind it will undermine performance. If they are taught merely to change the order it is very obvious to the examiner that no particular rationale lay behind their choice.

**False structures** introduced by candidates with a strong 'view' who hope to demonstrate it can also undermine some. They tend to ignore the question and instead force the sources around a pre-arranged thesis or set of knowledge, e.g. in Unit 2581 Q3(c) a fair few were determined to skew the question to the accession of Mary rather than political instability and Somerset and Northumberland's relative role in it during 1547-53. On Unit 2582 Q7(c), the 'Hitler Myth' took over ('if only he knew') excluding any attempt to assess how the war impacted on Hitler's popularity.

**Consistency between (b) & (c)** didn't always follow for many. Having questioned the reliability of sources in (b) they went on to use them as dependable in (c) or as a useful reference. This shows they are not critically evaluating in (c) as in (b). The skills are transferable.

Finally, **judgement**, as in (b) is of obvious importance. Many candidates survey the field and come to a judgement that has not been 'earned'. It cannot just come out of the blue, but needs to build through evaluation and grouping from the beginning. It can be balanced, it can point to exception, but it must be consistently there as each 'section' or grouping is considered. Judgement is mentioned, in stages of effectiveness, in every Band and is a key quality looked for by examiners.

### Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2580/01

Most answered Q3 but Q2 was also popular. A smaller number tackled Q1. It is very pleasing to see the numbers studying Medieval History grow and this summer again saw 2580 out perform the other two document papers. The standard is a high one, although mean GCSE scores showed the candidature to be weaker than last summer. No letters of complaint were received.

### The Reign of Alfred the Great 871-899

- (a) A clear understanding of the Viking Army over-wintering in London was shown by most but some did not look beyond 872. Some picked up on the importance of Viking tactics (peace made, at a price, and the pressure transferred elsewhere with London at the pivot and Mercia next). Most understood the importance of Mercia and London. Some focused on the provenance of Asser (not a requirement and a considerable diversion).
- (b) Some missed the focus of comparison - English methods against the Vikings, but most answered this question well. The best picked up on the dates and the changes in the interim, highlighting the sense of progress and development from a personally led shield-wall army harassing the Vikings to diplomacy, mobile cavalry armies under Ealdormen and acting in alliance. Good responses looked at tone and the different roles of Alfred, direct in B and implicit in C (setting up allies, welding forces etc.) More could have been made of the origins of both sources, although those who talked of the differing circumstances of Asser and Aethelweard forgot about methods of fighting.
- (c) Some excellent responses were observed which not only challenged the assumptions implicit in the question but fully engaged with the sources. The defensive measures were very well known but a weakness for some was to allow own knowledge to take over, describing them in a positive manner and not to spot that the success of such measures could be questioned. Such candidates neglected other factors such as diplomacy. The Fyrd, for example, was not necessarily purely defensive. Weaker candidates failed to focus on 'primarily', failing to evaluate the measures of the 880s against other factors. More could have been made of D as an overview, especially as many were over-dependent on C. The weakest candidates dumped God, learning and education in mini-essays as other factors. There was a brief point to be made here about morale, government and organisation, perhaps linked to diplomacy.

### Teacher Study Day

An AS Study Day on Alfred the Great will be held in conjunction with The British Museum at the Museum on Friday 2 December 2005.

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.14.

### The Normans in England 1066 – 1087

- (a) This reference was well known and explained effectively by most. The context and linkage were less well assured. It was part of an account which sees the devastation as the consequence of Danish invasion and English rebellion. Some made appropriate links to the later Domesday Book, to Norman terror tactics and to William's likely

- redistribution of land on a large scale and tighter control over the English. Weaker candidates just described the problems faced by William before devastation occurred. A few thought the North still under Viking control.
- (b) Responses here were more varied. The similarities were not always seen and the context was not fully appreciated, that A was commenting on the conquest itself, whilst C was soon after the conquest. Not all spotted that A focused on William, C upon regents, proud lords and Norman subordinates. The primary/secondary division was made much of when discussing provenance without further explanation. Many believed that a 12<sup>th</sup> century source must be secondary. Stock evaluation based on time and distance in this context is not helpful. More useful was the English flavour to both sources.
- (c) Most answers were satisfactory with the majority agreeing with the proposition (Norman rule provoking resistance rather than allaying it). They did not probe the sources sufficiently where there is evidence of external Danish invasion in D whilst B blames the English for innate rebelliousness. Those who did group and link between A and C and between B and D were able to discuss the contrasts and link to the question. The nature of Anglo-Saxon opposition to William and the consequent Norman responses needed a more precise understanding. Some used a format that was more suited to past questions on this and so found particular difficulties. Some speculated as to whether Norman rule was harsh and spent most of their time discussing that.

### **The First Crusade and its Origins 1073-99**

- (a) This was reasonably well tackled. Most demonstrated a clear understanding of the nature of the attitudes of those participating in the crusades by noting concepts such as 'remission of sins' and 'armed pilgrimages'. Some struggled with the context (the original call and promise of crusade made by Urban II). A minority of answers diverted into motivational issues, including economic, whilst some wrote irrelevantly about the various causes of death. There were many mistakes – a confusion of the People's Crusade with the First; misspelling Jerusalem; confusing penance with a plenary indulgence and thinking that Christ died in the Holy Sepulchre.
- (b) This was not especially well done. Some candidates set off on the wrong track immediately – 'the two sources have different opinions of the motives for the crusades...' and so wrote about motives rather than the problems encountered. Others got bogged down in an examination of the origins and development of the quarrel between Bohemond and Raymond. Many could see the problems of leadership in both B and D but few picked up on the other problems mentioned by D – dress, language, country strangeness and the inferred need to bond for such a diverse set of backgrounds. There was much stock evaluation – B was better because it was first hand (very few picked up that Raymond of Aguilers might be a key protagonist in the leadership problem referred to) and D was 'useless' because he was not there or writing far too long after the event, despite the comment that he was 'knowledgeable' in the introduction.
- (c) Though some candidates sought to argue a case, for many this question led to unfocused answers. They omitted to look at the issue of success. Others left the matter of decisive leadership at the gates of Antioch. Some thought all the sources backed the view that popular enthusiasm was the key to success and failed to probe further. Most saw popular enthusiasm as religious, with some excessive diversions into background 'causes' to make this point. Other factors such as Muslim disunity were rarely picked up on, perhaps to be expected in a 'more' ... 'than' type of question. Quite a few, rather awkwardly, argued that the sources saw God as their leader and his decisiveness gave them unity. This was a valid 11<sup>th</sup> century point but it could excessively distort the answer. Few qualified popular enthusiasm by casting doubt on D's assertion that fame, money and territory did not come into it. Where candidates did group appropriately and argue a case there was a very effective use of own knowledge, especially on 'decisive' leadership.

### Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2581/01

Although not such a high standard as 2580, the candidature for 2581 was an able one, a distinct improvement on January's entry, although the estimated grades were down 1.5% at A and 1% at A-C compared to Summer 2004. The order of popularity was unchanged: Q2, closely followed by Q3, with then a sharp drop in numbers to Q1, then Q4 with only a minority attempting Q5. One letter of complaint was received about all of Question 4.

### The Wars of the Roses 1450-85

- (a) Although surprisingly few mentioned the Hundred Years War by name most provided relevant information about its end, sometimes in excessive detail. A minority concentrated either on the events of 1450 or 1470-71. The main weakness here was linkage in the way the reference was used within the source. The question required an explanation of the link between the end of foreign war and the outbreak of civil strife, the latter term not always understood. Candidates should always read on to appreciate how a phrase is used. The link was clearly set out in the first six lines and was, after all, why Vergil refers to the end of the war.
- (b) Some effective comparisons were seen, although a fair number compared the wrong sources, B and C, instead of B and D. As it was possible to use C relevantly, it was decided that a properly focused comparison using one unspecified source could be given some credit. Many candidates provided a general comparison of the sources instead of focusing on the question's wording. The two sources show opposing 'attitudes to Richard's claim to the throne' and this should have been the central point. Only stronger answers discussed provenance and reliability. Relatively few, for instance, noted that, since B is from an indictment (not a well understood term) for treason drawn up, probably at the behest of Margaret of Anjou, by the 'Parliament of Devils' it was expected that it would throw the book at Richard. Most recognised differences, better ones found some similarities in Richard's claim, but many found 'attitudes to' difficult and did not focus on this as much as on basic similarity and difference. A few were confused by the last line of D, thinking that York was descended from Richard II.
- (c) Weaker candidates were misled by 'civil strife' to comment on vague disorder and lost the opportunity to write about the actual actions of York and others. Most however were knowledgeable about the causes of strife in the 1450s but found it difficult to focus on the 'restless ambition' of Richard of York as opposed to rebellions inspired by him. There are clear references to aspects of this in all the sources. Some simply dismissed it on the grounds there were other causes. 'Main' was not addressed. Candidates often missed the obvious opportunities for assessing the quality of the evidence given. Is A, written in Henry VII's reign, a king who had won his crown from Yorkists, fair in pinning the blame for the feud between York and Somerset entirely on York and his 'outrageous lust for the crown'? Many candidates often provided knowledge to argue that Henry VI was the real cause of civil strife – a sensible alternative explanation to pursue. Another useful line pursued by some was to note that York's behaviour during and after Henry's breakdown suggested that he did not aim for the crown but simply to be given what he regarded as his rightful place in government (a view suggested in the much under-used source C).

### The German Reformation 1517-30

- (a) This was done reasonably well by most who referred to Frederick the Wise and had a fair knowledge of the extent of his support of Luther. Some suggested Philip of Hesse, but only a minority of them noted that his support really dates from a few years later. Most struggled with princes, failing to realise that a brief sentence on princely-imperial relations would have made evaluative sense here. Linkage was a weakness for most. The introduction tells us that it was a report from the Diet of Worms, a point noted by comparatively few. The source itself indicates that princely support encouraged Luther

to stick by his opinions and undermine the papal and imperial bans, a point little noted by candidates. Contextual support was commonly provided in the form of references to Frederick's keeping Luther safe in the Wartburg after the Diet. Providing appropriate contextual support requires careful attention to dating: neither imperial elections of 1519, (dwelt on by many) nor the Wartburg 'safety period' nor the Peasants' and Knights' Wars provided much support. None could have been what Contarini meant. A good example of a response to this question is given in the general comments under Q(a).

- (b) Answers to this were rather mixed. Most candidates focused on the content, with few making useful reference to the provenance and noted that both sources suggested that Luther was willing to make peace. However by taking the source at face value they missed much that an awareness of provenance should suggest. Better answers drew attention to the conditional nature of his statements, particularly in Source C. Only a sensible few were able to see that 'your unwise and disastrous representative' was hardly a conciliatory statement to publish if your intent was to make peace with the Pope. Only the best answer realised that willingness to accept correction by the words of the Bible amounted to denying papal authority and proclaiming *sola scriptura*. Few understood the significance of the contexts, linked to different dates, or that 'A' came from one of his books/pamphlets of 1520 but was writing of 1518. Some answered it was a letter to the Pope. A key weakness was in not mentioning what type of document each was. It clearly led some candidates to take Luther at face value in answering the question. This is an example of a candidate dealing with this problem:

*'Luther wrote the Tract shown in Source A because of the way he was treated by his enemies such as Cajetan and Eck and shows no attempt to make peace with Catholicism. Source C, on the other hand, is written after Charles' condemnation, with the purpose again of trying to suggest he is a peacemaker but this is limited by the evidence of his Tracts of 1520 in which he denies papal authority.'*

- (c) Most candidates found plenty of evidence in the sources to support the claim. Most, too, recognised that Source B does not support it, though many picked up only one of the two explanations it provides for failure to reach a settlement – Luther's stubbornness and the support of the Princes. Comparatively few realised that Source A and, especially C can be used both for and against the statement, since both, when read in context, can be seen as showing Luther as equally to blame. Evaluation of the sources was rather weak. Most candidates provided own knowledge (based around Eck at Leipzig and the treatment of the Bull of Excommunication) but sometimes it was irrelevant because it concerned events after 1521. Candidates would have been helped if they could name authors – 'Erasmus in D argues that....' is much more effective than 'Source D says.....'

### 3 Mid Tudor Crises 1540-58

- (a) Whilst a significant number got the reference completely wrong, identifying the rebellion as the western rebellion or with the usual geographical muddle, most candidates recognised that this referred to the suppression of Ket's rebellion, but knowledge of this rebellion distracted many from the context of the reference – Warwick/Northumberland's increasing power and influence and its consequence for Somerset. Instead they described the causes of the rebellion and results of the 'notable victory' for the rebels. This may have been because the whole source was not read carefully before starting to write but even those who began by copying out the steer did not always grasp the link adequately. It was worrying that so few picked up on 'notable'. Some concentrated on the latter part of the source (Lady Jane Grey) and diverted irrelevantly whilst others similarly diverted by wrongly attempting evaluation of provenance which led them to a Catholic view on the Lady Jane Grey coup in 1553. What follows is an example of putting the right material together:

*'The 'notable victory outside Norwich' was the defeat of the rebels from Ket's rebellion in 1549. The original 1,800 men sent to defeat the rebellion under the Marquess of Northampton had deserted so Northumberland was sent with 12,000 troops (with later reinforcements of 1,000 foreign mercenaries) to defeat the 16,000 strong rebel forces who had taken Norwich. The rebels initially were on the strategically placed Mousehold Heath outside Norwich but withdrew to the valley, where they were defeated, 3,000 being killed. Northumberland managed to control his troops well so proceedings after were very legal (only 49 rebels were executed and there was no looting). This victory gave him the popularity and military strength to overthrow Protector Somerset so that he could 'control both the King and the Kingdom'.*

Candidates should also note that the rebellion was named after its leader, Robert Ket; it is not 'the Ket's rebellion' as many seemed to think.

- (b) There were a number of points of detailed comparison which many candidates successfully identified, especially the similar remarks about the council and the contrast between the 'gentle approach' mentioned in 'A' and the charge of 'malicious and evil government' in B. However, candidates do need to read carefully when making comparisons of detail: a number saw the word 'evil' in both sources and claimed a similarity, even though in A it is applied to the rebels, not Somerset. Many candidates drew attention to the different tone of the two sources and sensibly tried to explain this by discussing provenance and date. Comparatively few, however, made the point that Source B simply reports a proclamation by Warwick and others (a source within a source) who were therefore the real authors of the attack on Somerset, not Grafton whom the weaker considered to be running a newspaper ('The Chronicle') variously claimed by whole Centres to be either read by all or not for public consumption. There is no point in speculating on the views of 'a contemporary' when all that he does is to describe what others do. Few picked up on the references to lavish spending on buildings as a criticism of his rule. Many took the 'attacks on Somerset' to mean attacks described in the sources rather than the way in which the sources attacked him.
- (c) There were many possible strands to this and examiners did not expect candidates to cover all of them in the time available. They were, however, disappointed when they did not use their own knowledge to draw attention to economic and religious factors in political instability. In analysing the sources, many candidates failed to focus sufficiently on 'boundless ambition', instead taking the question as meaning simply 'How far were Somerset and Northumberland responsible for political instability?' Some, by contrast, made a valid distinction with regard to Somerset between his ambition and his policies. Others made a useful distinction between Somerset and Northumberland, arguing that the latter, who comes across in the source as more ambitious actually brought stability after the instability of Somerset's Protectorate. A surprising number of candidates, however, ignored the reference to the Lady Jane Grey plot in Source D and the short lived instability after Edward's death that resulted from the changes in the succession. Thoughtful context gave added value to factual accounts, such as this conclusion:
- 'Without a doubt Somerset and Northumberland were ambitious men; this was almost a requirement for their job. Somerset, however, made a number of very important political mistakes that led to unrest. And was either man truly exceptional in his actions? The Tudor Court was rife with factional disputes and power-gathering. It should hardly be surprising that two men seized their chance to take power.'*

The phrase 'the government of the Lord Protector' in Source B frequently caused difficulty when candidates interpreted it as a separate body of people rather than an abstract noun. Those who realised Source B and C gives evidence of the ambitious behaviour of Northumberland as well as Somerset made a valuable point. There was much stock evaluation of provenance of the 'private' letter, public 'chronicle' without any



development of this. What follows shows a good Band 1 source based attempt to argue the issues, using own knowledge to extend and enrich:

*'Overall the sources do imply that the ambition of first Somerset and then Northumberland did cause political instability in the year 1547 – 53. Sources B and C, in particular, cite Somerset's personal ambition as the cause of instability in the light of the various rebellions of 1549 and then his plot to overthrow his successor the Duke of Northumberland. There is certainly evidence to support this if one considers Somerset's attempt to maintain power in 1549 when he took Edward VI with him to Windsor, which was effectively seen as kidnap. In the case of the Duke of Northumberland's ambition Source D firmly notes that he was the cause of considerable instability over the issue of Edward's successor in 1553. The Duke can certainly be seen to have had an agenda as he placed his daughter-in-law the protestant Lady Jane Grey as the King's successor. Many historians argued that this caused the most serious threat to the stability of the Tudors, and it was the nearest that the monarchy came to a crisis, as it provoked active Catholic outrage.*

*However it is important to note when looking at Source D that it was written by a Catholic at the time, and therefore a man who wishes to highlight the misdemeanours of a Protestant Regent during Protestant rule. In addition many historians argue that Northumberland did not cause much political instability at all during his rule as Lord Governor of the Privy Council. This can be supported by the fact that he ended the unpopular wars in France and used Parliament more frequently than Somerset to legitimise Acts of Law that were passed. In addition it can be argued that by listening to the increasingly opinionated Edward and working with his council Northumberland actually created political stability. Importantly there were no significant rebellions or uprisings during his rule.*

*In terms of Somerset's ambition Source A supports the case against it causing political instability. The source supports the view that it was, in fact, his more selfless style of rule that led to political instability. The traditional view of Somerset amongst historians was that he had good intentions and cared for the poor and this source seems to support this. This discredits the idea of a personally, boundlessly ambitious man causing political instability. This can be supported by his abolition of torture and the fact that he did not use the Treason Laws during his reign. This was arguably what caused political instability. Others argue that the existence of Regents rather than 'real' Tudor Monarchs was bound to cause political instability regardless of their personal ambitions'.*

It is also worth noting here that candidates write very vaguely about religion under Edward and many are confused. Although the situation is confused it is worth pointing out that Somerset did know what he believed – he was an Protestant. People were told what to believe – there was an Act of Uniformity. The 1549 Prayer Book was Reformed, that is why the weaker rebels disliked it. Protestants did not rebel about religious changes - Ket's rebels would have liked a better standard of clerical behaviour and learning, but they would not have rebelled on that account alone.

#### **4 The English Civil War 1637 - 1649**

- (a) There was some chronological confusion here (placing the source after the 2<sup>nd</sup> civil war) and candidates found this difficult to answer satisfactorily. Many failed to take the obvious line of explaining what the source meant by 'King Charles' wickedness' and those who did often referred to grievances from the 1630s which had already been dealt with, perhaps because these were more clearly in breach of parliamentary privileges, rather than the charge that he was responsible for the First Civil War. There

was also a tendency to regard the source as a premature call for Charles' trial. The source itself should have provided candidates with sufficient clues to what the Levellers actually were calling for at this stage. Many overstated the influence of the Levellers in the Army in July 1646, failing to appreciate the war had only just ended. The introduction and date should have indicated that this source represented the view of a radical minority. Many, both here and in (c) wanted to force the Levellers into a religious context when this source presents a purely secular political argument. Others were determined to write about the franchise, again not mentioned here. The following is an answer that tried to deal with the sources with a good idea of context presented in an explanatory manner in an explanatory manner:

*'The Leveller leaders wish for the House of Commons to make a statement to the people of the Kingdom about Charles and all of the negative things he has done. They do not wish to lay the blame at his 'evil counsellors' as many at the time and certainly in the past had wished to do. This was an extremely radical approach to the situation and one that only a few members of the Commons would have wished to take. They still wished for a compromise with the King and few could imagine government without him. Even as late as autumn 1647 the search for a settlement was taking place. If this statement from the Commons had been made then all hope of settlement would most probably have been lost'.*

- (b) In contrast this was usually very well done. The sources provided a number of points of detail for direct comparison, for example 'going to London'. The crux lay in the dates and many saw that Source C showed how far the tactics outlined in A had been followed. Many also made successful use of the fact that A was a letter to the Queen and C a public response to the Newcastle Propositions. Most candidates focused on tactics – but outlook was largely overlooked. What follows is a good example of comparison in context which gained Band 1:

*'It is evident that Charles' main tactic in this period was to delay for as long as possible his answer to the proposed Newcastle propositions. He did this because he believed given time the many branches that had combined to defeat him in the 1<sup>st</sup> Civil War would divide due to conflicting opinions of the situation. Source A was written in July 1646 and it directly suggests that Charles was planning to delay his answer. As Source C, the King's third answer to the Newcastle propositions, was presented in May 1647 it is clear that this delaying tactic worked.*

*The Sources compliment each other in terms of provenance as both sources come directly from Charles I. The contrast in provenance is that Source A is a letter to his wife whilst Source C is a direct address of the Commons. The word conscience is in both sources and is crucial for understanding the King's tactics through this period. As he had lost the 1<sup>st</sup> Civil War, Charles was in a position that meant he could only truly regain power if the victors divided and gave him a chance to steal back the power of the personal rule. The matter would have been on his conscience as Charles believed he had made sufficient concessions to the Long Parliament in 1641. The biggest of these concessions being his favourite, Strafford, who was executed in 1641. Therefore declaring to Parliament that to accept the Newcastle propositions would be a loss of conscience would have to be accepted and therefore giving him more time.*

*However, the Sources do also hold some contrasting elements which ultimately show how the pressure from Parliament had to be appeased. 'I*

*must delay as long as possible a complete rejection of them' is what was said by the King to his wife in Source A. However, 10 months later the King had agreed to few aspects of the Newcastle propositions. 'He will conform the Presbyterian government'. This shows that the King had to appease Parliament in order to keep the negotiations open. With both Sources A and C, juxtaposed, it becomes clear that Charles I used delaying tactics. The provenance of the Sources clarifies this as ten months had passed between the King's first suggestion of his tactics and his third attempt to continue negotiations further to give himself more time. The King appeased Parliament by making some concessions with every answer. However, one thing the King had resolved never to lose from his prerogative was control of the Militia. This is evident in Source C'.*

- (c) Responses here were mixed. Most candidates picked up the clear references to religion in Sources C and D, though some did not fully understand the differences between the army and Parliament. Fewer understood that Charles was perhaps referring to religion in A when he talked of 'loss of conscience'. Source B was not well handled by most. Many regarded the Levellers as a religious sect whereas their aims, as illustrated in B, were political. There was a general failure to appreciate that this Source was a pointer to an alternative explanation for failure to achieve political settlement in 1646-47. The Sources also provided a clear pointer to another line of argument, that the main problem was Charles himself. More candidates did make this point. The question was also specifically about 1646-47 so that references to the Second Civil War, usually via references to the Engagement with the Scots in December 1647 and the 'Vote of No Addresses' were therefore irrelevant. Only the very best candidates were able to reach a clear judgement on the question of the relative importance of factors. Most resorted to assertion. Many claimed the Army wanted to remove the King far earlier than the first recorded remarks to this effect. The significance of the Putney debate was also problematical for some, as was the range of religious divisions. It made a great difference if candidates briefly described the situation in 1646-47 – that the 1st Civil War was over with the King in the hands of Parliament and gave some context on issues such as the Covenant. Interpretation and use of the Sources was then made so much easier. This is an extract of an answer showing how cogent comments on the Sources can be made in the light of good knowledge:

*'Sources C and D provide the strongest support for the importance of religious divisions in scuttling any settlement. Source C reveals that Charles will not tolerate the existence of Presbyterianism for ever – he only gives them three years. Source D reveals how the politicised zeal of the New Model Army disrupted any chance of a settlement as in 1647, as a result of lack of indemnity and back-pay, they became another party in an already complicated political scene, one grimly set in the belief that God's Providence rides with them, therefore whatever they believe is right and compromise is out of the question. This is ironically similar to Charles' own belief in the royal prerogative...'*

### **Louis XIV's France 1661 – 1693**

- (a) This was generally poorly answered. Some candidates appeared not to understand the word 'pious'. Despite the clear indication in the introduction that the Source is about religious life at Versailles, many misinterpreted 'endless ceremonies' as referring to Court ceremonial in general. Few picked up the clear reference to 'calculating priests' – a point which could have been appropriately used to link the reference to the Source. The most common approach was to relate the reference to Louis' views of divine right, relevant but not central to the explanation. Some tried to bring in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, straining the Source somewhat. What follows tries to set Louis' own view beside that of the writer:

*'Louis XIV was often referred to as 'the Most Christian King'. He believes that he was descendent from the Christian King Clovis. It can be interpreted from Source C that the Court had become bored with the ritual which took place at Versailles. However, while analysing the passage it must be taken into consideration that the German princess had to convert from Calvinism to Catholicism. Louis was determined to create 'un foi', 'one faith' and he centred his image around his faith'*

Although evaluation of the sources is not a requirement in this instance a comment, briefly and properly used, added explanatory weight to 'imagines he is pious'.

- (b) Nearly all answers pointed to the contrast between the positive view of Source A and the negative one in Source B and many picked out appropriate details to contrast. It was when they attempted to explain these opposing views that candidates ran into trouble. Many suggested that Source A was unreliable because Madame de Sévigné was only at Court for one day ignoring the information in the introduction that she was often at Court. Others argued that Source B was unreliable because, as an Italian, Visconti was jealous and prejudiced against Louis – again ignoring the information in the introduction. Hardly anyone commented on similarities, particularly the grand scale of life at Versailles. One candidate was clearly carried away by the party atmosphere of Madame de Sévigné's account, claiming that guests were rowed in gondolas listening to tapes of 'The Sound of Music' playing anachronistically in the background. What follows is a brief but focussed and genuine comparison:

*Visconti and Sévigné, writing contemporaneously, disagree as to the effect Versailles had on its residents and visitors. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the Dauphine whom Visconti mentions was a full-time resident, while Sévigné merely visited, as her letter shows. The excerpts also discuss different aspects of the palace and court, which may be another reason for their differing perspectives. At any rate, Sévigné, in writing an account of a brief visit, concentrates on society, and seems to have spent much of her time indoors "gambling" and in the "royal apartments" noting their lavish furnishings. In contrast, Visconti directs the reader's attention to the outer world – one of construction, canals, lakes, sand and smelly swamps. They both concede that the palace was a vast undertaking; de Sévigné was grateful for the space "so one did not feel the heat unduly" and Visconti comments that a million francs have only sufficed for a tenth of the whole. When Sévigné observed the artificial waterworks from a gondola, she found the effect magical; Visconti's view includes foul, polluted waters. Sévigné was a staunch royalist and her views should be doubted, perhaps, while Visconti's attitude is likely to be more objective.*

- (c) Most saw Sources B and C as support for the statement and A and D as opposed. The better answers noted that all except Source A can be used to provide evidence both for and against it. Own knowledge was used by many candidates to oppose the statement by referring to Court ceremonial and to the work of leading artists and craftsmen. Many also used their knowledge that Versailles took many years to build to put Source B into context, although few noted he was writing early on in his stay. A common misreading was the assertion that Source C describes Louis as a tyrant. It was in fact referring to the ritual of life at Versailles. It would be useful in producing an argument for this question to make some comment on what Louis' 'sense of his own glory' may have been, in order to make a judgement, for example:

*'Louis wanted to be seen as the State, L'état c'est moi' and 'Most Christian King' which he fought the Emperor Leopold for and also the 'Sun King'...'*

Quite a few failed to comment that three of the sources are really critical of Versailles as a reflection of *gloire*, although it is possible to argue either case from all the Sources. Many used the Sources as a mine of information, forgetting to evaluate. The following is a good example of brief and concise evaluation which introduces some own knowledge and is based upon common sense:

*'Liselotte's (Source C) evidence on Versailles as a vehicle for Louis' glory must be seen in the light that she was the wife of 'Monsieur' Louis' brother, and was clearly unhappy at Court. Forced conversion to Roman Catholicism upon marriage to an alleged homosexual would not have been conducive to happiness, nevertheless her evidence concurs with that of Visconti and La Bruyère, despite venom reserved for 'calculating priests and old women', the latter possibly referring to Madame de Sévigné in A.'*

### Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2582/01

Again, approx 80% answering Q7 on Nazi Germany. A long way behind in the rank order were (as in previous years) Q3, Q6, Q4, Q2 with a clear drop to Q1 and finally a small number tackling Q5. The estimated grades were down 1.5% at A. One letter of complaint was received about Source B in Question 3 while two letters of complaint were received about Question 3(c). One letter was received about Question 4(a), another about Source A in Question 7 and another about all of Question 7.

#### 1 The Origins of the French Revolution 1774 - 92

- (a) There were some excellent responses to the question but weaker candidates clearly had little idea of who the Duke of Brunswick was. The Manifesto was better known, if not always explained properly. Most struggled to achieve linkage, doing so mainly through the threat to Paris, a useful route for many. Most candidates were able to grasp the context and, in the absence of explanatory information, made much of it.
- (b) Again some excellent responses were seen, but there was also much generalised comparison without the sharp focus required on 'motive'. Few could appreciate the difference either in detail (C's reference to Lafayette as a trigger) or in breadth (with the generalised and vague reference to 'glorious' motives in Source B). Provenance also proved a problem for many. A surprising number failed to pick up on the authorship of B, Robespierre, whilst C caused much confusion. Was it the *Times* writing, in which case the evidence was dismissed on account of prejudice, or, as most argued, was it an Englishman whose evidence was dismissed on the same grounds? Careful reading of the introduction would have revealed a Frenchman writing in the *Times*. Whilst probably royalist ('no wrong ... the Royal Family'), the detail might suggest it is the better evidence, but both are highly tendentious in their approach to motive.
- (c) The vast majority of the responses accepted the hypothesis in the question but some did blame the King and his family, especially the Queen, picking up on suggestions and hints in A, B and D. A few pointed at Radical activity, suggested in A, B and C, as manipulating popular protest. Own knowledge was often lacking as few developed the suggestions in C and especially D that war might have triggered the fall of the monarchy. Some used own knowledge irrelevantly, deploying pre-1789 information (sometimes back to the American War) which had little or no bearing on a question clearly focused on the summer of 1792. Others drifted into 'why was there popular unrest?', hence a long-term approach that usually diverted or 'How much popular unrest was there?', rather than establishing the relative importance of unrest v other factors. Such candidates divorced themselves from the sources and their evidence.

#### 2 The Condition of England 1832 - 53

- (a) This provoked a very mixed response, dependant on candidates' own knowledge. The 1848 Act was reasonably well known by most and explained well (in some cases with succinct accuracy). Less well known was the term 'permissive'. Many ignored it, as they

- did the obvious linkage of the uneasy compromise argued by Source D of which the permissive aspect was a part. However, for some candidates it was the other way around – permissive was well known but the details of the Act and what it set out to do were very much thin on the ground. A few diverted into a discussion of Chadwick.
- (b) Done reasonably well by most, largely by comparing the content which revealed a considerable difference in both attitudes and responses. Weaker candidates did not use the steer in the question (attitude/response) to help them organise their comparison. The main weakness here was a failure to look at provenance. A key similarity was the religious background of both authors. Unfortunately, those who did pick up on this were thrown by it, making some rather silly comments on the difference between Oxford and the Midlands as a possible explanation. Some misread B to be a sermon. Not many picked up on the dates, linking them to recent cholera epidemics, despite references to ‘the recent fatal diseases’ in A and the title of the pamphlet in B. More pleasing was that a fair few picked up that the more ‘scientific’ response in B was in fact inaccurate, promoting a miasma theory on the origins of cholera that was later proved wrong.
- (c) This was much less effectively done, although a few excellent responses were seen along with many adequate ones. Despite the strong steer in the question weaker candidates struggled with the idea of principled issues versus practical ones as the more important delaying factor in health reform. Of the two, perhaps predictably, principle led astray more than practical. Some simply and separately presented the two issues, using the sources as illustration and missing a rather obvious grouping of A and C, which stressed principle (religion, individualism, *laissez faire* and the sanctity of private property) and B and D which stressed practical issues (the difficulty of cleanliness, engineering, cost etc.) Those who opted for such self-contained sections failed to compare and assess relative importance, crucial to the question. Provenance was a key way of doing this as clearly C, Chadwick, had an agenda, part of which was the 1842 Report given here, whilst A and B come from partisans of two very different approaches, B hardly being typical. D contains a balance of evidence as part of its interpretation of compromise. Others took off into essays on Chadwick, or cholera, or just provided general descriptions of poor health, making only token reference to question or sources. Own knowledge tended to be diversionary, rather than aiding an assessment of provenance or establishing the relative importance of Health on governments’ agendas. Some long and detailed plans were seen from some Centres, frequently longer than the rather brief essays that then followed.

#### Teacher Study Day

An AS/A2 Study Day on Poor Law will be held in conjunction with the National Trust at The Workhouse, Southwell, Nottinghamshire on Thursday 2 February 2006.

The day focuses on issues relevant to this AS option and to the Unit 2591 synoptic theme ‘Poor Law to Welfare State’.

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.17.

### 3 Italian Unification 1848 - 70

- (a) Most candidates knew a fair amount about Villafranca, the war and Napoleon III’s motivation. If they fell down it was on linkage and context, especially the point that Napoleon is here trying to sell an unexpected peace that betrayed Plombières and Piedmont, hence the rather spurious claims that Italy will become a nation as a Papal confederacy. This was, after all, *Le Moniteur*, and ‘spin’ was in the air. It proved a good example of the need to read the whole source to get a feel from how the quotation fits with the overall comment. A minority of weak candidates confused Plombières with Villafranca.
- (b) Many responses were excellent but a fair few struggled to establish a detailed comparison and unless they worked hard there was a tendency to relapse into sequence. The sources provided a lot to work on so the opportunity was there (their

shared 'Englishness', the focus on youth, delusions of strength, the minority status of hot-headed nationalists in contrast to some clear shifts explained by dating, and the differences between Venetians and Tuscans). Provenance was neglected, both similarities (educated Englishmen likely to be sympathetic to moderate Nationalism) and differences (a journal of reflection as opposed to a piece of diplomatic assessment). Weaker candidates struggled with the concept of a diplomat, their function and, in this case, that Fane (D) was accredited to the Austrian Court. Without picking up on date and an awareness of changes between 1850 (the aftermath of the 1848 Revolutions) and 1863 (post the proclamation of a united Italy minus Rome and Venetia) it was difficult to explain changes in tone, emphasis and attitudes of the Italian public.

- (c) We are very apologetic about the wrong date given in the attribution to the Cartoon. It is certainly not January 1858, but it has proved difficult to track down a precise dating. It probably dates from January 1859 when the existence of Plombières was made known Treaty but December 1858 cannot be ruled out as rumours (correctly) began to circulate that an agreement had been signed. All examiners were alerted to watch for any problems that candidates might encounter. All reported back that no candidate showed any signs of having suffered as a result. We were very fortunate that, for once, the date was not an issue – it had no bearing on the answer to sub-question (c). It was there only to provide evidence on Austria's weakness or otherwise in the run up to the 1859 War. This was how candidates approached it. Many took it at face value, evidence for the weakening of Austria, but better ones realised it was making a predictive point about Austrian power and commented that it took two powers, in secret conference, one a great power, to hold her down.

Another general point to make is that we did not expect any knowledge about Austria's internal situation, nor did we get any. We did, however, expect an assessment of Austria's position in Italy and of the general diplomatic scene that so clearly conspired against her – because that is clearly specified in the specification. This is largely what we got.

On this paper, the focus is always the sources. Most candidates produced some very reasonable assessments of Austria's ability to resist unification, the typical answer focusing on strength in 1848/49 (A), continued military strength even in and after 1859 (with France coming to terms at Villafranca in C) followed by decline at the hands of growing foreign powers – France, Prussia (an opponent in the 1860s), Russia (indifferent after the Crimean War) and Britain (C and D). A typical conclusion was to argue that, on her own, Austria could have sustained her position in Italy (although few used the evidence in D on this) but could not do so in the face of hostile great powers prepared to conspire and intervene to weaken her. Some candidates, usually better ones, consistently argued for Austrian strength, citing Italian divisions (easily elaborated on given the remarks in A), the success of Austrian generals and admirals (the Battle of Lissa) and the Quadrilateral system in the North. They also used the unreliability and propagandistic nature of the cartoon in B, Napoleon's apparent abandonment of the cause in C, another piece of propaganda, and the 'wait and see' approach of D. There is much in the latter that would suggest war with Austria in the 1860s was still the preserve of a radical few and that without Prussian diplomacy, Austria would have retained her toe hold in Italy. Own knowledge was often impressive but it could lead the well briefed away from the sources, certainly their evaluation. What follows is an example of a very good response, Band I, where the candidate just about managed to contain own knowledge from eclipsing the sources which are enriched and commented on by that knowledge:

*There are a number of indications that Austria was indeed too weak to prevent Italian Unification. This can be seen in the 1859 war when Austria was twice defeated, first at Magenta on the 4<sup>th</sup> June and then again at Solferino three weeks later. However it is important to note that these victories were not at the hands of Italians, but at the hands of the French. Indeed, more Italians died*

fighting on the Austrian side than on the Italian side. Austria's strength changed over time. In 1848-9 after the Fall of Metternich on the 13<sup>th</sup> March 1848 there were a number of risings, in Milan and Venice most significantly. While the Austrians were initially driven out of Milan as, by the 20<sup>th</sup> March the countryside had risen, they took the city back on 6<sup>th</sup> August after defeating Piedmont at Custoza on the 25<sup>th</sup> July. The Austrians, when put under pressure, withdrew to their set of 4 fortresses, the quadrilateral, and the Piedmontese proved too weak to defeat them there. However, by 1859 the story was different and it took Napoleon getting cold feet to stop the war. In the negotiations following the war, at Zurich in November and then at Turin in March 1860, the Austrians were indeed shown to be too weak. By 1866, when they lost Venetia, they were once again powerless. However in all cases it was French, not Italian, power which bowed Austria.

Source B shows the weakness and impotence of Austria in 1858 as Italy and France are seen to be 'clipping its claws'. The fact that Austria is tied to the stake shows that it has no power to prevent Italy and France from reducing its power, symbolised here by the removal of its claws and royal plumage. Source D seems to slightly contradict source B in that it treats the claim that 'Italy has an army strong enough to defeat Austria in battle' with suspicion, as it says that the supporters of this view 'are numerically small'. However, this apparent disagreement between sources B and D can once again be explained by the fact that France are not involved in source D and they are in source B and therefore Austria is reduced in power by France, not Italy. Source C shows that Italy was perhaps once more less involved than France as it talks of the treaty of Villafranca at which Cavour was not consulted. The existence of the quadrilateral however gave Austria strength in Italy. During the course of Italian Unification this set of fortress towns was never defeated. Therefore militarily it could be argued that Austria was not too weak to prevent Italian Unification, it merely withdrew from choice.

Source A talks of the failed revolution in Milan which Austria put down and shows therefore that in 1848 the Austrians were strong enough to defeat Italy which they did not only in '48 at Custoza but also in March '59 at Novara once more. The ten year gap between the writing of source A and the composition of sources B and C saw an increase in French involvement in Italian Unification through not only the January '58 treaty at Plombières – source B – but also the 1859 war – source C. The ten years however also saw a decline in Austrian power on the continent. Metternich fell in 1848 and from then on the power of Austria began to diminish. Therefore by 1866 when Austria ceded Venetia – the roots of which are seen in source D – they were no longer strong enough to maintain power in the Italian peninsula.

It would seem therefore that Austria was, by 1859, too weak to resist the Unification of Italy, if it was attacked by France. Piedmont, while shown in source B in the form of the Prime Minister, Cavour, and the King, Victor Emmanuel II, was not it would seem powerful enough to expand into Austrian territory by themselves. They failed in 1848 when Victor Emmanuel's father Charles Albert pronounced that Italy would 'fare da sé' and it was through French diplomacy and military power in 1859/60 and in 1866 that they managed to achieve Unification. Indeed Italy's



*army was similarly defeated on land – Custoza – and sea – Lissa – in 1866. Therefore it seems that while Austria was indeed too weak to resist French power which led to Unification, it was not weaker than Italy itself.*

#### 4 The Origins of the American Civil War 1848 - 61

- (a) Answers to this were very mixed. Many candidates looked at the general key issue (economics grievances and secession) and the sentence that follows this reference in Source C. They thus explained the reference wholly in relation to economic issues – the abuse of economic power by the North. As a result they missed the fundamental constitutional point that Davis was making and its context and linkage, a justification and response to Lincoln's accusation of southern rebellion. Davis argued that the South could legally secede because they had only delegated power to Congress on a conditional and voluntary basis. Now that they faced minority status and abuse of those powers (on slavery and the economy) they could withdraw. Although a majority had some grasp of this, few explained it with clarity or spotted the linkage and context.
- (b) Candidates were more effective in their comparisons of content when they quite rightly commented on the similarities (as to be expected from two Southern commentators), but were less well attuned to compare provenance, the key to the differences between the two. This lay in the dates and the tone of both. Calhoun was speaking to the Senate in 1850, the tone is more matter of fact, a last testimonial read by another. Reagan was speaking to Congress in 1861, on the eve of Civil War. His points, whilst similar in the arguments used concerning economic injustice, are angry and accusatory. Many candidates were confined to Band III or below because their comparison was uneven.
- (c) There was a very wide spread of marks on this question. Many candidates used the sources as a mine and were content to plunder them purely for economic references, over-using A and B, plucking out what was available in C (and ignoring its comment on wider issues like slavery and the constitution) and misinterpreting D by reading the 'spirit of the age' to mean urban industrialisation rather than the 'freedom' Lowell intended. Own knowledge was very skeletal for most. Better candidates spotted the slavery issue as a possible 'main' issue and recognised that D pushed this further to equate freedom with power, both demographic and economic. They could also see the looming crisis over slavery in C where Davis corroborates Lowell's point about numbers and the point at which the South would be in a minority. Source B also hints at slavery when it refers to a crusade against the South's 'rights and institutions', but few seemed to spot this. Similarly, few made any basic evaluative links, such as pointing out that the only source where no reference is made to slavery comes from 1850. The three that refer to it are from 1861, the eve of southern secession. There seemed a particular reluctance to evaluate sources in this part (c). The best introduced the election of Lincoln as a prime cause or developed sectionalism as a factor. Economic issues were downplayed, with few using slavery as a link here – after all it was an economic institution. As always, many listed reasons for secession without establishing relative importance (the main reason), especially as provenance/evaluation were neglected, the obvious way of achieving this.

#### 5 The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell, 1877 - 93

Answers to this question were rather weak.

- (a) This was not well done, largely because few candidates seemed aware of what 'boycotting' actually was. Most tried to guess its general meaning with mixed success, weaker candidates had to resort to 'boycotting refers to boycotts'. Some claimed it was a tactic used by landlords to trap tenants or that peasants boycotted taxes. Linkage proved more successful as candidates could work it out as being part of a concerted programme by Davitt and the Land League to foment a Land War which was then difficult for the authorities to suppress given the 'legality' of tactics like boycotting. Few could go beyond this to look at its consequences for Parnell (a more difficult position) and for increasing the solidarity and effectiveness of tenant action.

- (b) This generated a lot of commentary on provenance and purpose but not much was particularly effective. There was much stock comment on the bias of the cartoon in B without its stereotypes being established, let alone its message that 'external' radical forces were tending to create likely support out of old ignorance and unrest. The peasant is mesmerised but restrained by the Church. In that sense most missed its similarity with A whose more measured, legal tone argues for a reluctance to revolt unless provoked by misgovernment. Most, surprisingly, struggled to interpret the cartoon, the detailed gloss of which made the points crystal clear. Similarly little was made of the context of A, a House of Commons Speech, whilst clearly many did not know of Isaac Butt despite the introduction which told candidates he was the founder of the Home Rule Party. An effective way of focusing comparisons would have been to look at the various key groups in Ireland and their propensity to rebellion (peasantry, Church, respectable citizens, landlords etc.) as revealed in A and B. This would then allow provenance to be assessed especially purpose (Butt's special pleading for Home Rule and stress on conservatism, ties and geography with an English popular magazine stereotyping in a hostile and almost racist tone). Judgement would then follow as to which is the better evidence for likely support of rebellion.
- (c) Most candidates attempted a relevant answer here but only a minority were able to offer a sharp and specific focus on the sources or find the relevant own knowledge to extend the discussion on political or economic problems on the major issue facing governments. Many gave up on the sources, contenting themselves with vague and token references. This enabled them to dump massive amounts of knowledge going back to the Famine and then to Gladstone's early reforms in the First Ministry. The minority of successful candidates argued that it was the use of economic and social issues by Irish politicians (Davitt and Parnell) for political purposes that posed the main problem. Here, Source D was particularly useful, especially given its semi-private status, and also Source B and C. Another successful route was to examine the political and economic references in all the sources, establishing priority (the main problem) through evaluation and provenance (possible exaggeration of political success in D, the balance of C where formidable and effective political leadership is contrasted with 'internal contradiction and jealousies', the differing messages of B with the explicit political purpose of A where no reference is made to social and economic issues). Own knowledge could also highlight the Second Land Act, the government's ability to deal with grievance and do deals with Parnell and prise him away from the Land League. Candidates floundered because their ability to grasp and apply some skills was limited, whilst own knowledge merely described the background or the cause of political or social unrest, not how governments prioritised their relative seriousness.

## 6 England in a New Century, 1900 - 18

- (a) This question was done well by most candidates. New Liberalism was clearly well understood and candidates were perhaps over-eager to explain its background (Boer War, Rowntree and new younger liberals) and subtleties rather than the concept itself. Some contrasted it briefly and with profit to Gladstonian Liberalism. Linkage and context were a little weaker with quite a few not realising that Churchill himself was a New Liberal at that stage. Certainly only a minority referred to the context of the 1906 Election. Weaker candidates struggled with 'collective organisation' and muddled New Liberalism with Socialism (missing the 'individual' incentive still crucial to the former).
- (b) Responses here were more mixed. Most were clearly aware that we were looking at a Liberal view of the 1911 Act in Source C and a Labour, Socialist or Fabian Socialist view in Source D. After that middling and weaker candidates struggled and began to misunderstand, especially Beatrice Webb in Source D (many appeared not to have encountered her). They either guessed her views or sank without trace. Provenance proved weak. Many gave up entirely on Source C, claiming vaguely that it was propaganda without thinking why it was – the need to put a New Liberal message across, its controversial contributory nature (vital to New Liberalism as opposed to Socialism), its limited nature and the restrictions as to who qualified. More attempted to

assess D but without a grasp of who the Fabians were and their plotting to achieve a fully funded state policy on the poor, or an awareness of the importance of how this was to be financed (full funding versus a contributory insurance that retained the element of self help initiative) they tied themselves in knots. There was confusion over Masterman (claimed by some to be a Labour MP) and very few seemed to know about the Minority Report on the Poor Law or about Lansbury. Few attempted a judgement as to which provided the better evidence despite the two different types of source presented for comparison, a poster and a diary, one with general and rather vague claims, the other with a more detailed, if one sided, discussion of the politics behind the 1911 Bill. What follows is a Band II response, an effective comparison but missing final judgement and an awareness of the Minority Report.

*Sources C and D are concerned with the Liberal National Health Insurance Act 1911. Source C is a poster produced by the Liberal Government promoting their new policy of social reform. The source is designed purely to attract more support for their reforms. Source C, like Source D, gives no indication of what the Act contains. They are more concerned with the impact it will have. Source D is the response of a leading socialist member of the Labour Party, Beatrice Webb. Her political position entails she is for a socialist state with considerable state intervention.*

*The sources do have similarities. Firstly they both consider the National Health Insurance Act 1911. Secondly both the sources appear to be for a Welfare State, however the motives for wanting social reform are different.*

*Source C is attempting to draw support from the poorer members of the electorate by promoting their Welfare State, however whether the Liberals believe as such in a welfare state as Labour Party members such as the author of Source D does is doubtful.*

*Source D states how '...the more we examine the Bill the less we like'. This could well be for two reasons, firstly the clash in motives which is strongly linked to the second, that the Liberals want to undermine the Labour Party to prevent them gaining too much support. The motive of the Liberal Party could well be to prevent the growth of the Labour Party. Whilst they are a united party and conducting social reform the support from the left is assured, the left have no reason to vote Labour. The author of Source D is strongly for state intervention because it constitutes the ideology of her party and she will therefore not be satisfied with the half hearted attempts of the Liberals which only serve to damage Labour.*

- (c) This was more successful as most candidates picked up on a better future for the working class and could discuss this using sources B and C. They then progressed to discuss more practical and electoral motives using Lloyd George in A and Beatrice Webb in D as evidence. Although many did not make a judgement, leaving the two separate aims to be judged by the examiner, a more able minority were able to introduce other possibilities using own knowledge such as National Efficiency, race survival issues, the need to address the social revelations of Booth and Rowntree and the pressure and success of New Liberalism, the latter clearly in the sources and linked to a better future for the working classes. None referred to the aim of countering Conservative Tariff Reform. Many candidates penned themselves into a Band III by using the sources for reference. Few could attempt evaluation (such as A perhaps having a different audience to B, Liberal MPs rather than the public during an election, hence a different dimension to 'aim', or A, C and D all pointing to electoral politics with only B stating a case based around a reasoned case for a better working class future. Again, lack of evaluation bunched many responses into the middle of the Bands, accentuated by the same fault in (b). Rather surprisingly few attempted to back up their assertion that a

better working class future was the main aim by referring to any of the reforms up to 1914, or challenged it with references to their narrowness and limitations.

## 7 Nazi Germany 1933-45

Much has already been said about this question in the general comments, with advice on how to tackle it. Centres should read closely what is there.

- (a) Yet again candidates struggled with Bolshevism as a concept (given the number of past papers on which it has been set, that is extraordinary). Those who did know dealt with it reasonably competently but most missed the appropriate linkage and context – 1942, well into the war with Bolshevik Russia. Candidates preferred to discuss the Reichstag Fire, of only glancing relevance by 1942, or switch the comment onto the Jews (the essence of last summer's question) but referred to in the previous sentence. There was much circuitous comment – 'scare stories developed from Bolshevism' or 'Bolshevism produced scare stories'. Most breathed a sigh of relief when they saw Nazi Propaganda and talked at length about this, ignoring Bolshevik scare stories. There were long accounts of Goebbels, variously spelt, and of how propaganda methods may or may not have been successful. Linkage was shaky, few commenting on the White Rose's message that such stereotyping should be rejected, or its failure to get that message across. Some misread the introduction and stated that the Scholls were at an anti-Nazi rally rather than trying to rally anti-Nazi feeling. Overall explanation and linkage were, in many cases, limited.
- (b) Answers to this produced better marks, despite a significant amount of sequencing. Better candidates realised that they were not comparing like with like. Source B was summarising reports from across Germany on general morale whilst Source C was commenting on the bombing of Berlin. This enabled them to establish a difference and to look to provenance to assist in determining any reason for this or which was the better evidence. However many candidates, as they moved to do this, fell by the wayside. Stock evaluation was especially guilty. Many could not resist the lure of Nazi bias which renders any source useless. The Gauleiter was duly dismissed, despite providing very useful evidence on how Germans and especially party officials reacted during wartime. If the Gauleiter's evidence was accepted then a misreading of 'countrymen' led others from an appropriate path. It was taken by some to mean rural folk, thus creating a town/country divide which, whilst not wholly untrue, was not what Source B meant. Poor Christabel Bielenberg was even more blighted. Candidates seized on the date (1968) and pronounced senility or sought base motives (selling her book). A number of candidates assumed that because Bielenberg did not criticise the Nazis either she was completely overwhelmed by their propaganda (and cited the German unity she referred to as an example of *Volksgemeinschaft*) or that she supported them (a Nazi husband emerged from nowhere). As we cannot expect any own knowledge of her, the former was possible and did at least show some interpretation; the latter was just lazy thinking. Others thought C was a novel. A worrying but significant minority thought C was accusing the Germans of bombing their own cities, a successful but diabolical tactic as it united the German people.
- (c) Answers here were seriously undermined by a lack of own knowledge. Many candidates do not seem to have studied the war years, even in basic outline. As a result they were thrown back on to the sources and the generic hints provided there or they decided to press on regardless to discuss opposition and Hitler's popularity in the 1930s. Some very useful points could be made by looking at the White Rose and the Officer Class (A and D) pre-1939, if only to demonstrate that they were there before the war and remained minority groups that failed (most seemed unaware of this, or at least brushed it under the carpet in D). However, to go further than this was unwise as irrelevance quickly set in. Another major error was to drift into general commentary on opposition, moving out of focus on the extent of serious damage done to Hitler's popularity by the war. Most missed the 'serious' aspect, talking of popularity in a very general way and often assuming 'D' was speaking on behalf of the whole German people. Some introduced what they wanted to talk about – the issue of the Hitler Myth,

another way of either diverting back to the 1930s or of intruding on issues of only glancing relevance and which prevented focused comment on the question. Better answers argued for less popularity before the war than appeared to be the case, hence a less dramatic decline. Those with some knowledge argued for a wobble in popularity in 1938-39 followed by adulation between 1939 and 1941 and then, following Stalingrad, a progressive drop in popularity that had become serious by 1944-45. This could easily be illustrated by the sources. The best answers went either for balance, teasing out 'for and against points' in the sources (as in A and C) or for an argument that saw popularity maintained to the bitter end by Goebbels' loyal Total War Speech, the failure of the plots, the marginalisation of opposition, fear of the Nazis and of the prospect of Russian invasion and a fanatical Hitler Youth. Some argued for a clear party/Führer divide. Sources were referenced rather than evaluated by most (if only they had commented that A and D are not typical and refer to minorities). The sources would have repaid careful reading – the Scholls in Source A are arguing that most Germans 'blindly follow their leader' whilst Bielenberg in 'C' is observing that bombed Germans cooperate 'whatever their politics, whatever their belief', implying human bonding rather than support for the Nazis in some new-found unity. Source D on close reading is more concerned with traditional German honour than with the White Rose's ideological opposition.

## Units 2583/01-2584/01: English History Period Studies (AS)

### General Comments

Units 2583 and 2584 are identical in their aims and assessment objectives. The only difference is in the choice of Study Topics for Candidates. These general comments apply to answers in both.

The overall quality of the scripts was satisfactory. A high proportion of Candidates demonstrated sufficient understanding and knowledge and all examiners were pleased to read some scripts that reached an extremely high standard. On the other hand, some Candidates, albeit a minority, were ill-prepared for the examination and produced very poor work. These Candidates in particular are reminded of the fundamental requirements in the assessment of answers:

- (a) the **relevance**, accuracy and quantity of factual knowledge;
- (b) evidence of the exercise of **informed historical judgement** and **awareness of historical context**;
- (c) **effectiveness of presentation**: the ability to communicate arguments and knowledge in a clear, orderly fashion with maximum relevance to the Question set.

All Units require responses in continuous prose, and therefore include the assessment of quality of written communication. All of these qualities are tested at AS Level, an intermediate stage to A2. However, the most successful answers were already reaching standards that promised high marks at A2; the weakest were unsuccessful in all three aspects.

Most Candidates concentrated on explanations when writing their answers. The most successful supported these explanations with sound knowledge. In contrast, weaker answers were often vague or very general in their arguments and provided little supporting knowledge. Some Candidates were able to record knowledge but without much understanding, being unable to connect it to an argument. The most successful candidates made such links, using appropriate knowledge to support arguments or explanations.

The Comments on Individual Questions begin with statements about the Key Issue and associated Content on which Questions were based. Centres might wish to discuss these with Candidates when using the Mark Scheme as a help to teaching. Previous Reports have emphasised the need to give equal attention to each of the four Key Issues in a Study Topic. Study Topics that were tested in a previous examination should not be neglected. Question setters are very resourceful! They can derive a number of Questions from the same Key Issue. The requirement on examination boards is to test the whole of the Specification over a period of three to four years. The Questions must be fair. OCR's policy is that they must 'jump out' of the Specification. They must be of an appropriate AS (or A2) standard. The pair of Questions in a Study Topic must be broadly comparable with each other and with other Questions in the same and different Units. These comments do not reflect a major problem because groups of Candidates from most Centres answered both of the alternatives in each Study Topic. But some Centres produced answers to only one alternative Question, which suggests a restricted concentration on certain Key Issues.

The best noted key words, phrases or dates in their answers whereas the less successful responses were often more general, combining relevant and less relevant material. For example, Question 13(b) in Unit 2583 asked 'How widely supported was the Church of England at the time of Elizabeth I's death in 1603?' The repetition of Elizabeth I's death and 1603 was intended to make clear to Candidates that they should focus on the end of the reign but some limited their discussions to the early and middle years of the reign. In Unit 2583, Question 3(b) focused on Peel's aims 1841-46 but some wrote much more widely about his career. Most Candidates could suggest several reasons for a development but moderate answers often listed them whereas the more successful responses attempted to put them into some order of importance or priority.

Candidates are entitled to use any relevant material and argument to answer a Question. For example, they might get credit for using an appropriate parallel (as between the English Reformation and Lutheranism or between Asquith and Gladstone). But such comparisons should be made briefly, usually in a sentence. Candidates can use material learned in another Key Issue within a Study Topic. There can be no prohibitions on material apart from relevance but care is taken to base Questions on one Key Issue and the highest mark can be gained by answers that keep narrowly to the Content indicated for that Key Issue.

Most Candidates used their time effectively and very few scripts showed evidence that Candidates seemed to have run out of time. Forty five minutes are sufficient for even the best Candidate to write a very sound answer and it allows time to write a brief plan. Some weaker Candidates seem to have written for a much briefer period, perhaps pointing to the need for more practice in writing answers that are more extended than are required at GCSE. Some Candidates considered only one factor in an issue. For example, Unit 2583 Question 18(b) asked 'How far do you agree that Charles I lost the First Civil War (1642-46) because of his financial weakness?' but some answers dealt only with finance so they failed to consider 'How far ...?' this given factor was important.

### **Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2583/01**

Mean GCSE scores showed the candidature to be weaker than last summer. One complaint was received about Question 1(a) and another about Questions 18(a) and (b).

### **England 1042-1100**

#### **Q1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066**

(a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. There were some sound explanations of the importance of the Godwin family during the reign of Edward the Confessor. The most successful explained the basis of the family's power in Wessex and considered the roles of Earl Godwin and Harold Godwinson. Some examined the role of the King *vis-à-vis* that of the family members. Good answers provided a series of reasons and the highest marks were awarded to those that offered some priority among the reasons. More moderate answers sometimes focused only on Harold Godwinson and the succession issue. This was relevant but only a part of the Key Issue.

(b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Candidates who attempted the Question could usually offer a relevant series of reasons for the importance of Normans during the reign of Edward the Confessor. They explained why the King allowed them such influence. The claim of William of Normandy to the succession was relevant but some answers limited themselves to this aspect. Some Candidates based their arguments on the claim that Norman influence at that time has been exaggerated, an example of an acceptable alternative approach.

#### **Q2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072**

(a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Candidates were awarded high marks when they considered a variety of the problems that faced Harold Godwinson in defeating William of Normandy's claim to the English throne. Some latitude was allowed to give credit both to those who focused mainly on the period before the invasion and those who concentrated on the invasion and its aftermath.

(b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. The focus of the Question was the importance of castles in the reign of William I. Some answers gained credit when they used particular examples to illustrate their arguments. Whilst moderate answers were sometimes descriptive about the building and features of castles, others deserved higher marks because they explained their functions more widely.

**Q3 Norman England 1066-1100**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. There were some excellent answers that compared the methods of government of William and Anglo-Saxon England. The Topic begins in 1042 and Candidates were thus not expected to have detailed prior knowledge. The basic issue might be seen as a discussion of change and continuity. The Chief Examiner's Report notes that examiners do not look for set answers or one argument in answers. Therefore, when answering this Question, Candidates could claim that either change or continuity was more important. The most successful answers considered both possibilities and came to a considered conclusion.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. There were fewer answers to this Question but sufficient on which to base general comments. There were some good assessments of William II's relations with Anselm and some commendable essays that considered other aspects of the Key Issue. Some moderate answers were limited to accounts of the King's character and some very weak answers were characterised by irrelevance when they ignored the Key Issue.

**Q4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042-1100**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. The focus was an examination of the claim that England's wealth was an important motive for the Norman Conquest. Candidates could reject the claim that wealth was a priority and devote more time to other factors but a mark in the middle or higher Mark Bands required at least an adequate understanding and explanation of the factor that was stated in the Question.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Some good answers included examples such as London and Norwich to illustrate their arguments. The most successful essays also pointed to the fact that some towns declined, often in competition and in local rivalry with others that were more favoured by Normans.

**England 1450-1509**

**Q5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450-1470**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. The most successful answers were analytical, focusing on the instruction 'Why..?' They offered a variety of reasons and the best responses judged which was most important. There were some useful examples such as Warwick and York. Some less successful answers were too vague in argument and knowledge.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. The more successful Candidates avoided mere descriptions of battles but focused on assessments of the respective military strengths and weaknesses of Lancastrians and Yorkists from 1455 to 1461. Appropriate knowledge was used to support the arguments.

**Q6 The End of the Yorkists 1471-1485**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Candidates could suggest different judgements; they did not have to agree that Edward IV was most successful in handling finances. However, a mark in the middle or higher Bands required an adequate understanding and knowledge of this aspect of his reign. There were some very commendable responses. Among developments that Candidates considered were the acts of resumption, the King's close personal scrutiny of finances, investigation of feudal claims and the encouragement of trade.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Answers continued the pattern of previous years: candidates usually showed a good knowledge and understanding of Richard III. Less competent responses were content to tell the story of his reign, but most constructed effective arguments about the reasons for the problems



that he faced after he became king. The circumstances of his accession were very relevant but good answers went beyond these to explore and assess other reasons.

**Q7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485-1509**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Answers could give priority to the plots of Simnel and Warbeck but the most successful Candidates went further to look at other aspects of the Yorkist danger to Henry VII, for example the role of Lovell. These fitted the Pretenders into a wider context. The general standard was good.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. Examiners noted that the standard of most answers was very sound. Many linked Henry's aims in foreign affairs to his achievements. A variety of relevant developments were considered. Some described the King's aims generally (the weakest ignored his aims) but were less capable of producing examples of developments or knowledge to assess Henry's success.

**Q8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. There were too few answers on which to base general comments.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. There were some confident and persuasive assessments of the condition of the Church in England at the end of the Middle Ages. Among issues that were discussed were the condition of Lollardy and other heresies, monasteries and friars, and the extent of anti-clericalism. There were some effective discussions of church building and other forms of religious patronage.

**England 1509-1558**

**Q9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509-1529**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Examiners found the quality of answers variable. Whilst most were able to offer valid reasons for the rise of Wolsey, some were uncertain about the chronology and referred to developments much later than the period from 1509 to 1514 which was specified in the Question. Wolsey's contribution to the organisation of foreign exploits was usually explained satisfactorily; the most successful answers also considered other reasons for his rise.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. The Question asked about the reasons for Henry VIII's change of attitude to Wolsey. This allowed Candidates to explain why the minister was first in favour. However, the emphasis needed to be on change. Some Candidates spent too long explaining why Wolsey rose to power giving a brief conclusion about his fall. This was not the sort of acceptable alternative approach to which examiners can accept. Some moderate answers mentioned a number of factors without linking them directly to Henry VIII's attitude; the points were implicitly relevant but examiners had to make the link. However, most of the essays were at least very satisfactory and some were of an extremely high standard. There is a high level of awareness in some Centres of the ways in which factions helped to poison the King's mind against Wolsey. The Divorce issue was usually considered clearly.

**Q10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529-1558**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Almost all Candidates noted the prohibition of discussions of Thomas Cromwell and religion. This was inserted because the Study Topic is about Government, Politics and Religion and there is another Study Topic that allows for study of Cromwell and religion. Candidates who study Cromwell must not be allowed an unfair advantage by offering clearly overlapping topics and Questions. Nevertheless, religion and politics were closely linked in the sixteenth century and, although it was not required for any mark, examiners allowed some common-sense leniency if Candidates considered the political implications of some

aspects of the Reformation. Most Candidates handled the Question very successfully. A discriminating factor was often that the better essays were clearer about Cromwell's aims.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. There were fewer answers to this Question but their standard was usually satisfactory and often sound. Some Candidates devoted too much time explaining the reasons for war between England and Scotland or France. The highest marks were awarded to the essays that addressed directly the Key Issue of the impact of the war on the English monarchy.

**Q11 Church and State 1529-1558**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. There some well-argued studies of the condition of the Church of England in 1529. Some excellent answers considered alternative explanations (not necessarily historiographical opinions). They came to a judgement about the balance of positive and negative features. The majority acquitted the Church of the charge of major problems although examiners were willing to consider other judgements as long as they were justified. Some Candidates provided arguments for and against the claim that the Church needed considerable reform but did not come to a conclusion about the weight of the argument.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. Candidates did not have to provide an equally balanced view of Somerset and Northumberland; greater attention could be given to the one who was thought to have made England more Protestant. Some moderate answers asserted that one was more successful; they did not consider the other in answers that lacked comparison. Examiners note that Candidates can find comparative Questions more demanding but the Question was valid because the Key Issue is clearly based on a comparison of Somerset and Northumberland (and Mary I). The overall quality of answers was pleasing. Claims were well-supported and most Candidates came to clear conclusions.

**Q12 Social and Economic Issues 1509-1558**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Candidates were usually able to explain why enclosures caused government problems in the first half of the sixteenth century. The most frequent discriminating factor that distinguished the most successful answers was their handling of governments' responses. For example, they pointed out the difficulty of curbing the actions of rich and powerful men who were engaged in enclosure. Tudor governments lacked the means to enforce policies without local support from the influential people. Furthermore, government attempts to deal with the problem were intermittent.

**England 1547-1603**

**Q13 Church and State 1547-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. There were many good and some excellent appraisals of Mary I's success in restoring Roman Catholicism to England. Examiners applauded the general quality of the answers. Although it was not necessary to achieve any mark, it was interesting to note that some Candidates used apparently local examples to support their arguments. The most effective discussions focused on the condition of religion at the end of Mary's reign. Some included relevant material from the early years of Elizabeth's reign, for example her Church settlement, to underline their arguments but this was not necessary.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. The quality of answers was variable because some Candidates did not pay enough attention to the extent of support for the Church of England 'at the time of Elizabeth I's death in 1603'. It

was relevant to describe the early religious settlement and the consequent problems with Catholics and Puritans but, after doing so, some assumed the situation at the end of the reign. More effective answers sometimes referred to early developments but considered how far the settlement had survived by 1603. They examined the problems of Catholics and Puritans and assessed the situation in 1603. There were some sound references to the work of Whitgift and a few worthwhile mentions of Hooker (not mentioned in the Specification and therefore not necessary, but rewarded when explained).

**Q14 Foreign Affairs 1547-1587**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. There were many sound answers that linked the Netherlands to Elizabeth I's foreign policy to 1585. They were explanatory and considered a number of issues, including the reasons why the Netherlands were important to England, the Queen's reluctance to alienate Spain, Puritan enthusiasm for involvement on the side of the Dutch rebels and implications for relations with France. Some answers were incomplete because they did not examine the situation at the end of the specified period, especially the consequences to policy of the assassination of William of Orange (the Silent).
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Answers could give much time to Mary, Queen of Scots, because her role was integral to relations between England Scotland to 1587. However, some limited themselves to the period she was in England. More creditable responses also looked at relations in the early years of Elizabeth I's reign and noted the potential danger of an alliance between Scotland and France.

**Q15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. There were some well-informed discussions of Elizabethan factions that illustrated their characteristics and influence by specific examples, for example the Cecil/Burghley and Dudley/Leicester groups. Some good answers continued their explanations to the later years and examined the importance of Essex and Robert Cecil.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. The quality of most of the answers was sound. It was possible to take a comparative approach and compare the degree of Elizabeth's success as a governor at the end of her reign with the situation earlier, but the focus needed to be on the later period. There were weaker responses that comprised long surveys to which the later years of the reign were a minor appendage. Some very successful Candidates examined a range of factors that involved the Queen's government, including the continuing war with Spain, Ireland, relations with Parliament, Ireland and her personal prestige.

**Q16 Social and Economic Issues 1547-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Examiners read some interesting explanations of the effects on English trade of the collapse of the Antwerp market. These explained why Antwerp had been important and assessed attempts to overcome the problems that resulted from the collapse of the trade. Some assessed the effectiveness of new trading companies and overseas ventures.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

**England 1603-1660**

**Q17 Politics and Religion 1603-1629**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Examiners could award high marks to some unbalanced answers because the specified period of Charles I's reign (4 years) was briefer than that of James I's rule. However, many Candidates were able to provide balanced and thoughtful accounts of the Stuart kings' relations with

Parliament and examine the claim that they handled Parliament badly. Some of the best answers were organised thematically, for example dealing first with issues of divine right versus parliamentary power, then religion, or foreign policy. Other answers that examined the kings sequentially but made some links or comparisons could also merit very high marks. There were different ways of tackling the Question.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Candidates were usually able to explain a number of problems faced by Charles I to 1629. A few seemed uncertain about the chronology of the period and went beyond 1629 but most stayed within the specified limit. Candidates did not have to agree that the King's most serious problem was money but a mark in the higher Bands needed an adequate consideration of this stated factor. There were some well-rounded explanations that were supported by appropriate knowledge and indicated a priority among the problems that faced Charles.

**Q18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629-1649**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Most Candidates wrote relevantly about the period from 1640 to 1642. It was very relevant to explain why he faced such opposition in 1640 but some Candidates spent too much time on detailed accounts of Personal Rule in the 1630s. High credit was given when Candidates examined the possibility that the aims of the parliamentary opposition changed or developed from 1640 to 1642, especially explaining the aims of the more radical MPs.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Candidates could offer a variety of reasons for Charles I's defeat in the First Civil War but needed to explain his financial problems to attain a high Mark Band. They could then, if they wished, assess other reasons for the outcome of the conflict, including leadership, a comparison of the royalist army and the New Model Army, and the intervention of Scotland. Some moderate answers claim correctly that the King had dire financial problems before the outbreak of the war but then devoted too much to explaining them. The focus of good answers was on the period from 1642 to 1646 and the war itself.

**Teacher Study Day**

An AS/A2 Study Day on The Civil War and the Republic will be held at Peterborough Cathedral on Friday 13 January 2006.

For details see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet.

**Q19 The Interregnum 1649-1660**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. The Question asked 'Why..?' and the better answers were analytical, offering a series of reasons why Cromwell became Lord Protector in 1653. The most commendable Candidates explained which they judged to be the most important reason. There were some effective explanations of the Instrument of Government. It was very relevant to explain the background to the establishment of the Protectorate, for example the troubled relations with the Rump and Barebones, but some related events without explaining how they led to the Protectorate.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. There were fewer answers to this Question but the standard was generally sound. Some Candidates limited their consideration to Cromwell's relations with Spain but a sufficient number also examined his aims towards the United Provinces and France. Few mentioned the Baltic but this was not regarded as a gap.

**Q20 Society and the Economy 1603-1660**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Examiners read some interesting Appraisals of the position of the Church of England from 1640 to 1660.

They linked its loss of authority with the declining reputation of the Stuart monarchy, the rise of religious sects, and a republican government that did not adhere to Anglicanism.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Some weaker answers were general, even vague, about the position of London but some answers focused well on the commercial and financial importance of the city. They discussed London's importance as a centre of population and trade, its links to the court and government and the role of traders. The overall standard of answers was satisfactory.

### **Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2584/01**

The estimated grades were down 2.5% at A. One letter of complaint was received about Question 7(b).

### **England 1780-1846**

#### **Q1 The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783-1830**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Candidates could argue that the failure of the radical challenge was mainly due to other reasons, such as the inherent weaknesses of the radicals, but a mark in a higher Band needed an adequate discussion and evaluation of Pitt's repressive policy. Examiners read some very successful answers. The more moderate responses sometimes considered only Pitt's policies and did not examine 'To what extent' they were influential.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. Some Candidates argued that the Tories' repressive measures were more significant than their reforms from 1822 to 1830. This argument was valid if it was well-supported, an acceptable alternative explanation. Most Candidates could explain sufficiently well the major reforms, for example the commercial measures that were supported by Huskisson and Peel, or Catholic Emancipation. The best answers considered their significance, examining seriously how far they represented a genuine 'Liberal awakening'.

#### **Q2 War and Peace 1793-1841**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Some candidates were prone to write accounts of the war with France, especially with a concentration on the Napoleonic Wars, that lacked attention to British interests. The most important problem posed by the Question was the reasons why Britain fought. Most answers did focus on this and there were some very effective responses. Examiners were generally pleased by the standard of the answers.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. There was a tendency in some weaker answers to be very unbalanced, especially towards Palmerston. Examiners did not require an equal balance between Canning and Palmerston but a high mark needed a satisfactory understanding of each. However, there were some excellent essays that were well-organised and evaluative. These showed a sound understanding of relations with the United States (mentioned in the Specification) whereas lesser answers tended to be much more confident about the ministers' handling of Greece and the Eastern Question.

#### **Q3 The Age of Peel 1829-1846**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Candidates could argue that, unlike the claim in the Question, Peel's policies towards Ireland were more reforming than repressive. The discriminating feature was usually Candidates' ability to explain his repression, such as the attempted suppression of the Catholic Association and the prosecution of O'Connell. Most answers could consider his reforms successfully.

- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. There were some very sound answers to this Question on Peel's reforms. They considered his aims from 1841 to 1846 and linked them to policies. There were some counter arguments, such as that his preoccupation with the middle or business classes was more important than his concern for the people and the poor. The quality of knowledge of his reforms was good and almost all of the answers were relevant. Those who referred to earlier developments, such as the Tamworth Manifesto, usually linked them to the specified period and its Key Issue.

**Q4 The Economy and Industrialisation 1780-1846**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Whereas moderate and weak answers tended to tell the story of Britain's industrialisation, often with detailed accounts of factory conditions, the most successful answers focused on the contribution of factories, explaining why they were important, and then comparing factories to other developments such as the increasing population and the availability of capital. The general standard was satisfactory rather than good.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. There were some very successful answers whose Candidates considered a number of responses to industrialisation and in particular assessed the significance of Trade Unionism. Among other factors that were discussed relevantly were factory reforms and the Anti-Poor Law League. A discriminating factor was the extent to which Candidates examined the effectiveness of these movements. Some were able to describe their main features but were less able to assess their success.

**England 1846-1906**

**Q5 Whigs and Liberals 1846-1874**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. The most frequent difference between moderate and good answers was that the latter showed a satisfactory understanding of both Palmerston and Gladstone. The high Mark Bands required a reasonable balance between the two. When there was a considerable imbalance, it was usually in favour of Gladstone. However, examiners were pleased to read some very commendable essays that were able to compare successfully the contributions of each to the development of the Liberal party.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. The overall standard of answers to this Question was sound. Most Candidates were able to assess the importance of individual reforms during Gladstone's ministry from 1868 to 1874. Some excellent answers supplemented this with overall judgements that conveyed Candidates' views of the weight of evidence. Some Candidates compared the direction of policies in this ministry with traditional Liberal aims, a very relevant line of argument.

**Q6 The Conservatives 1846-1880**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Candidates could disagree that 'Outdated policies were the most important reason why the Conservatives were out of office for most of the period from 1846 to 1874' but a mark in a high Band required adequate consideration of this stated factor. Some Candidates preferred to give prior importance to the weaknesses of the leaders or to the long-term effects of the split of 1846. Most Candidates agreed with the claim and some very good essays explained and assessed successfully what could be meant by outdated policies.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. The key instruction was 'To what extent ...?' Almost all of the Candidates could explain Disraeli's defence of British interests abroad and in the Empire but some limited their answers to this aspect of the Question. The most successful answers considered these foreign interests along with other commitments, such as the defence of the monarchy, Church and aristocracy. Some

moderately successful Candidates were able only to describe some of Disraeli's policies without looking at their underlying themes or principles. Others referred to general principles without providing supporting examples. The best responses combined good levels of explanation and appropriate knowledge.

**Q7 Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846-1902**

(a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. This comparative Question invited Candidates to assess the success of Palmerston and Disraeli in securing British interests in the Eastern Question. Examiners read some sound answers that were reasonably balanced and focused on assessments of their policies. They came to a conclusion that was justified by previous arguments. The least successful answers tended to show knowledge of one statesman but not the other; such an imbalance could not merit a high mark.

(b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. There were some very interesting accounts of the reasons for imperialism. The Question asked Candidates to consider particularly the fact that imperialism might be exploited politically, for example in the rivalry between the Conservatives and the Liberals. They were free to justify the weight that they put on this factor and possible to suggest the priority of other factors. Candidates sometimes provided a relevant list of reasons (for example political interests, economic factors, religious aspirations and strategic concerns) but did not indicate how important they were. The general standard of the answers was good.

**Q8 Trade Unions and Labour 1867-1906**

(a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Most Candidates were able to explain satisfactorily the emergence of the Labour party to 1906 but some answers provided only a story and did not examine reasons. In contrast, the most successful answers were analytical, considering the importance of new political groups such as the Fabians and assessing them against other factors such as the contribution of Trade Unions.

(b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. Most Candidates could explain at least generally the attitudes to the Conservatives and Liberals towards the working class. The highest Mark Bands were awarded when the answers were reasonably balanced in their discussions of each party. Some Candidates gained credit when they pointed out some difference between the attitudes and policies of the two parties. Some weak answers were characterised by vagueness.

**Britain 1899-1964**

**Q9 Liberals and Labour 1899-1918**

(a) Examiners read some convincing and well-constructed explanations of the position of the Labour party by 1918 that assessed the importance of wartime developments. The instruction 'How important' allowed Candidates to explore other factors. Moderate answers usually showed one of two tendencies, either a reliance on long surveys of the rise of Labour that did not examine the impact of the War sufficiently or an explanation of the political consequences of the war on Labour and other parties that ignored the wider picture. However, examiners read some excellent appraisals with effective assessments of the impact of the war on Labour and compared it with other factors.

(b) The quality of answers was variable. Whilst most Candidates wrote relevantly and provided sound and rounded explanations, others produced answers that were incomplete. A number of these were uncertain about wartime developments from 1914 and ignored the importance of the Easter Rising. On the other hand, there was usually a good awareness of the divisions within Ireland.

**Q10 Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918-1939**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. The standard of the answers was usually good as Candidates considered a number of reasons for the fall of Lloyd George's post-war coalition. There were excellent discussions that were well-informed and persuasive about the final stages of the coalition government. Credit was given when the answers explained Lloyd George's domestic policies and compared them with other factors that destroyed his government, for example personal distrust, and Conservative revolt.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 4 and its associated Content. The most important discriminating factor was the extent to which Candidates were able to assess the success of the economic policies of the National governments of 1931-39. Some Candidates were able to explain the economic problems but were less successful in dealing with government policies. However, there were a number of sound answers that deserved a high Mark Band because of their ability to explain and assess policies clearly, considering some successes as well as failures.

**Q11 Foreign Policy 1939-1963**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 2 and its associated Content. Some Candidates found difficulty in assessing whether British decolonisation after the Second War was successful. They were able to describe some salient developments but lacked an argument. Some answers provided an argument based on one example, usually India. On the other hand, there were some very accomplished studies that combined persuasive arguments and a range of appropriate examples. These answers were fully relevant and conveyed a real sense of understanding.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Whereas some Candidates accepted uncritically and descriptively the claim that Britain was involved in the Cold War to 1953 because of its wish to maintain its status as a great power, better Candidates went further to provide an assessment of the claim in the Question. The most successful Candidates were also able to track developments to about 1953 whereas some of the more moderate responses focused exclusively on the early stages of the Cold War in the immediate post-war period.

**Q12 Post-War Britain 1945-1964**

- (a) The Question was based on Key Issue 1 and its associated Content. Most Candidates were able to describe accurately the major social reforms of the Labour governments from 1945. The characteristic of the answers that deserved the highest Mark Bands was usually their success in assessing how far the reforms were moderate or extreme. Some made the point that some reforms might seem radical but were in fact widely accepted, pointing to moderation. An example that was often cited was the National Health Service, which was widely accepted except perhaps by some in the medical profession, although its impact was to be considerable. Bevan was willing to make concessions to preserve the private health sector that satisfied reluctant doctors. There were a number of good answers that combined description and assessment.
- (b) The Question was based on Key Issue 3 and its associated Content. Examiners were pleased to read a good number of answers that were able to consider the successes of the Conservative from 1951 to 1964 as well as other factors, such as the divisions within the Labour party, that allowed them to retain power. Most answers were very relevant and clearly explained.



## Units 2585/01-2586/01: European and World History Period Studies

### General Comments

Examiners felt the examination questions worked effectively, differentiating between candidates and enabling candidates to demonstrate what they knew, understood and could do. There were many very effective answers which addressed the question set and which demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the topics along with the ability to analyse and evaluate that knowledge and understanding in the terms of the question set. The last is, of course, highly important – a characteristic of some weaker answers is the tendency to write about the general topic rather than the specific issue/focus raised in the question.

That said candidates generally are now familiar with the demands of the question paper and in the main attempt to write relevantly. There were very few entirely worthless responses.

Rubric errors were very rare, but a few candidates attempted to answer more than one question.

### Things that could be done better:

A general weakness in many answers is the lack of a sense of chronology and lack of respect for historical accuracy and terminology. Failure to get events in the right order or the tendency to conflate separate events (e.g. hyperinflation and the Depression) undermines the effectiveness of many answers. Similarly there is a tendency to feel that any example will do whether it demonstrates the point made or not (so that, for example, Austerlitz seems to be a battle which can demonstrate every possible strength and weakness of Napoleonic warfare). In addition, many candidates, whilst recognising the need to include evidence, fail to explain the example given so that it can effectively support or demonstrate the point made ('Isabella was clearly motivated by religious belief, for example, Grenada'). Furthermore, there is a sloppiness in many answers in the use of historical terminology perhaps arising sometimes out of lack of understanding. For example, 'Weimar' appears at times to be a political party, a specific government and also a system of proportional representation.

There appears also a growing tendency to ignore the requirements of formal written English. Too many candidates are employing general terms lacking precise meaning and introducing too much colloquial English both of which tend to obscure more than clarify what the candidate wants to say. Essay writing requires formal and precise English usage in order that ideas and points expressed are conveyed precisely, accurately and clearly. Standards of grammar, punctuation and paragraphing continue to deteriorate.

Examiners also commented on a worrying and increasing tendency for candidates to ignore the question set and write seemingly pre-learned answers to related but different questions. Candidates need to plan and write answers to the question set if they are to secure high marks. The simple rehearsal of a learnt related question will not do them justice.

Candidates also need to understand the demands of the command instruction and the topic focus. As has been said often in these Reports previously, **questions generally require relative assessment of relevant factors** – 'Assess the reasons why ...' requires the weighing up of different reasons by analysing the different ways they were significant and how they relate to each other. Similarly, questions starting 'How successful ...?' and 'How important ...?' require responses which do not simply assert success/importance but evaluate the relevant areas against some effective test of success/importance (e.g. by establishing criteria for judging success/importance). Again testing an assertion about an identified 'main factor' requires discussion of the ways in which that factor could be considered main, and the limitations of that factor, set in the context of relative discussion of a range of factors. These requirements have been pointed out so many times in past Reports and INSET meetings that every candidate should know clearly what he/she has to do in an AS essay. For detailed guidance, teachers are referred to, for example, the Summer 2004 Report pp.52-53 and the Summer 2003 Report p.28.

Candidates need to be encouraged to support points with apposite and accurate examples. They also need guidance on how to effectively explain and justify relative importance. Finally, the quality of analysis and analytical language in the responses of many candidates who know a good deal is often poor and little more than assertion. Effective employment of analytical language such as 'long term', 'short term', 'direct', 'indirect' and even of descriptive terminology ('economic', 'social', 'political' etc.) is also a rarity.

**Things to avoid:**

- Over long essay plans.
- Long 'background' introductions to answers.
- Colloquial or slang English.

**Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2585/01**

The estimated grades were down 1% at A-C. One letter of complaint was received about Question 5(a).

**1** There were very few answers.

- a) Some answers were lengthy and well-informed, but many did not go beyond 1099.
- b) There were too few answers to be able to comment.

**2** There were very few answers.

- a) There were too few answers to be able to comment.
- b) Many candidates were able to develop a list of reasons and explain them individually, but the ability to link reasons together or to evaluate relative significance was less common.

**3** A popular option, with more takers for (a) than (b).

- a) Here there were a range of responses. Most focused well enough on the religious motives of the Crusaders, but relatively few picked up on 'zeal' and many failed to balance religious motivation against other factors. Better answers supported ideas with specific examples drawn from the build up, characters and course of the First Crusade. Not surprisingly, given the evidence, the knights' motivations were more effectively dealt with than those of the 'people'.
- b) A common fault here was the failure of modest responses to focus on the issue of 'success'. Instead candidates wanted to explain why the Crusade failed. Better candidates weighed the failures of the crusade against its (limited) successes in order to address 'How successful ...?'

**4** There were too few answers to be able to comment.

**5** Quite a popular option, with the majority answering on (a).

- a) Whilst there were some very good answers to this question which focused on the question set and assessed the reasons why patronage of princes and nobles was so important. It was good to see candidates using specific examples to support their analysis. Good answers also showed why the contributions of nobles and princes were important by placing their role in the wider context of Renaissance Italy. Many more modest responses wanted to answer a related but different question about the relative importance of different factors in producing the Renaissance – which was not the question set this summer. Other weaker responses described how princes and nobles contributed (rather than explaining why their contribution was so important).

- b) There were far fewer answers to this question and generally this question was poorly handled with candidates displaying relatively little knowledge about Machiavelli or Castiglione and resorting to vague generalisation and assertion.

**6** As ever, this was the most popular topic on the Unit, with most candidates opting for (a).

- a) Better answers here weighed up the importance of religion in policy towards the Moors, Jews, Church reform and the War in Grenada. Religious motivation/influence in such answers was balanced against other motives/influences such as the political and economic considerations. Other answers differentiated between Ferdinand and Isabella. There were a good number of excellent answers. In more modest responses there was more description, less analysis and often an attempt to deal with too great a range of policies.
- b) There were a range of responses here, too. Generally, candidates were better at recognising Charles' own contribution to the problems he faced than in examining those he inherited or were the result of other factors. Whilst there were a number of good answers, relatively few candidates sought to identify the problems facing Charles before analysing the causes.

**7** This topic seems to attract a number of generally well-informed candidates.

- a) Most answers were well-informed, displaying good knowledge and understanding of the Ottoman military. The best were able to analyse and evaluate the relative strengths and weaknesses overall and in relation to particular elements. Naturally, perhaps, the 'strengths' were more effectively covered than the 'weaknesses'.
- b) Answers to this question were generally less effective than those for (a). Whilst there was often good knowledge, there was a tendency to list aims and describe actions rather than address the command instruction 'To what extent ...?'

**8** This was quite a popular option, with most opting for (a).

- a) Whilst there were well balanced assessments which established linkages between different motives and argued relative importance, more modest responses either whilst dealing well with religious motives failed to deal with other motives or dismissed them briefly, or provided a list of motives without addressing the issue of 'main'.
- b) Many candidates displayed good knowledge of technical advances and described them well but did not effectively link them to 'success in exploration' or balance this area against other factors involved in 'success'.

**9** This is a reasonably popular topic. Most candidates chose to answer on (a).

- a) This question produced a good range of answers. The best not only provided a number of explained reasons but were also able to weigh their relative significance/importance and so address 'Assess'. High on the list were Charles' absence and the power of the princes as well as the appeal of Lutheranism. More modest answers provided a sometimes well prepared list of reasons (but without any attempt at linkage or relative evaluation) or descriptive/narrative accounts.
- b) Far fewer responses and, in most cases, this question was not well answered. The tendency was to provide narrative accounts of Charles' relationship with the princes with occasional passing comment or only implicit analysis.

**10** Another reasonably popular topic, with many answers to each of the options.

- a) A range of responses here. There were a number of effective responses which evaluated success against aims and provided balanced analysis. Most areas were covered well, but candidates seemed less secure on the Ottoman threat. There were relatively few purely narrative accounts of foreign policy.

- b) There were a range of responses here also. The best answers covered a range of areas and provided a clear assessment of the domestic strengths and weaknesses. In some responses the range was rather narrow, if still evaluative, focusing on finance/economics. There were many more descriptive accounts with little analysis beyond generalisation/assertion.

**11** This topic attracted a number of candidates. Both options were tackled.

- a) The majority of answers focused on Francis I and, in most cases, candidates' knowledge and understanding of Henry II was less convincing. Better answers were evaluative: for example, setting foreign policy in the context of the Habsburg-Valois conflict and examining short and longer term successes and failures. Some seemed to find it hard to recognise that there were both successes and failures.
- b) A range of responses here, but many answers tended to description and focused on religious policy rather than problems. The main focus was on heresy. Better candidates linked the interaction of policy with problems, typically arguing that there was a lack of concerted approach to religious problems between the King, Sorbonne and Parlement, with the King unable to carry out a consistent policy because of personal sympathies and difficulties from association with the Schmalkaldic League.

**12** A relative small clientele here. Both options attracted candidates and on both there were a range of responses. Many demonstrated a good understanding of military developments and constraints and the best were able to evaluate developments and problems effectively.

**13** A reasonably popular option with candidates answering on both choices.

- a) Many demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the work of the Jesuits, but the key differentiator was how far candidates addressed the issue of how important. More modest answer focused on description of the work of the Jesuits and asserted importance. More successful answers evaluated importance by assessing impact and/or setting the Jesuits in the context of other factors.
- b) Whilst there were some effective answers, many candidates regarded this question as an opportunity to assess the recovery of the Church, sometimes after the Tridentine Decrees of 1563. Since the question did not specify dates this was acceptable if the candidate balanced such discussion with treatment of Protestantism and areas where abuses were still not addressed.

**14** A relatively small number answered these. Whilst many had reasonable knowledge of relevant material, examiners commented that the key differentiator was the degree to which candidates were able to use their knowledge to address 'To what extent ...?' in (a) and 'Assess ...' in (b).

**15** A smallish number of candidates here. Most opted for (a).

- a) Better answers uses knowledge effectively to provide a clear assessment and argue ranking of reasons. Many, however, seemed to have prepared for a question on why the North won and found it difficult to bend that material to the question set.
- b) Fewer candidates answered this. Although some were of high quality, the question was generally poorly handled. Answers tended to focus on 'outbreak' and treatment of 'continuation' was very limited. Anything after Brill and the Sea Beggars was very rare.

**16** A smallish clientele answered on this topic.

- a) The tendency here was to description with few effectively addressing 'How serious ...?' Weaker candidates generally could not differentiate between 'financial' and 'economic'.

b) Some effective answers demonstrated range and depth in demonstrating the significance of religious belief in shaping Philip II's rule. However, many weaker responses lacked depth and tended to focus on church reform.

**17** A small number of takers here.

- a) The majority focused entirely on the Huguenots, with few giving space to anything else. Some candidates wrote irrelevantly about Richelieu's policy towards the nobility.
- b) Better answers compared and contrasted the positions in 1622 and 1661. Many weaker answers failed to assess 1622 or provided long narrative accounts.

**18, 19 & 20** There were too few answers to be able to comment.

**21** A very small number of candidates, generally answering on (b). Examiners were not impressed by the quality of responses generally, and noted that some candidates seemed to think that Sweden was too far north, too cold and too dark to be successful.

**22** A small clientele answered either question.

- a) This was generally answered well with candidates demonstrating good knowledge and coming to a reasoned judgement on the claims of 1679. Weaker candidates tended to deal with 1679 exclusively without setting it in a wider chronological context.
- b) Whilst some candidates were able to offer a wide perspective and demonstrate the impact of Louis' France in Europe, many candidates simply tended to describe Versailles.

**23 & 24** There were too few answers to be able to comment.

### **Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2586/01**

The most popular questions on this paper remain Germany 1919-45 and Russia 1894-1917. However, a good number of candidates were prepared for Questions 2, 5, 9, 14, and 15, and there were fair numbers answering Questions 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 17, 19 and 20. There were hardly any answers to Question 4 and none for Question 10.

Examiners are clear that weaker candidates tend to perform better on 19<sup>th</sup> century questions than 20<sup>th</sup> century ones. This phenomenon relates particularly to the widespread practice of preparing weak pupils for Weimar/Nazi Germany. This is not a wise course.

The estimated grades were down 1% at A. One letter of complaint was received about Question 6(a) and another about Question 16(a).

**1** The French Revolution retains a loyal following from a number of centres.

- a) There were a good number of effective answers here from able candidates who understood the features of religious division and were able to analyse its impact in the context of other factors. Weaker answers either suffered from a lack of knowledge or understanding about religious division or wrote general answers about the course of the revolution.
- b) Again a mixture of the highly competent and the weak. Able candidates appreciate the multi-faceted aspects of the Terror and its impact, dealing not only with the extremes of internal policy but also with the levee en masse and the conduct of the war. Weaker candidates appeared confused about chronology, context and details.

**2** This topic attracts a fair number of centres and both questions were generally answered well. More candidates attempted (a) than (b).

- a) There were a good number of able answers here, demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of the topic and sound relative analysis of a number of factors and producing a sound balanced conclusion. Weaker candidates often knew some of the elements of the 'main' and other factors in general terms but became confused when attempting explanation or suffered from poor knowledge.
- b) Whilst there were fewer responses here, there were a good number of high quality answers which assessed the claim in the quotation effectively. Most argued that the 'democratic' elements of Napoleonic rule were little more than window-dressing and the reality was that he was a dictator. Others sustained an argument that Napoleon should be viewed as an 'enlightened dictator'. Weaker responses tended to describe aspects of dictatorship rather than analyse and evaluate.

**3** This topic attracts a relatively small number of centres. Both questions attracted takers.

- a) There were a range of responses here with the generality seeing a change after the murder of the Duc de Berri. Weaker responses tended to assert change or continuity within a description of the period.
- b) As above a range of responses. Generally candidates were able to discuss the impact of foreign policy and sought to set it in the context of other factors. Effective answers addressed the issue of 'How important ...?' rather than simply listing factors involved in Louis Philippe's overthrow.

**4** There were too few responses to be able to comment.

**5** The most popular 19<sup>th</sup> century topic with a good number of responses to both questions. Responses varied from the very good to the poor but there were many high quality answers.

- a) Most candidates who answered this question were able to say something about the strengths (a little) and weaknesses (more) of Italian nationalism, but a key differentiator here was the ability to support general points with accurate and effective explanation and evidence.
- b) The best answers here addressed the whole period (1848-70) and focused on the nature of Garibaldi's contribution(s). Assessment was provided by examining the impact of his contribution at different times and by setting it in the wider context of the forces at work. Weaker answers tended to focus on the conquest of Sicily and Naples or to provide potted biographies.

**6** This topic attracts a number of centres.

- a) There were a range of responses. The better answers addressed both wars and were able to examine the common features and the differences. Generally the Austro-Prussian war was better known and understood than the Franco-Prussian war. Knowledge of the latter was especially weak in poorer responses.
- b) The best answers here were able to identify a number of aims and assess the relative importance of isolating France. Some did this by showing how French isolation linked in with other aims and to foreign policy developments. The best answers were able to back up their assessments by sound reference to events and alliances over the whole period. Weaker answers were marked by a poor sense of chronology and confusion over treaties and events.

**7** Attracted a very small number of candidates who generally coped well with the questions, displaying sound knowledge and understanding.

**8** This topic attracted a fair number of candidates.

- a) Weaker responses tended to accept the quotation uncritically and described the negative features of Nicholas' rule. Stronger answers focused on 'How far ...?' and sought to provide a balanced assessment.
- b) Weaker candidates tended to describe aspects of Alexander's rule, especially the reforms, without addressing the quotation. The better answers tended to place reform in

the context of maintaining autocracy and assessed how far the latter impinged on the nature of the former.

**9** This is a popular topic area with a good range of candidates.

- a) Weaker candidates tended to ignore the question and instead wrote a general essay on the reasons for the South's defeat. Those more modest candidates who did address the given factor tended to dismiss it. Better answers considered the South's attempts to win international support and the hopes it placed in it, as well as considering the impact of Lincoln's Emancipation proclamation in finally closing the door to such potential support. Few candidates argued that it was the 'main' reason and set it against other factors.
- b) There were fewer responses here. Whilst the best were able to provide a balanced assessment of Grant's generalship, with the balance being on the strengths side, more modest candidates either provided a description of military campaigns with little assessment or sought to write a different essay comparing Grant with Lee (this was legitimate insofar as the comparison was used to draw out the strengths and weaknesses of Grant as a military commander).

**10** No takers for either question. We do not think that a single candidate has ever answered on this Study Topic (Politics and Reform 1877-1919).

**11** A small number of centres answered these questions.

- a) Some weak candidates wrote about the causes of westward expansion, but there were many effective answers which focused on the quotation and the linkage between westward expansion and the Indian wars.
- b) This question was also well-handled by a number of candidates, but weaker candidates suffered from a lack of knowledge.

**12** A small number of centres answered these questions.

- a) This was answered well by a good number of candidates who produced a balanced assessment of impact over the period. Weaker candidates wrote generally about the position of Blacks in the South, or described measures and counter-measures, or demonstrated confusion over the terms of the amendments and Civil Rights Acts.
- b) The best answers focused on the nature and degree of achievement, making sensible comparisons between the two. Weaker answers tended simply to compare the two individuals with little focus on achievement.

**13** A popular topic.

- a) There were a range of responses. Weaker candidates tended to describe the events of 1905 and some could not resist the temptation to write about the causes. Better answers focused on the reasons for survival, pointing to the nature of the 'revolution' and opposition, the timely concessions of Nicholas II, the loyalty of the army and various actions after 1905 which contributed to Nicholas' security in power.
- b) Whilst there were some very weak answers, many candidates were able to identify a range of factors as well as Lenin. The key differentiators here were both the knowledge and understanding shown by the candidates and the ability to argue about the relative significance of the factors identified. The role of Lenin was typically balanced against that of Trotsky, the failings of the Provisional Government, Dual Power, the Kornilov Affair and so on.

**14** Another popular topic.

- a) There were a good number of strong answers here, demonstrating good knowledge and understanding of the war, and balancing the role of generals against technology, tactics, attrition warfare, balance of forces and so on. These better answers supported points with sound and accurate references to generals, battles, campaigns etc. However, weaker

candidates tended to describe somewhat stereotypically the trenches and/or provide uncritical condemnations of Haig and other generals.

- b) This was also popular and most candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge of the Treaty of Versailles and some of the issues surrounding it. Many answers did not get beyond the description of aims and some description of terms. The best answers examined the treaty in terms of the degree of 'satisfaction' of the main powers involved and the need to 'compromise'.

**15** Another popular topic.

- a) There were some excellent and many very good responses here and a good many candidates were able to link the fear of communism to the appeal of fascism. Whilst weaker candidates tended to generalise about the 'Italian people', better candidates were able to differentiate effectively between socialists and communists, and to show how fear of communism affected the elites, the Pope and the King especially. The best linked this effectively to the fact that it was the elite which brought Mussolini to power and not the ballot box. 'Fear of communism' was balanced against other factors well in the better answers.
- b) This attracted fewer candidates than (a) and was, perhaps, overall, less well-handled. Whilst there were many good answers which effectively compared the reality of Mussolini's domestic policies compared to the propaganda story, weaker answers either tended to describe domestic policies or to write generally about propaganda.

**16** As ever, this was the most popular topic (by a long way), attracting a wide range of candidates. Weak students really should not be taught Weimar/Nazi Germany.

Examiners are clear that candidates tend to perform better on 19<sup>th</sup> century questions than 20<sup>th</sup> century ones. This phenomenon relates particularly to the widespread practice of preparing weak pupils for Weimar/Nazi Germany. This is not a wise course.

- a) The aim of this question was to elicit responses which moved candidates away from the typical 'rise of Hitler' essay. Many Candidates had, however, prepared such an answer and were determined to reproduce it irrespective of the question actually set. Examiners did reward candidates who did attempt to use what they knew in relation to the set question and a broad interpretation of 'other political parties' was applied. That said, there were a good number of able candidates who sought to use their knowledge effectively to answer the question set. Such candidates not only demonstrated some sound knowledge and understanding of other parties (particularly the Nationalists, Communists and Social Democrats) and their approach, but were able to link this through their knowledge of the political context of the period (particularly 1929-32), their understanding of the constitution and the 'backstairs intrigue' of the winter of 1932-33 to the rise of Hitler. Many weaker candidates not only failed to answer the question set but showed a poor knowledge and understanding of the period generally.
- b) This attracted fewer candidates. The best answers here dealt with the whole period and were able to discuss the contention in the question in relation to the New Plan, Four Year Plan and thence to 'Total War'. More typically answers dealt with the period 1933-39 only and tended to merge the New and Four Year Plans (if known) together and discussed autarky, autobahns and armaments. Weaker answers showed confusion and limited knowledge.

**17** This topic attracted a number of candidates, with the greater number opting for alternative (b).

- a) A key differentiator here was knowledge and understanding of the Locarno Treaties. Clearly those who knew little or were confused about them and their context could not score well. Generally this question seemed to produce general multi-causal answers and there were few who were able to provide a relative evaluation of factors.
- b) Many candidates here seemed to have prepared for a 'doomed to failure' question and of these some appeared to know little about the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises and their significance. Others could describe aspects of the crises but did not link their knowledge effectively to the question focus. Few were able to discriminate between or



compare the impact of the two crises on the League. Those that did and focused on the question set scored highly.

- 18** This topic attracted a relatively small number of candidates and a range of ability.
- a) Relatively few answers covered the whole period, but there were a good number of evaluative answers shaped around a cost/benefit analysis of collectivisation – usually contrasting the economic benefits with the human/social cost. Weaker answers tended to be descriptive.
  - b) Some saw this as an opportunity to describe the Five Year Plans. This was legitimate insofar as links were made with organisation for war. Successful answers also focused on the war years and the impact of the Nazi-Soviet Pact.
- 19** A relatively small number of candidates answered on this topic.
- a) Weaker answers here tended to provide descriptions and narrative rather than assessment of success. Better answers placed the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan in the context of the Cold War and the general international context.
  - b) Only a few responses. The weakness here was a tendency to stop treatment at 1968.
- 20** A relatively small number of candidates answered on this topic.
- a) Most candidates answered on this question. There were a range of answers, but the better ones discussed a number of issues, including the international context, dominance, containment, the role of China and nuclear weapons.
  - b) Too few answers to be bale to comment.

## Units 2587/01-2589/01: Historical Investigations (A2)

### General Comments

A number of Examiners have marked one of these papers in each examination session since Curriculum 2000 was introduced. Every year there are also new Examiners and it was notable this year how the comments of new Examiners mirrored what the more experienced Examiners have been reporting over the sessions. In (i) candidates continued to refer to the provenance of the Passages at some length. It seems extraordinary that they can still be doing this when virtually every report has stressed that it is not necessary and wastes time in a paper where the time allocation is far from generous. This was often noted as a tendency in a single centre. Weaker candidates often quoted extensively from the Passages or made comparisons which were not valid. Some were picking phrases from the Passages out of context to make a comparison and others did not restrict the comparison to the aspect mentioned in the question. Candidates also wasted time on an introduction which repeated the terms of the question or the steers to the Passages. Examiners reported that more candidates were comparing the wrong Passages showing carelessness. Candidates should perhaps be told that the comparison is not bound to be between Passages A and B. At least one centre had given the candidates good advice. Their plans read 'point by point, similarities, differences, conclusion'. As a result they all scored in the higher Bands. Candidates should not be referring to the Passages by line references. This means the Examiner must look back at the Passages to identify the reference. Nor should they use references in the form of *as in continued to correspond.....convince him*. This again means the Examiner must look up the relevant Passage. The QCA's GCE criteria are clear that candidates are required to explain themselves – it is their responsibility.

In (ii) there were still candidates who provided a brief paraphrase of each Passage in turn, followed or preceded by a mini-essay on the key issue in the question without making any link between the two. There continued to be candidates who were reluctant to engage with the Passages at all and wrote an essay on the topic in the question. This happened especially on Elizabeth I and on Roosevelt. Candidates do need to be careful to balance the requirement to use all the Passages with the need for some supporting material. Some lacked sufficient own knowledge or used inappropriate material. Evaluation techniques were not always sound. Candidates listed general information without relating it clearly to the Passages or they cited other historians' views where factual evidence would have been more convincing. At least one centre had clearly instructed candidates to compare the Passages A/B, C/D, B/C, A/D and so on without any evaluation. This prevented the candidates from being able to show what they could do. Some Examiners reported a decline in formulaic answers assigning the Passages to particular schools of historical thought and evaluating them entirely on this basis, but some saw more of this type of answer, notably on Lenin and Stalin. Candidates were often confused by Passages where two views were explained or contrasted or where the historian was outlining a view that was not his/her own.

In the essay questions techniques were usually better, although several Examiners commented on the lack of detailed support in essays. This seemed most prevalent in topics where the schools of history approach is common and the different interpretations were described but not supported with appropriate evidence or indeed evaluated, beyond asserting that post-revisionist is best. Some centres stressed interpretations to a degree which was not very effective. One wrote, *An interpretation is that Gladstone looked at Ireland from an Irish perspective...The interpretation that Gladstone did what was best for the British people can be applied here...The interpretation that Gladstone believed in a minimalist state can be used when looking at these reforms.*

The vexed issue of presentation was mentioned by several Examiners. They deplored the lack of upper case usage, the proliferation of informal language, employment of abbreviations beyond those normally accepted and the introduction of numbered points when continuous prose was required. Examples quoted included the Pope *dissing* Charlemagne.

However, all Examiners were pleased to report that they had seen some excellent work, written cogently and coherently which had impressed them greatly as showing what can be achieved by candidates of 17-18 after a relatively short time of study. There is rarely an examination session where Examiners fail to learn anything new from the scripts they read.

**A2 ENTRY SUB-CODES  
starting with the June 2006 exams**

Teachers are referred to pp.146-147 of the new Specification which details the sub-codes that your Exams Officers will use when Unit 2588 and/or Unit 2589 entries are made for your candidates sitting A2 exams, starting with the summer 2006 exams.

Details were circulated in *Newsletter 1* (Summer 2004), pp.10-11.

**INSET Units 2587-2589**

The cycle of main INSET meetings returns to Units 2587-2589 this November & December (alongside Units 2580-2582). For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet pp.10-11.

**Changes to Unit 2587-2589 question papers  
Starting with the June 2007 exams**

The formal Notice detailing these changes may be found at  
<http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/newsandupdates/ShowQualNewsDetail.do?server=PRODUKTION&site=OCR&oid=2047&newsitemoid=23057>

An exemplar question paper of every option in the new format may be found at  
[http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Specimen%20Assessment%20Materials/ASA\\_Level34722.pdf](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Specimen%20Assessment%20Materials/ASA_Level34722.pdf) ]

### Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2587/01

The forecast grades were down 4% at A-C. No letters of complaint were received.

#### Charlemagne

**1(i)** Better candidates were able to find a fair number of points of comparison between the Passages and tended to consider similarities first and differences second. They argued that in both Passages the government tried to amend the problems by capitularies (B) or by missi (D) but that both were not successful. Only a few noted that the Passages covered different periods (B 800-814 and D the whole reign). Weaker candidates tended to dwell on the Decomposition theory and to quote at length from the Passages.

**(ii)** Stronger candidates, who had read all the Passages carefully, began their answers with Passage D as it contained the relevant comment and outlined both sides of the debate. They then went on to use cross referencing of the other Passages to develop their argument. These Passages were particularly suited to this type of analysis. The mention of counts in Passage A was often missed as candidates preferred to comment on the corruption of the churchmen. Weaker candidates found Passage A difficult. They also tended to quote at length from the four Passages with some evaluation but very little own knowledge. There was lengthy comment on the Carolingian Renaissance in some responses.

**2** This essay was less well answered than question 3. A few candidates wrote excellent answers but most were less strong. Candidates might argue one side of the question exclusively and so lacked balance. The historians' views they cited were not always within the context of the debate. Some examples were universally known such as the Irminsul and the Avar Ring as evidence of valuable booty, but the wealth of Lombardy was less often mentioned. Candidates usually concentrated on the period before 800 or that after 800 but not both. It was recognised by examiners that the question could be interpreted in various ways and some candidates discussed whether it was wars or other factors which exhausted the Empire, while others considered whether the wars did or did not exhaust the Empire. Some tried a bit of both, which was not generally as successful, but either approach was equally valid. The exhaustion was sometimes seen as more a feature of Charlemagne's later years than of his Empire with reference to historians who emphasise how tired Charlemagne became as old age overcame him.

**3** This essay was less popular but the candidates who chose it were generally well able to tackle it. They analysed whether Charlemagne's policies were changed by this coronation or whether he was continuing the policies of the 790s. An irritation was the number who referred to Charlemagne being *coronated*. Some candidates were confused by the chronology and had the Capitulary of Herstal or the General Admonition as contemporary or even coming after the Programmatic Capitulary of Aachen. The debate on expansion versus consolidation was well covered citing Spain, the Mediterranean and the Danes. Many examined the later relations with the Byzantines. A few discussed Charlemagne's use of the imperial title for instance in the new oath of fidelity in 802. There was sound debate on the Divisio of 806 and the better candidates were able to compare it with the crowning of Louis in 813.

#### King John

**4(i)** Candidates found it difficult to get much out of Passage D and resorted to saying that such and such is in Passage B but not in D and so on. Good candidates picked up on the issue of trust: in B John's trust of John de Gray and in D his distrust of Langton. This was a neat comparison containing a difference within a similarity. Candidates were often adept at seeing what they hoped to see in the Passages. Several asserted that both Passages mentioned that Langton had lived in Paris or that both showed the prudence of Innocent. Equally the reference in both to canon law was often missed.

(ii) This question was answered well by many candidates who were able to consider the stubbornness of both sides, their political positions and the financial benefits John derived from the Interdict. Passage A caused problems to some who missed the point that a hostile view of John, nevertheless emphasised the degree of support he enjoyed. These candidates often made no mention of D, despite the helpful reference to earlier tensions in the steer. Some, who did see this, then overworked the phrase. Some weaker candidates wrote at some length on the events leading up to the rejection of Langton and the long term nature of the dispute. In a few cases this involved a considerable amount of information about the issues between Henry II and Becket. In evaluation, some candidates were obsessed with whether the authors had access to administrative records or not. One candidate wrote *I think that this source even though contemporary has a lot of bias in it so I cannot see which parts I can take seriously.*

**5** This was easily the more popular of the essay questions and there were answers which were well informed about both the events and the debate. The aim of the question was to reduce the emphasis on the Angouleme marriage, but the candidates were largely determined to include all they knew about John's marital adventures, which was often a good deal. One candidate asserted Isabella was only 8, adding child abuse to John's other crimes. The debate about John's finances was known to most candidates and there was some excellent detail on his need to hire mercenaries (even if this was a frequently mis-spelt word) and the complaints against them. Lupescar was known by most. John's strategic skills and his failure were well evaluated with many candidates ready to argue his situation was impossible. The settlement at Le Goulet was relevant because of the advantages which Philip Augustus gained but too many candidates described it and the preceding events at length. As usual, weaker candidates were not able to distinguish between this war and the later campaigns so that Bouvines made many appearances with John claimed as being present at the battle. It is time these persistent errors were eliminated as an elementary chronology of the period should be familiar to all those studying this option

**6** This question was not well answered by the few candidates who chose it. The needs of the barons such as the ending of arbitrary fines and disseisins or reversing royal afforestation should have been well known. Where the needs of the barons were discussed they were seen as a single group with one set of needs and aspirations. The actual content of Magna Carta was rarely known, apart from clause 61 and John's dislike of the committee of 25. Answers tended to include the need of both sides for peace and then move to the Pope's annulment of the Charter and hence John's death. There were also the answers which any question on Magna Carta produces about its constitutional significance and clause 39.

### **Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2588/01**

One-third of candidates answered on Philip II and another third on Elizabeth I. Peter the Great was answered by just over 20% and Cromwell by 11%. The estimated grades were down 2% at A-C.

Two letters of complaint were received about Question 5; one of these complained also about Question 6.

### **Philip II**

**1(i)** Generally this question was well answered. Candidates were largely able to find several differences and many went on to mention the similarities in the views about his slow decision making and bureaucratic working practices. Some referred to traditional and revisionist interpretations and evaluated these, but this was not necessary and could use up valuable time. Some weaker candidates compared all the content of the Passages without focusing on Philip's character.

**(ii)** This question revealed a serious lack of knowledge in weaker candidates who struggled to provide supporting evidence or drew it from Philip's rule of the Netherlands and not Spain. Others repeated the content of the Passages or answered the question from their own knowledge. They might also evaluate the views of Philip's character, in some cases repeating their answer to (i), and fail to link the character traits to serious problems. The better answers grouped the character traits

and evaluated their impact on problems in ruling Spain from provenance and well selected knowledge. The very best discussed the debate about the impact of the individual in shaping events as opposed to the structural argument of Braudel.

**2** This question was based on the key issue of strategies in foreign policy. Discussion of the Netherlands was therefore only relevant when linked to policy towards France or England. The status of the Netherlands is frequently not understood and this should be addressed by centres. There were excellent answers which made thematic comparisons with effective integration of the relevant debates. Weaker answers narrated events in the Mediterranean and relating to France and England. One examiner referred to these as *anecdotal*. These answers often had very little comparison. This was the less popular of the two essay questions

**3** Candidates were usually able to make a reasonable effort at this question. Their difficulties arose from failing to define the 'duties of a Catholic King' and from an imbalance between the Spanish Church and the Papacy. Candidates were not expected to have equal coverage but those dismissing the Papacy in a couple of sentences in their penultimate paragraph were likely to be confined to Band III or lower. Some candidates seemed to have prepared answers which evaluated Philip's religious or political motivation in a general way and did not adapt what they knew to fit in with an analysis of his fulfilment of his duties. Some answers were very well informed and the best often had brief but pertinent introductions identifying the qualities and obligations of a 'Catholic King' and providing a useful reference point for the rest of the essay. An unusual evaluative comment was '*it is hard to say how far or how well Philip II fulfilled his duties as the 'Catholic King' in his dealings with the Spanish Church, as we do not know how many people went to heaven*'.

#### **Elizabeth I**

**4(i)** Some candidates struggled with the Passages and failed to pick up the difference between *had been extremely dangerous* and *lack of success*. There are still candidates who take Passages too literally and depicted Elizabeth as physically forcing the Earls to choose between flight and rebellion. Some found Passage D more troublesome and often attributed the views of Elizabeth or the plotters to Levin, the author of the Passage. But most candidates were able to see what they had to do and thus produced effective responses which focused on the interpretations.

**(ii)** Most candidates seemed to be able to handle these Passages and most could reach a relevant judgement. Some were determined to write at length about the threat posed by Mary, Queen of Scots generally, without much reference to the Passages. Some focused far more on the Catholic threat than on Mary specifically. One or two confused her with Mary Tudor. Others preferred to analyse the Northern Rising, including its causes, as they missed the implied references to Mary in the Passages. Candidates continue to assert, untruthfully, that Christopher Haigh is a Catholic and even if he were, this is not relevant evaluative comment. Good answers were able to distinguish between the real and the perceived threat. Factual error of a basic kind appeared, e.g. Norfolk was involved in all the plots, Mary married a third husband in England who was called Leicester, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day was the direct cause of the assassination of William of Orange.

**5** This was not a popular question and few good answers were seen. Study of the court is clearly set in the specification and has been the subject of recent research. It is covered in one chapter in Haigh's popular book on the reign as well as in Barbara Mervyn's SHP textbook. Candidates tended to describe court life and digress into Elizabeth's refusal to marry. They might focus on her image. Others rejected the statement without further consideration and went on to argue that the Privy Council or Parliament was the centre of political life. Some of these would have been better as answers to Q6. In a few cases candidates did not number their answers clearly so Examiners credited them with a response to whichever of the questions would give the highest marks. Several Examiners commented on the unfortunate tendency of weaker candidates

to choose questions they cannot answer. There were a few, but very pleasing, exceptions where candidates discussed Elizabeth's control of her court, how much they influenced her decision making and used examples to show her problems with court faction, notably from the 1590s.

**6** This question was very popular and very effectively answered by some candidates who were able to use their knowledge in a relevant way and focus on the issue of co-operation. Sadly, the majority, although fully prepared for the topic, insisted on writing their revision essay, which might centre on how Elizabeth controlled Parliament or debate about whether or not its powers were growing. Even the issue of conflict was not always usefully developed as many saw this as the opposite of control, rather than co-operation. The phrase 'dominant theme' confused some who took it to mean 'Was the House of Commons dominant?' or 'Were relations with the House of Commons dominant? Some argued that religion or free speech was the dominant theme. The question was confined to the House of Commons but some wrote long paragraphs about the House of Lords and its role in the religious settlement. Candidates seem to have a knee-jerk reaction to questions on the House of Commons. They launch into Sir John Neale, his 'thesis', the Puritan Choir, men of business and misreading of a particular pamphlet without stopping to consider how to use all this relevantly. Some dismiss Neale as a charlatan and deceiver and often go on to damn Elton as well. A more tempered assessment would be helpful. Candidates might argue that one historian saw the outcome as being largely co-operation, another as being largely conflict and a third as something between the two, without ever giving any detailed examples to show why historians thought this way or evaluating their views to any great extent.

### **Oliver Cromwell**

**7(i)** Candidates found some of the nuances in the Passages difficult to identify. They also often compared the role of Parliament without any reference to Cromwell. The steers to the Passages should have helped the candidates to move off in the right direction, but these seemed either to be ignored or to be used as one of a limited number of comparative points made. Candidates tended to look at Cromwell's inability to work with Parliament thus drifting away from the role. Examiners felt this was a challenging question and credited those who tried hard to maintain the focus.

**(ii)** The key word here was incapable, but some candidates missed this emphasis and wandered away from the question. Passage A confused some candidates who felt Cromwell was speaking anything but *plainly*. The other Passages were usually well used with phrases like 'had no further use' and 'faith in the institution apparently survived unshaken' compared. The balanced view of Passage D was often taken as the best interpretation. Candidates were a little short of contextual knowledge as there was some information in the Passages, but only needed to produce a sample of the material given in the mark scheme to achieve a high Band.

**8** Candidates did not always read the question carefully and so wrote about Cromwell's rise to power in a general way and disregarded the dates in the question. In particular they included events from the Second Civil War. Some dismissed 'divisions within the Parliamentary side' cursorily and then went on to other factors. This may have been because they knew little about divisions as even the Self-Denying Ordinance was not universally known. General advice is always that a substantial paragraph, at least, is expected on the factor mentioned in the question. The element of debate was not always very marked in some answers. However, there were some clearly argued responses which were able to argue a case for family ties, military reputation, and religious motivation to reach a balanced conclusion.

**9** This was the less popular of the two essays and the word 'reluctant' gave some candidates trouble. They tended to outline Cromwell's actions in the 1650s and conclude that these showed he was/was not 'reluctant' without much reference to 'Head of State'. His enthusiasm for the Major-Generals and the high life of Whitehall were often used as evidence. This led on to the view that he was reluctant to rule constitutionally or turned down the kingship because he was content with his position as Lord Protector and so was not reluctant. In a few cases there was some lack of knowledge as to when Cromwell became Head of State. Some tried to use the Passages, which is

generally not envisaged, and moved on to Cromwell's reluctance to call Parliament. Candidates found this question challenging and there was a wide variation in the marks given as less able candidates struggled to interpret the subtler points. Some recognised that this was a question about motivation and could set ambition against a desire for reformation in assessing why Cromwell became Lord Protector and why he refused the offer of the Crown.

### Teacher Study Day

An AS/A2 Study Day on The Civil War and Oliver Cromwell will be held at Peterborough Cathedral on Friday 13 January 2006. Included in the agenda is a lecture by Professor Barry Coward on the English Republic.

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.15.

### Peter the Great

**10(i)** Most candidates could identify the main points of contrast by cross referencing but did not always focus on foreign affairs. Some found Passage D problematic as it included a balanced assessment of Peter, thus reflecting the difficulties with Passage D in question 7. Candidates should be ready for Passages which do not necessarily outline one distinct interpretation.

**(ii)** Candidates from some centres were able to analyse aims and achievements effectively. Others, inevitably, went astray because they made no attempt to define Peter's aims. There was clearly a vast amount of contextual knowledge which could be quoted, but most candidates were concise and pertinent in its use. One Examiner identified an obsession with the Great Embassy which was covered at length as an example of a great achievement.

**11** This was the more popular of the two essay questions. Some answers were well argued and entirely analytical. They came to no set conclusion. Band I was reached equally by those asserting Peter's changes were revolutionary and those suggesting the opposite. Few wanted to reserve their judgement and most were ready to be decisive. Some weaker responses went through Peter's reforms and at the end of each paragraph stated that thus they were or were not revolutionary. No coherent view emerged from this technique. Some reached a flawed conclusion as they did not have a realistic idea of what constituted revolutionary change. It needed to be exemplified as extreme change. General accounts of change and continuity in the reign were likely to be less successful. Examiners also commented on the way candidates seem to feel that greatness in this period always involved the sacrificing thousands of lives. Some candidates did stray into foreign policy which was not 'within Russia' but military and naval reforms could be relevantly used.

**12** This question was answered by few strong candidates. There were some who could evaluate the different reasons for the establishment of St. Petersburg. The less convincing tended to be more descriptive writing a paragraph on each reason but not assessing their relative importance. One Examiner felt that the answers to this question were weaker than those to question 5, which was the question felt by most to be the least well answered on this paper.

### Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2589/01

One letter of complaint was received relating to Question 5, and another about the whole exercise set on Lenin (Questions 13-15).

### Napoleon I

**1(i)** The comparison was identified successfully by most candidates but some were less clear about the reference to *ancien régime* nobles in Passage B and weaker candidates assumed that nobles and notables were the same thing which led to a poor comparison. Some candidates took the reference in Passage D to 'would faithfully implement the Emperor's will' as a contrast to



Passage B, without recognising that this was Napoleon's hope rather than fact. The distinction between aims and reality in the two Passages was, however, picked out by abler candidates. Some candidates thought 'high-ranking servants' referred to the menial class.

(ii) Some candidates were too intent on the schools of historians approach and referred to 'legend' historians, 'modern' historians and 'revisionist' historians in a way that was rarely effective. Better candidates recognised the difference between the interpretation in Passage A and in the other three Passages and tested this against their contextual knowledge. They also saw the differences and similarities between Passages B, C and D. They argued that because of the sham nature of the 'democratic' institutions and plebiscites and because of the features of a 'police state' popular consent was lacking. But some felt that other evidence such as the lack of revolt and the expressions of public enthusiasm could indicate a degree of support. Several candidates assumed from the dates given in the title of the book from which Passage C came, that it was a contemporary Passage and centres might advise candidates that the Passages are given in the chronological order of their publication.

2 This was the more popular of the two essays and there was a general awareness of the main areas of debate. Most candidates argued that Napoleon's abilities had been over-estimated. Some described the different interpretations and only evaluated in the final paragraph or two but many better candidates were able to assess the claims about Napoleon's talents, the nature of the French army and the deficiencies of Napoleon's enemies. The citing of evidence to support or refute these arguments was much less successful. Specific examples were particularly absent in discussion of Napoleon's strategy and tactics, but were more plentiful when it came to the mistakes and defects of his enemies. There were some factual errors as well with the corps system rarely explained effectively and equally rarely correctly spelt. Candidates attributed a range of developments in the 1790s to Napoleon and earlier military changes to a varied group of generals without much discrimination. The names, dates and locations of the various key battles were frequently confused. These defects reduced the value of arguments which were sound in outline.

3 There were some very strong answers to this question, but many responses did not have enough information about Britain's role in Napoleon's downfall. As stated earlier, a substantial paragraph is expected on the factor given in the question and it should not be dismissed curtly in order to consider other causes. Long accounts of the Peninsular War and the Russian campaign predominated. British involvement in Portugal and Spain was not often appreciated and the British subsidies to help defeat Napoleon were not often mentioned. The Continental System was better known and Britain's naval role, the subject of recent publicity, was well covered. The best answers were able to see how the role of Britain was linked with the other factors and most concluded that the latter were more influential.

### **Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80**

4(i) There was plenty of material available for the comparison but weaker candidates found the focus difficult and some compared little more than the steers to the Passages. The balanced view of Passage C gave some candidates trouble as it corroborated Gladstone's role as a unifying factor but differed from B in mentioning Gladstone's failings. Few linked his claims to be 'above' the Liberal factions with C's assertion that he ignored his colleagues.

(ii) This was often answered very well as there was plenty of accessible material in the Passages. It was not necessary for candidates to use all the evidence they were given to reach the top Bands. Despite the abundance of material in the Passages, some candidates spurned them to argue that other factors such as the appeal to varying groups and the weakness of the opposition accounted for Liberal success at the hustings. Better candidates used evidence to support the view that Gladstone was crucial, notably from his good standing in the press and reputation as the 'People's William'. Gladstone's moral convictions were well understood but his instinct for 'right-timing' has less coverage. Perceptive candidates used Passage D as a starting point as it summed up the debate clearly.

**5** This was answered with very varying degrees of success. The able were well informed and some had much to say about how far the legislation met the wishes of the factions within the Liberal party or of Gladstone himself. Either of these approaches or a combination of them was equally acceptable. There was, however in some answers a remarkable lack of detailed knowledge of the legislation or a belief that the term 'legislative programme' included foreign policy and some lengthy accounts of the financial reforms of the pre-1868 period. Some answers described the reforms and evaluation was of the 'thus it can be seen that Liberal aims were achieved' type. It was a good idea to begin with some definition of aims and the best responses were those which grouped the legislation according to the aims it was seen as fulfilling.

**6** This was a well known topic, but many candidates could not use their knowledge effectively to target the specific question. Some were unable to define Gladstone's policies clearly beyond a vague reference to morality. Others described Disraeli's achievements and discussed his motives but barely mentioned the possibility that he was reacting to Gladstone. Good answers often began with a brief outline of the main trends of Gladstonian foreign policy and then analysed Disraeli's policy similarly pointing out that, in contrast, it lacked a moral dimension, favoured a greater role for Britain and involved expansion. They could then argue that there were other features which had much in common with Gladstone, or that Disraeli was not, in any case, much moved by what his rival wanted. Some candidates focused on the argument that the two followed similar foreign policies, but did not adapt their response to the demands of the particular question.

### **Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-71**

**7(i)** The comparison was generally well supported by reference to the Passages, although the similarities evaded some candidates.

**(ii)** This question was mostly answered successfully with candidates showing an encouraging knowledge of the constitution. Some struggled to define 'principles of liberalism' or to consider the principles on which the Confederation was based.

**8** Few candidates approached this question with a narrative but they did not always distinguish between the Zollverein and general economic growth and neglected the idea that most members of the Zollverein were hostile to Prussia in 1866. Some were not able to see how the various causal factors were linked. Some Examiners felt that candidates lacked information about industrial power and wrote generally about why Prussia was successful. Others knew a great deal about the efficient Prussian railway system. One Examiner felt that some needed to be more familiar with a map of the German States.

**9** This question was more likely to lead to a narrative response. Candidates did not always succeed in finding a balance between the earlier wars and France and strayed into the debate about whether Bismarck had a plan or not. This could be relevant since, even if he improvised, he could still be seen as responsible, but the focus on the question needed to be maintained. Arguments about how far the French were to blame for the outbreak of war seemed to be less well known and some answers made little mention of debate.

### **Roosevelt's America 1920-41**

**10(i)** The vast majority of the candidates were able to identify the main areas of comparison and most were placed in the higher Bands. Some found the elements of doubt in Passage A confusing, yet again emphasising that candidates should be ready for Passages which do not necessarily put forward a single interpretation.

**(ii)** This question was usually well tackled. Less strong candidates had a tendency to be descriptive and did not assess the New Deal specifically. Some were unsure about *fundamental* change and argued that any change was fundamental or fell back on an assessment of success or

failure. Better candidates had some excellent supporting information and could show how some of the New Deal measures were still having an impact in the US.

**11** This was a popular question and generally answered well. Some candidates concentrated on either the 1920s or the 1930s and did not cover both. One or two believed Roosevelt was President for the entire period. Some went beyond 1939 and included Pearl Harbour. The Far East was often less well dealt with. One Examiner felt that answers to this question tended to suffer more than most from material being omitted with a consequent lack of balance. Examiners do not expect total coverage for high Bands, but where a range of aspects can be discussed, answers should not focus on just one or two.

**12** This question elicited some long descriptions of organized crime and the activities of Mr. Capone. Speakeasies or as one candidate asserted *sleepeasies* also featured. The effects of prohibition or the reasons for its introduction were other aspects prepared by candidates who were then intent on making use of their knowledge, whether relevant or not. These answers did not suggest the candidates had made much progress in their analytical techniques during their course. They were often unable to make any evaluative judgement about the relative importance of the factors. The best answers included political and constitutional factors.

#### **Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24**

**13(i)** Most candidates coped well with the comparison but not all appreciated that Bolshevik propaganda was being reported and took the Passages at face value. Some Examiners reported that candidates found it hard to identify clear similarities or differences and missed subtleties like the break with the main Bolshevik supporters in C and the alienation of the working class in general in B. There was a feeling that similarities were better explained than differences. Some fell back on comparison of provenance.

**(ii)** The concept of a turning point confused many, although it is a familiar approach in Units 2590-2591. Many managed to relate this to the introduction of the NEP, but recital of the content of the Passages was quite common. The debate about how far there was change or continuity in the period was not very well known, despite have featured in previous questions on the topic.

**14** The key issue on which this question was based has been tested regularly but the question yet again found candidates unprepared. Few seemed to have any knowledge of Lenin or the Bolshevik party in the period beyond the split with the Mensheviks. Candidates are expected to cover the entire content of the specification and questions are set on all aspects. This first key issue is as much part of the topic as the better known areas. Examiners are disheartened by the continued failure of candidates to answer questions on the early Bolshevik period well. There are some honourable exceptions and some who have clearly made a study of 1903-1917 and have a good grasp of the ideological and practical progress made by the party. Candidates should also be aware that the Bolsheviks seized power in October 1917 and not in February.

**15** This was a familiar debate but some candidates described it rather than evaluated it. The better candidates could quote evidence to support the interpretations. Some were reluctant to reach a judgement. The evidence indicating that Bolshevik popularity was increasing in the autumn of 1917 was not always well explained. The question did require a sound knowledge of the chronology of 1917 and, as in the previous question, this was not always forthcoming. Candidates discussed the weakness of the Tsarist regime in many answers. Trotsky's role was missed by some candidates, who perhaps had taken Soviet views to heart.

#### **Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-39**

**16(i)** Some candidates wanted to write about Chamberlain rather than Halifax and not all of them realised that the Passages were about two different aspects of policy, one dealing with the

occupation of Czechoslovakia and the other with negotiations with Russia. But most could pick out the similarities and differences effectively and Examiners felt this was a successful question.

(ii) Examiners reported many excellent answers to this question, although some responses made insufficient use of the Passages and in at least one centre the Passages were ignored. Candidates were generally knowledgeable about public opinion, but some, reversing the trend noted above, used little contextual material. Most came to a judgement agreeing with the question.

17 This was the less popular essay, but most who chose it were able to discuss a wide range of factors. They were aware that confidence in collective security was greater among the public than in government circles. Some were ready to argue that Britain was actually far more involved in European affairs than previously in peacetime. Weaker candidates were not certain just what constituted 'support for the League of Nations' and wrote narratives or went beyond the 1920s.

18 Some well argued answers reaching a high standard. However, some candidates focused on description and wrote a general account of appeasement and the imperial element was rarely included. Many of these did not centre their discussion on Chamberlain's aims. Some found the focus on 1937-38 too narrow and strayed into 1939. They lacked the detailed knowledge to make a convincing judgement and were not aware of the various forces influencing policy making, such as the Foreign Office, the media and the military. Some were unaware that any re-armament had taken place before 1938 and knowledge about re-armament was generally thin. As stressed earlier, the factor mentioned in a question needs substantial discussion.

### **Stalin and the Development of the Cold War in Europe 1941-55**

Overall, more Examiners reported that this topic was the least well tackled than any other.

19(i) This was another successful question, where candidates could make a sound comparison as long as they were not sidetracked into schools of history and trying to fit the Passages into one of these. Weaker candidates found Passage A more difficult as they failed to see that Howarth did not fully support the views of Truman. It is quite usual on this topic for Passages to describe one interpretation and then to make a critical judgement of it and candidates should be ready for this.

(ii) The focus of the question was 'misinterpretation' and not all candidates addressed this directly. Some Examiners felt they had seen very few good answers to this question and that evaluation was especially weak with candidates repeating the steers and providing little beyond that. Some preferred to focus on why communism spread.

20 Some candidates did not keep to the dates stipulated in the question. This seems to be a continual problem with the questions on this topic and centres are urged to ensure candidates are fully aware of the chronology of the period. Candidates had a tendency to give lists of factors and to fail to assess their relative importance. Some had very little accurate knowledge of the course of events during World War II. But many candidates were able to debate a range of reasons for war time tensions and included clear, supporting detail about the Second Front and Poland. Some knew less about the problems that emerged over Germany in the last months of the war.

21 Some saw this as an opportunity to describe the history of the Cold War 1945-49. They were rarely well informed about the responsibility for the Blockade. Better candidates could focus on Germany. A surprising number, however, believed the Wall was constructed at this time.

### **Examples of responses, with comments by the Principal Examiner**

#### **Answers to (i)**

*Both sources B and C describe the Kronstadt mutiny as a confrontation. In B this is 'between the working class and the Bolshevik party'. The working class and notably the Kronstadt military base*

*had been the basis of Bolshevik support for many years, especially in the build up to October 1917. In C the confrontation is between the Bolsheviks and their former supporters.*

*Both sources agree that the Bolsheviks essentially tried to hide the fact that the Kronstadt rebels were the same rebels to be involved in 1917. Source B comments on the 'major effort to conceal unpleasant truths', whilst source C mentions how the Bolsheviks claimed that the rebels 'were not the same men' that had been so loyal to the Bolsheviks in 1917. They both appear to agree that the 'strongest supporters' of the Bolsheviks had turned against them and that the Bolsheviks did their best to cover this up. They agree that the rebels were leaders of the proletariat who abandoned the Bolsheviks as they were betrayed by them.*

*The sources disagree over who the Bolsheviks believed was responsible for the Kronstadt rising. Source B implies that the Bolsheviks believed the rising to be caused by 'a mysterious White General' Source C, however, argued that the Bolsheviks believed the rebels to be 'peasant lads in sailor suits' and that they were not led by any official leader since they brought their 'anarchist' attitudes with them from the countryside.*

*Both sources agree on the Bolsheviks either covering up or dismissing the evidence that the Kronstadt rebels used to be their strongest supporters. The sources disagree slightly on the root causes of the uprising.*

This is a point by point comparison so at once is likely to be placed in Band III or above. It deals separately with similarities and differences. The points are illustrated by brief but pertinent extracts from the Passages. It is not complete as several points are missed. The final summing up is weakly and oddly concluded. But the answer has clearly identified the substance of the comparison about the rebels and so was placed in Band I but not given full marks. Further, the candidate keeps talking about 'sources' – which, of course, the Passages are not.

*Source B was published in 1982 by Sheila Fitzpatrick. She argues that the Kronstadt rising was a rift between the Bolshevik party and the working class. She claims that the Soviet press was led by a 'mysterious White General'. Source C was published in 1996 by Orlando Figes, who argues that the Bolshevik claims about the background and political beliefs of the Kronstadt rebels were false. He claims that the Kronstadt rebels were not the same as they used to be claimed that they had been replaced by 'peasant lads in sailor suits'. The two sources both show different views on the Kronstadt uprising. Source B is stating the problems the Bolsheviks faced whereas source C is merely saying how the Kronstadt rebels had changed. Source C is more of a social source whereas source B is more political.*

This response is not inevitably going to score less well because it is shorter, but it contains little comparison. The opening sentence is not necessary. The second only quotes from the steer. The third sentence is the reference to the content of the Passage about the rebels. Similarly Passage C is introduced with repetition of the author and part of the steer. The comment on Passage C lacks clarity. The comparison comes in the second paragraph and thus the answer shows listing of content rather than direct comparison. But, in this case hardly any content is listed. The points cited are not a true comparison and the conclusion adds little. The answer does use brief quotes and not long sentences from the Passages and, coincidentally, quotes the same phrases as the previous answer. There is so little real comparison that the answer was placed in Band VI.

### **Answers to (ii)**

*The Kronstadt uprising of March 1921 came after 3 years of Russia fighting against itself and the Bolsheviks defeating their opponents. Consequently conditions had deteriorated and people were unhappy with most things that occurred. After the Kronstadt uprising the Bolsheviks felt that immediate action should be taken before a full scale revolution ensued.*

*Source A, J.P. Nettl, argues that the Kronstadt uprising was very much a turning point in Bolshevik rule and also explains how the lack of experience at this level of rule may have been shown by the*

rash decisions made by the Bolsheviks. He adds that their actions were to have serious consequences which hints that this was a turning point. This opinion is an accurate way to see the early Bolshevik rule as they gradually understood how to run Russia more effectively. This was not surprising as much of their time in control until this period was during a civil war. The Bolsheviks could not concentrate on improving Russia until the war was over and when this came, the Kronstadt problems followed, highlighting the need for change.

Source B, Fitzpatrick, explains how the Bolsheviks attempted to cover up any rift between themselves and the working class. This is not surprising considering that they needed people to stay calm as they attempted to regroup after war. They blamed it on the Whites in the hope that the loyalties shown in the civil war were reignited. They were shocked and had to act against working class rebels 'for the first time'. This shows it was a turning point. Figs in source C also shows that the Bolsheviks were surprised that the workers were really unhappy with them and tried to pretend they were not former loyal revolutionaries. War Communism, introduced during the civil war was highly unpopular and very restrictive and working conditions deteriorated and food was not readily available. The workers' support for the Bolsheviks in the war was then expected (by the workers) to be rewarded immediately and the uprisings followed.

Source D, Service, explains how conditions were poor and food at a premium. He explains how the army were also unhappy and the Kronstadt uprising just enhanced peoples discontent and negative attitude. The source also uses this as a reason for the Bolsheviks needing to change and signals towards this as a vital turning point in Bolshevik rule.

The Bolshevik rule was changed following the Kronstadt uprising and War Communism was replaced by the New Economic Policy and conditions gradually improved. Although this showed that the uprising played a part in Bolshevik rule, its overall importance was more to highlight problems than it being the main problem itself. Some would argue that the uprising showed how the Bolsheviks had not gained complete control and that this showed change was needed and was consequently brought about. Others would argue that it was the leadership of Lenin which enabled the Bolsheviks to keep control and change the situation following Kronstadt. An argument is also put forward that the Bolsheviks always had control and that this was another sign of rebels from the Whites returning to attempt to cause problems, but the Bolsheviks could dismiss this and evolve using the NEP.

Overall this shows how it is difficult to understand how important the uprising was as a turning point in Bolshevik rule. However, it does seem that it played some role in showing the Bolsheviks that change was needed and the NEP followed.

This answer is focused on the question, returning to it regularly but not always very explicitly. It uses all the Passages, but not very fully – and it describes them as “sources” which, of course, they are not. There is some own knowledge about the NEP and the civil war, which again could be more effectively utilised. There is evaluation of the view expressed in Passage A and of the general argument that the uprising was a turning point. These comments indicate that it is likely to be placed in Band III or above. The answer is often wordy and could make its points more succinctly and the final judgement is weak. As a result it was given a mark at the lower end of Band II.

When discussing the view that USA misinterpreted the communist takeover of Eastern Europe, each debate has evidence to support the views.

Orthodoxy was the view that Stalin was aggressive and expansionist and this can be supported by the Passages. Passage B comments on the actions Stalin was prepared to go to gain control and 'tighten his grip'.

Purges underwent of country leaders such as Tito and Lazlo Rajk, minister of Hungary showed aggressive attitude. Also Stalin's actions portrayed to be expansionist as he broke Yalta and

*Potsdam agreements. Stalin 'bulldozed' Roosevelt into moving the USSR border further west into Poland to gain more territory in the first place and then portrayed only what can be described as aggressive and expansionist attitude by invading countries which are mentioned in passage A such as Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, therefore essentially 'slamming' down an iron curtain across Europe.*

*These two passages mentioned however must consider the relative reliability and utility of the passages. Both passages were not written at the time so does not show any real contemporary evidence which may mean reliability can be questioned. Also the name of the historian portrays to be western which may mean he takes a western attitude which is that of orthodoxy. However the passage does produce good understanding of the period so the utility is high.*

*Another view that can be argued is the revisionist view. America was aggressive and the USSR needed security. Passage D supports this stance on the debate as it comments on the numerous times the USSR has been invaded, '27 times'. This could have led to the US misunderstanding the communists take over as they portrayed it to be aggressive, but Stalin recognised their was 'inevitable rivalry' and so 'tightened its control' for 'necessary self-defence', whereas the USA saw it as aggressive and therefore misunderstood.*

*The USSR had means to be concerned about security as the USA delayed opening a second front in the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War when Germany invaded Russia. They believed the US had self-interest and actions of aggression supported by the revisionist view and the only thing Russia could do was to gain security by invading countries to put a corridor between Germany and Russia and the US misinterpreted this as aggressive and expansionist behaviour rather than a 'justifiable concern over security' as passage A mentions.*

*The utility is relevant as the passages provide a good interpretation with reliable sources while not being typical. The final view is post-revisionist, the belief of mistrust on either side which could have led to the US misinterpreting the takeover of Europe.*

*The USSR and US had general mistrust from the utmost beginning as conflict between 'capitalist and socialist' regimes was inevitable. Further actions of Stalin invading Eastern Europe such as Hungary and Poland may have led the US to believe the orthodox view as expansionism, but in fact Stalin did this due to the fact he had spies and discovered the US had not mentioned they were testing for an atomic bomb which supports the revisionist view. However the post-revisionist stance is general mistrust and this is supported by the fact Stalin implemented spies in the first place and Truman did not understand their security needs. So in conclusion could have led to their misinterpretation of the takeover of Eastern Europe.*

This answer is typical of many. The sentence construction is weak, making the meaning unclear. Spelling is not always accurate, although the candidate does get led right. The Passages are not a central focus and Passage C is not used at all. The other Passages are quoted to illustrate the schools of history. There are two misreadings of the Passages; the reference to Tito as an example of a purge and the '27 times' in relation to the invasions of Russia by Germany. There are needless references to utility and reliability which are not relevant here. There is little evaluation of the interpretations and no real judgement beyond the repetitive conclusion. There is an attempt to keep to the focus on misinterpretation and the candidate has some pertinent contextual knowledge about Yalta and Potsdam and the Russian spies and the bomb. The interpretations are summed up with a degree of accuracy. A response of this type is not likely to reach more than Band III at the most and this one was given Band IV.

## **Essay answers**

**Answer A:** *Sir John Neale, for so long the leading authority on Elizabeth I and her Parliaments had a somewhat Whiggish interpretation of Parliamentary relations in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Emphasising the significance of a 'Puritan Choir', the importance of the House of Commons and, with one eye fixed*

on the conflict of the century to come, he asserted that antagonism between Queen and Commons was the dominant theme of Elizabethan Parliaments.

However, this exceptionally argued edifice constructed by Neale (and Notestein) has recently succumbed to the meticulously argued researches of revisionists such as Elton and Graves, who would stress the dominant theme of co-operation.

Firstly, Neale placed considerable stress on the existence of an alleged 'Puritan Choir', a concerted party of 43 religious radicals agitating for Puritan reforms and Parliamentary privileges. However, Elton has shown that this conclusion was based on a misinterpretation of a 1556 pamphlet. In fact this 'Choir' was not cohesive. Several members in fact had Roman Catholic leanings and 12 were 'men of business' for the Privy Councillors. Indeed, Thomas Norton, one of the key 'agitators' had Lord Burghley as his patron. Using such evidence, revisionists assert that in fact there was not much executive-legislative conflict between Queen and Commons; instead Councillors were playing a much subtler game, utilising their clients in Parliament to lobby the intractable Elizabeth on issues such as marriage and succession where she remained intransigent. This would suggest that perhaps any conflict that existed is more attributable to tension between the Queen and her Councillors, rather than with the Commons.

Additionally, Neale's deterministic stress on the role of the Wentworth Brothers as forerunners of Pym and Hampden, has been undercut by Graves; Peter Wentworth's 1576 speech against Elizabeth in fact angered MPs to such an extent that they sent him to the Tower. Such a hostile reaction would suggest that such obstreperous MPs were mavericks, rather than representatives of conflict.

Additionally, whilst Neale stresses that Elizabeth was unwilling to summon Parliaments due to continual challenges of her royal prerogative, recent historians assert that in fact the Oath of Supremacy meant that MPs were loyal and certainly did not regard themselves as a body of agitators. The fact that Elizabeth never got all her bills passed in fact reflects procedural slowness rather than intentional blocking of her bills by the Commons. Elizabeth only ever had to impound 14% of bills, and this was usually due to drafting inadequacies more than contention with the Commons.

Moreover, whilst Neale concentrated solely on the House of Commons, perhaps subconsciously searching for the antecedents of conflict in the next century or a 'Highroad to Civil War', revisionists tend to see the 16<sup>th</sup> century Parliament as a bicameral institution, especially after 1571, when Cecil was given a peerage and made Lord Burghley, there was a double shift in the importance of the Upper House; in fact one half to one third of all legislation originated there and most Lords were patrons of MPs in the Commons and thus had them under their control and ensured their co-operation with the Queen and her government. Such an assertion would be corroborated by the revisionist interpretation of the 1559 settlement. Whilst traditional historians saw a conservative Queen struggling against a vociferous lobby in the House of Commons, recent research by Jones suggests a more Protestant government, manoeuvring furiously to construct a majority in the House of Lords, thus indicating a considerable degree of co-operation with the Commons where few of the Marian exiles, later to be identified as troublemakers, had returned to sit.

Indeed, the only real conflict between monarch and Parliament was over the monopolies issue in 1601, which Guy refers to as 'the ugliest in Tudor history'. Elizabeth was not initially pleased to relent over her 'choicest flower' but eventually co-operation was restored by her gracious oration of her 'Golden Speech'. Indeed, if it can be seen as a serious conflict, it was more due to genuine economic grievance than a demand for constitutional power. In any case, such an ill-attended Parliament could hardly be seen as exemplifying a major constitutional conflict.

On the whole, whilst the Commons increased in legislative importance and whilst Elizabeth's financial dependence on them also led to an increase in their privileges, they remained in a position of weakness and inferiority, summoned irregularly and at the sole behest of the Queen. They may have contained more country gentry and MPs may have been better educated, but they posed little threat to royal wishes and hence the chief theme of the period was co-operation.



This answer is focused on the debate to an extent, rather than the specific question, but it takes enough note of the question to reach a high Band. A better introduction would be to survey the debate in terms of co-operation as this is the factor identified in the question. The section on the Puritan Choir similarly could be better aimed at the issue of co-operation. The later paragraphs discuss several examples and the ways in which they have been interpreted with evaluation of the views. There are omissions – Mary, Queen of Scots, detail on marriage and succession and finance is only mentioned briefly at the end. The last paragraph brings in material which could have been more fully explained if less time had been spent on Neale. The style is mostly sound but can be repetitive and some of the sentence construction lacks discipline. As the answer was focused on the question, fully analytical, evaluated the views and reached a judgement it was placed at the lower end of Band I, but could, with some honing of the arguments, have come closer to full marks. Some of the unevenness needed to be ironed out and a greater degree of factual support provided.

**Answer B:** *It may be argued that the co-operation between Queen and Commons was the dominant theme of Elizabethan Parliaments. The House of Commons was made up of smaller landowners given status by Elizabeth as justice of the peace. Elizabeth faced much influence from both the commons and the Lords in Parliament. However, the Commons were those who were more controlled by Elizabeth as Elizabeth was at the top with the House of Lords below her then the commons.*

*The house of commons were made up of the gentry, many of which had influence within Elizabeth's religious settlement. Within the commons were a group known as puritans, these pushed Elizabeth to move towards a more protestant religious settlement. Puritans were well known in the commons as the puritan Choir after the vestment controversy. There were also puritan groups known as Presbyterians who did not accept Elizabeth's system of bishops and therefore formed their government based on ministers and lay elders with their own protestant beliefs and rituals. It is argued that within the commons Elizabeth faced much opposition rather than support from the puritans over vestments and bishops and when she would not let them discuss religious changes. However, the extent of puritan power in the commons was believed to be only small. There was believed to be 43 puritans in the commons but many of which were really privy councillors' men of business. Some of them tried to reform the church from within and followed a belief in prophesying. Elizabeth ordered Grindal to suppress prophesying but he refused and was therefore imprisoned which shows how she had control and co-operation.*

*The House of Commons is believed to have influenced many of Elizabeth's decisions on policy making. They clearly co-operated with Elizabeth as Traditional historians argue she had the god-given right to rule and was therefore in total control. However, it may be argued that the House of Lords also was another dominant theme of Elizabethan Parliaments. The Lords made up the nobility of Privy Councillors, large landowners and MPs. Many of Elizabeth's concerns passed through the commons then the Lords. It was their choice whether or not to pass certain acts of legislation. The Lords held more power than the commons and was made up of more people of political influence to Elizabeth. Both Lord Burghley and Leicester appointed with Elizabeth helping her make decisions.*

*It is argued by traditionalist historians that the commons was really made up of fewer puritans than is actually believed. They believe Elizabeth had the god-given right to rule and therefore had the total control over both Lords and commons, which kept them where she wanted them. Revisionist historian, Haigh argued that Elizabeth was manipulated by her councillors such as Cecil so that there was not really co-operation, but overall co-operation may have been the dominant theme.*

This is a short, poorly written answer. Capital letters are confused. The candidate struggles with co-operation and makes a number of inaccurate statements. The candidate has some hints of the historical debate and the reference to Haigh, although brief is fair enough. The factual material is not well linked to the question but there is some knowledge about religious opposition in the House of Commons. Some of the detail is not fully relevant and suggests the candidate may have been

*Report on the Units taken in June 2005*

hoping for a different question. To be placed in Band VI, an answer would not be properly focused on the question. There is some focus in this answer so it was put at the lower end of Band V.

## Units 2590/01 and 2591/01: Themes in History (A2)

### General Comments

The quality of work was a little better this year. Performances ranged widely in each paper but there were more top quality answers than in recent sessions, especially in Unit 2591 where 85 candidates scored maximum marks. The most popular topic in Unit 2590 remains 'Rebellion and Disorder in Tudor England' and in Unit 2591 'Russian Dictatorship'.

The overall impression gained by examiners was that most candidates were well prepared. Only the weakest candidates relied heavily on narrative and descriptive material; most essays began with an overview and provided elements of a synoptic answer. A key discriminator between really able and less competent candidates was the degree to which arguments were planned, explained and supported with factual examples. Several weak essays made assertions rather than analyses or attempted to apply a pre-determined analytical framework regardless of its relevance to the question set. This feature was particularly evident in essays on Tudor rebellions and Russian dictators.

Questions that demand an assessment of the relative importance of factors still seem to cause a few problems. Too much time can be spent on other factors and not enough on the main thrust of the question. Clearly a balanced approach is needed. This is especially true of the turning point questions and those that focus on the role of individuals. In the majority of cases, candidates miss the central premise of the question and list important turning points without addressing the question of their relative worth. Overall the technique required to handle synoptic questions has improved significantly in recent years: most candidates cover their designated period and try to make cross-references between the key developments. Perhaps it is appropriate now to remind Centres that basic exam skills need to be emphasised, namely reading the question carefully and focusing on its key demands. Candidates frequently ignore the bold type in questions (e.g. indicating the need to balance 'main' and 'most' with other factors, such as in Questions 3, 4, 5 and 15 in 2590 and Questions 1, 2, 7, 9, 19, 24, 25 and 26 in 2591).

Candidates generally used their time well. Few wrote only one essay, though a handful attempted three or even four – despite a rubric clearly saying "Answer any **two** questions." Most endeavoured to divide their time evenly, but a significant minority wrote a short second essay. Several candidates, however, wasted their opening paragraph: some wrote out the question, often incorrectly, while others paraphrased the question and asserted that it had been the subject of much historical debate. Many provided no introduction at all, which indicates that little thought was given as to how the candidate intended to frame an argument. Some candidates made excessive use of the Insert and included material that often detracted from answering the question set. Some Centres seem not to bother about handwriting and several scripts were close to being illegible. Often poor handwriting was not helped by candidates rushing to fill their exam booklets with as much information as possible. Slang becomes ever more prevalent. Statements such as '*Bismarck was the geezer*', '*Lenin was massive*', '*Trotsky was taken out*' and '*WW1 kicked off in 1914*' do not create a favourable impression with examiners.

### **INSERT Units 2590-2591**

The master copy that you use in your teaching may need replacing. Please check it with the text of the INSERT used in the Summer 2005 exams. Amendments and additions suggested by teachers have now been incorporated into various timelines.

INSERTs promote a distinctive approach in teaching and learning, encouraging a 'long view' of continuity and change, and a focus on patterns of development. They offer ideas on possible routes across sub-themes. They suggest points of reference around which to think, looking forwards and backwards over the 100 years.

INSERTs aim also to influence revision in those same directions, encouraging a focus in final preparations on writing essays that investigate a developmental pattern over time or explain a change/development by testing the relative importance of various factors or test the validity of a generalisation about the whole of a given period.

### **A2 ENTRY SUB-CODES starting with the June 2006 exams**

Teachers are referred to pp.146-147 of the new Specification which details the sub-codes that your Exams Officers will use when Unit 2590 and/or Unit 2591 entries are made for your candidates sitting A2 exams, starting with the summer 2006 exams.

Details were circulated in *Newsletter 1* (Summer 2004), pp.10-11

#### **Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2590/01**

The estimated grades were down 1.5% at A-C.

One letter of complaint was received about Questions 8 and 9, and another about Question 29.

#### **The Government of England 1066-1216**

**1** Generally well answered. The best responses were genuinely thematic and analytical, comparing the developments in Henry II's reign with earlier and later periods and supporting their arguments with good factual knowledge. Weaker candidates wrote a chronological narrative of the Norman settlement of England and failed to mention 'importance' or wrote extensively about historians' interpretations. Some ignored Richard and John or included sections on Anglo-Saxon England.

**2** The least popular question of this set, which produced a wide range of responses. Few candidates were able to explore the distinction between feudalism as a military system and as a form of land tenure. Better scripts saw the growth of a distinction between military and financial requirements but often struggled to illustrate their argument. Weaker answers described feudalism or drifted into why the later Angevins faced baronial alienation and revolt.

**3** This question was popular but not well answered. Most candidates focused on two themes, including the developing role of the chief justiciar, but their evaluations were very varied. Better answers made regular references to continental possessions; weaker essays offered no evaluation at all even when their overview and factual material was good. Some candidates brought in developments not obviously related to English government, such as continental baronial fiefdoms.

### **Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228**

**4** This question produced a mixed range of responses. At the top end, many candidates wrote excellent essays, using comparisons and cross-references to evaluate patterns of change within the context of papal intervention. Several candidates wrote solely about the relationship between the king and the archbishops of Canterbury, which was a serious mistake. Others produced formulaic answers that looked at changes in relations between the archbishops of Canterbury and the bishops and archbishops according to three headings: the primacy dispute, political disputes and exile or suspension. Often there was little knowledge of either examples of papal intervention or relations between English bishops and archbishops.

**5** A popular and generally well answered question. Perceptive candidates were aware of the difference between the Papal and Gregorian reform movements and compared the various ways in which the papal movement affected England. Patterns of changing relationships between kings and their archbishops were considered alongside the effects on monasticism, royal control and the power exercised within the English Church. Weaker answers narrated and described church/state relations, and focused on personalities. Some candidates wrote about the relations between kings and archbishops of Canterbury rather than the impact of the reform movement.

**6** The standard approach to this question was to go through the orders reign by reign and, although the period was covered, only the best candidates produced synoptic arguments. These balanced a range of factors which contributed to the changing patterns in monasticism during the period e.g. war and penance, piety and lifestyle, royal and noble patronage, land and feudalism, and the growth and stability of international monasticism. The main weakness, however, was that candidates did not look with sufficient clarity at reasons for monastic developments. Monastic life was frequently misunderstood. Few knew about the special characteristics of the Cluniacs.

### **Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603**

**7** The key to this question was how candidates dealt with the term 'effectively'. Better responses established criteria and then applied them to the outcome of each of the rebellions they considered. The best answers looked at the question thematically. A significant minority explained what the governments did rather than assess their effectiveness or wrote a narrative of Tudor rebellions. Themes such as negotiations, concessions, exemplary punishment and noble support provided an analytical framework for the better answers, which was missing in many others. Broad patterns of when or why some methods were more effective, together with an evaluation of the relative effectiveness of measures, provided the heart of the better answers. Many had thin knowledge to support their ideas, and a common weakness was to discuss preventative measures rather than how effectively governments dealt with rebellions. At its most extreme, this approach led candidates to ignore rebellions themselves and focus on government actions which increased stability. A common response was to declare that, since all rebellions failed, the government must have put them down effectively, while many candidates wrote about how conditions improved or made Elizabethan rebellions easier to suppress. Overall, this question was not well answered.

**8** Although 'faction' is specified in the syllabus and questions on 'faction' have been set before, a significant number did not understand the concept or failed to realise that factions often lay behind dynastic and other factors. Many gave insufficient focus to factions and treated it as a question about causes in general instead of linking factions to other factors. A lack of explanation was a feature that kept the marks down, although several responses spent too much time on Henry VII and omitted the mid-Tudor period altogether. Few candidates looked at rebellions to remove a faction from power, such as Mary removing Northumberland or Essex trying to displace Cecil.

**9** The most popular question in this set. Most understood what the question wanted and compared aims with achievements but only the best applied a thematic/synoptic approach. The most common failing, however, was for candidates to consider reasons for the failure of rebellion, and a disturbing number of candidates did not go beyond 1554. Weaker students often had trouble explaining both aims and achievements for the same rebellion, and some candidates claimed that all rebellions were successful because they had drawn their grievances to the attention of the

authorities. There were, nevertheless, many excellent answers that grouped rebellions by levels of success in achieving aims, and elicited patterns of aims which were likely to succeed, or times/contexts in which aims were more successful.

### **England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603**

**10** This question produced a wide range of answers. The best candidates attempted an analysis and synthesis of religious developments and focused on how they affected foreign policy making. Weaker answers lapsed into narrative, tried to introduce factors other than religion or failed to examine foreign policy before 1533, and so were unable to deal effectively with 'how far ...?'

**11** Most candidates made a real attempt to focus on personalities but many had difficulty providing factual support for their claims. Most assumed anything to do with the monarchs' character was good enough and several arguments hinted at synoptic thinking by comparing Elizabeth with Henry VII and contrasting them with Henry VIII. A common approach among weaker candidates was to shift the focus of the question onto other factors such as trade, religion and rivalry.

**12** The most popular of this set of questions and generally well understood. Some candidates tended to give an overview of relations with each country rather than an assessment of which was more important. The most common format was to narrate relations with France and Spain before arriving at a conclusion that was frequently 'they were of equal importance'. Analysis was therefore limited with weak comparisons and supporting material. Weaker responses focused on other factors (e.g. trade and security) rather than the influence of France and Spain.

### **The Development of Limited Monarchy in England 1558-1689**

**13** Most candidates did not define 'essential', which was the main thrust of the question, but instead discussed issues or personalities and relationships between parliaments and monarchs. Parliament's role and nature within government was not often explored. As ever, the unbalanced answers concentrated mainly on Elizabeth I and Charles II, but the role of parliament was sometimes inaccurately evaluated in both reigns. There was some very sketchy knowledge about the period 1688-89 and weaker answers had significant gaps in knowledge - usually James I and Charles I. Surprisingly few made any mention of the period 1629-40. Some also failed to understand the term 'government', confusing it with 'power' or 'authority'. Some discussed how parliament opposed the crown but provided no consideration of how essential parliament was.

**14** There were few really outstanding essays. Candidates frequently discussed the religious situation rather than assessed how religious factors limited the monarchs' authority. Some discussed Cromwell who was not a monarch and there was a tendency to focus heavily on the later period. More knowledgeable candidates set religion against other factors (particularly finance) in limiting the monarchs' authority but often adopted a linear approach which made it difficult to make synoptic assessments. There was also some confusion as to how limited were the powers of Charles II and James II, and some weaknesses on 1688-89.

**15** The most popular of the three and generally well answered. There was a tendency among weaker candidates to be linear/ narrative in their approach and to drift into an explanation for the Civil War and, while most answers focused on the reign of Charles I, some gave an inadequate assessment of Elizabeth's and James I's reigns. The comparative dimension required by 'main reason' was missed by some who instead confined their essay solely to financial problems.

#### **Teacher Study Day**

A Study Day on The Civil War and the Republic will be held at  
Peterborough Cathedral on Friday 13 January 2006.  
Included in the programme is a lecture by Professor Barry Coward on the Republic.  
For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.15.

### **Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689**

Hardly any candidates opted for this topic.

### **The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610**

**19** This popular question produced a range of responses. Almost all candidates wrote knowledgeably about Francis I: unfortunately, some only looked at him or failed to set his reign in the context of the wider period and the development of the nation state. Even among better responses, few assessed France before 1517 and were therefore unable to argue convincingly that his reign marked a turning point. Several candidates tried to short-circuit their answers by asserting that the real founder of French absolutism was Henry IV. There was also a worrying tendency to assume that the development of a nation state and absolutism were interchangeable terms. Nevertheless, there were some impressive essays in which Francis' reign was compared with other key developments in the period.

**20** This question was a good discriminator. The better candidates took an appropriate comparative approach and explained the differences between the two halves of the century in terms of the economy, religion, government, nobility, clientage, and personalities of the rulers, and linked them to the prominence of civil war. Weaker responses wrote about the general causes of the wars of religion, and failed to cover the whole period or avoid a narrative account.

**21** A popular question but often done less well than the others in this set. A common and simplistic approach was to assert that Catholicism united the people of France, Protestantism divided them and Henry IV reconciled both religious groups. Few candidates considered what a nation state was and most stated that religion was an important factor without explaining why. Many essays described the development of the nation state and wrote much more on other factors than on religion. In general, the period before 1534 received scant attention, even among better essays.

### **The Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century**

**22** This question generated a variety of responses. Some candidates wrote solely about the Jesuits, some described the origin and work of the new orders and others sought to show their relative importance in relation to other factors. Few candidates, however, convincingly assessed their achievements by 1600, and the notion of 'greatly exaggerated' was rarely considered.

**23** Very varied answers. Many candidates displayed a good overview but did not support the developments post-1563 effectively. Most answers looked at other factors, sometimes to the neglect of the main focus. Some had problems with causal links, for instance, in suggesting that the condition of the papacy improved after Trent, so the Council must have been responsible for it. A common approach was to divide the period into three parts: pre-, during and post-Trent, and then to compare the importance of Trent in a conclusion. Better essays set Trent in the context of the 16<sup>th</sup> century and offered synoptic assessments in terms of its achievements.

**24** The most popular of this set and confidently answered by many candidates. Most were able to apply a Counter/ Catholic Reformation distinction in their answers, often though as a 'shorthand' for proper analysis, and a few chose to explain these terms. There was a tendency to focus on pre-rather than post-Reformation years, and many spent too long on Luther and his attack on the Catholic Church or failed to explain the growing appeal of Protestantism. Only the best essays identified and evaluated the links between Protestant and Catholic ideas.

### **The Decline of Spain 1598-1700**

**25** While a few candidates produced a thematic response with synthesis over the period, most offered narratives of Philip III/Lerma, and Philip IV/Olivares, with virtually nothing on Charles II, making for an uneven coverage. Several weaker answers paid scant regard to financial problems and instead focused on the policies of ministers.

**26** Uneven coverage of the period was common; few ventured beyond 1648. Some attempted an evaluation against other factors. Most answers were descriptive.

**27** There was a minority of good essays that focused on the 1650s and compared this decade with other periods, notably the 1610s and 1620s. Weaker responses found it hard to make comparative assessments and kept largely to the 1650s, thus failing to cover the whole period.

### **The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715**

**28** A popular and successful question among candidates from high performing Centres. The best essays synthesised the three main ministers and discussed some of the lesser figures of Louis XIV's reign. Weaker candidates tended to assume that the ascendancy of France was synonymous with domestic absolutism, and made little attempt to compare contributions. Many answers were either narratives or concentrated on Richelieu to the exclusion of other ministers.

**29** Most believed that whatever damage was done during the royal minorities was temporary, and many had problems linking the two periods to the growth of absolute monarchy. A handful of candidates (out of 50) interpreted 'minorities' to mean 'small groups', and were credited insofar as this was relevant to the spirit of the question. In general the question was understood and well answered by most candidates.

**30** The least popular of this set of questions but frequently very well answered. There was a tendency among weaker answers to gloss over Westphalia and to focus instead on the Peace of the Pyrenees or to describe events of the period up to 1648 or under Louis XIV. Many provided sound overviews but lacked supporting evidence in developing their arguments. Several candidates suggested alternative turning points but the quality of their evaluation was often not strong.

### **From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661-1796**

**31** Many candidates handled the content of this question well but often looked at the establishment of absolutism in general rather than the similarities of the challenges facing the four rulers. The nature of the challenge was often not explained (e.g. serfdom), or topics pertinent to each ruler were discussed whether or not they had been a challenge. Several responses wrote about the extent to which the rulers were 'enlightened' and avoided the question set altogether.

**32** This question was well answered by informed candidates who looked thematically at the issues involved; many noted the Revocation and *Unigenitus* as turning points in attitudes in Louis XIV's reign. Weaker candidates produced narratives of the three reigns or attempted to tailor their prepared 'causes of the French Revolution essays'.

**33** In some respects, this question produced some of the best essays in the paper. Most notable were those candidates who assessed the philosophical criticisms of the Church. A common mistake, however, was a failure to discuss the Roman Catholic Church, preferring instead to look at monarchs' religious reforms. A minority struggled to discern the necessary focus or establish a coherent argument.

### **Comments on individual questions: Unit 2591/01**

One letter of complaint was received about Questions 2 and 3.

### **Britain and Ireland 1798-1921**

**1** This was a popular choice and produced some very good answers with candidates able to assess the leadership of a number of different leaders. Parnell and O'Connell received most attention, de Valera and Collins the least. Many students addressed 'effective' and discussed whether judgement should be in terms of outcome or impact. Weaker responses approached the question chronologically and did not go beyond O'Connell and Parnell. Several showed poor



knowledge of Parnell and made assertions rather than comparative assessments. The most common failure was to focus on the nationalist movement and to refer only to the period 1815-1890, ignoring the last nationalist leaders.

**2** The second most popular question in this set but not always well answered. Quite a few candidates failed to focus on the idea of a turning point and failed to relate it to nationalism, or conversely they identified all events as turning points. Weaker candidates were unsure what Catholic Emancipation actually involved or tended to concentrate on the reasons why nationalism developed, or they spent much time describing constitutional and revolutionary nationalism. The best candidates contrasted 1829 with 1798, 1845 and 1916.

**3** This was generally well answered, but often in a mechanical assessment. It was common to read that 'the Liberals helped Ireland, and the Conservatives were repressive'; indeed many turned the question into a discussion of coercion and cooperation rather than identifying gains. Better answers acknowledged variations in the attitude of individual political parties, and assessed the relative importance of gains, often economically, politically and socially. Weaker responses listed gains but failed to compare the two sets of government actions. Several seemed perplexed by the term 'Coalition government' and were even uncertain about Liberal and Conservative governments.

#### **War and Society in Britain 1793-1918**

**4** The quality of answers was very mixed. A minority of candidates produced very good essays that synthesised elements across the whole period. In almost all cases the army and navy were dealt with adequately and candidates were particularly confident when dealing with European commitments. However, the Empire was the only focus for many and their level of knowledge and understanding was generally poor. There was a tendency to concentrate on the French wars at the start of the period and then to leap forward to events in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century with little or no discussion of intervening developments.

**5** Very few did this question. A minority of skilful answers focused on the rise of public opinion and the role of the press in war, and in particular the effect this had on government policy in the Second Boer War and in other conflicts but, on the whole, the question was poorly tackled. Most candidates managed to consider other turning points but evaluations tended to revolve around the significance of public opinion.

**6** This was the most popular and successful of the questions in this set. Most candidates presented a fairly confident account of the mobilisation of industry and resources for war, and the expansion of this through the period. The synoptic range was often very impressive. Weaker answers took a narrow view of 'resources' and limited their material to weaponry developments and the use of railways. There was much discussion of the effects of the Industrial Revolution but often only in terms of technological developments.

#### **Teacher Study Day**

A Study Day for this theme & for 'The Changing Nature of Warfare' will be held in conjunction with the National Army Museum at the Museum on Monday 5 December 2005.

This will include a lecture by Professor Mike Paris of the University of Central Lancashire.

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.16.

#### **Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**

**7** The overall quality of answers on this topic was poor. Few candidates seemed to have the knowledge and analysis necessary to achieve high marks. Many candidates had trouble in Question 7 determining what 'social unrest' meant and the weakest relied on the Insert for their facts. Few candidates could explain the relationship between influences and policy or illustrate

their argument with examples of social unrest and there was a wealth of descriptions of the condition of the poor. A minority of candidates wrote well about political and warfare influences, the 19<sup>th</sup> century philanthropic movement, the effect of the economy and the role of individuals.

**8** Few candidates knew about housing in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and several tried to turn it into a question about public health. The significance of World War I was also not uniformly understood and a common failure was for candidates not to write a balanced answer. Many ignored the 1919, 1924 and later Acts, or even World War II and Bevan. The best answers had full control of housing legislation across the period and addressed the implications of 'turning point'.

**9** The best answered of the three questions in this set. Those candidates who performed well were able to evaluate 'the most important reform' and compared 1902 with other Education Acts. Surprisingly the 1944 Butler Act was ignored by many candidates which limited their coverage across the whole period. The most common weakness was for candidates to lack focus on 'the poor' and instead write general descriptions of developments in education.

### **Teacher Study Day**

A Study Day for this theme and for Unit 2582 'The Condition of England' will be held in association with the National Trust's Education Department at the Workhouse, Southwell, Nottinghamshire on Thursday 2 February 2006.

Included in the day will be a lecture by Dr Gillian Sutherland, Newnham College Cambridge, on 19<sup>th</sup>/early 20<sup>th</sup> century education (i.e. addressing content paragraph 3 of this 2591 theme)

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.17.

### **The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992**

**10** Not a well answered question. A number of scripts struggled to focus on the phrase 'labour movement' and how it might be interpreted. Potted histories of the Labour Party predominated to the detriment of assessing the 'expansion of the franchise'. There was also little understanding of the political context in 1884-85, 1918, 1928 and 1969 on the role that political opportunism played.

**11** This question produced some effective answers with many candidates able to assess a range of issues across the whole period. Though several candidates assumed that after 1911 the Lords became democratic, in general candidates were much stronger on the House of Lords than the Commons where changes tended not to go beyond the growth of the electorate. The best answers knew about the emergence of presidential prime ministers but weaker responses tended to list changes and many candidates ignored the shift between the two Houses.

**12** Too many failed to tackle the specific demands of this question. There was often either a narrative of how women gained the vote or coverage of developments in democracy without reference to the role of women. Many candidates struggled to include the post-1928 period (apart from references to Thatcher).

### **The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996**

Unfortunately, questions on the Mass Media theme again generated many weak answers.

**13** Candidates frequently lacked sufficient depth of knowledge to sustain their assertions and arguments. Few essays addressed most of the period and many candidates displayed pre-packaged answers that bore only a passing resemblance to the question that had actually been set. Many candidates relied heavily on the Insert. Some candidates believed that the popular press included Radio and TV. Most essays were no more than descriptions of the mass media areas.

**14** There was very little understanding of the question. Many candidates narrated developments in the media and ignored the key issues in the question. Points on the USA's influence were often vague or descriptive with little sense of what 'industrialisation' might mean.

**15** Some candidates struggled with this question. Many wrote solely about the control of TV. Others gave a potted history of the development of the media, but did not relate this to its relationship with the government.

### **The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1919**

**16** This was a very popular question that elicited several excellent responses. The best candidates had a very good overview and synthesised a wide range of issues and developments. They often concentrated on specific examples of planning and preparation, and used these to illustrate more general trends. Most essays covered the wars of Napoleon, the Austro-Prussian wars and the planning prior to the First World War. Few considered the American Civil War. Less successful answers tended to ignore factors other than 'planning and preparation', wrote about wars and battles instead of campaigns, or confined their arguments to narrow periods. Some wrote detailed narratives of specific battles or wrote generalised answers ignoring the question.

**17** A popular question that resulted in many descriptive essays on weapon technology and, surprisingly, limited knowledge of World War One. Only a minority focused on the impact of developing technology on land warfare. The role of communications was also downplayed. The tendency was to accept the premise of the question and offer minimal alternative interpretations.

**18** This was not a popular question. Many who selected it handled it well but a considerable number of candidates did not fully understand the relationship between public opinion and the winning of war. Indeed, public opinion was often interpreted as 'the public'. The concept of 'winning' was also sidelined, as was 'losing' in the case of the Russian Revolution. Some candidates were able to offer good examples but many focused on 'total war' and the importance of involving citizens and censorship rather than demonstrating how it affected the outcome of wars.

### **Teacher Study Day**

A Study Day for this theme and for 'War & Society 1793-1918' will be held at the National Army Museum on Monday 5 December 2005. This will include a lecture by Professor Mike Paris of the University of Central Lancashire.

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.16.

### **The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815-1919**

**19** Most candidates answered this question with confidence. They showed a good understanding of Metternich's role in hindering German nationalism, focused well on the role of Bismarck and several challenged the premise in the question by considering the role of Wilhelm as a rival contender. Some candidates had difficulty handling turning points and rather rashly saw each major development as a key moment of change. Failure to justify their decision was a common weakness. There was also a tendency in some cases to interpret the question very narrowly by restricting discussion only to turning points in German unification rather than cover the whole period, and several candidates ended their argument in 1871 or 1890.

**20** This question produced a variety of answers. Several candidates had problems seeing how industrialisation hindered German nationalism. Most centred their arguments around Prussian economic strength and considered how industrialisation helped German nationalism. Better responses produced balanced thematic arguments, focused on helped/hindered and included a discussion of the growth and impact of social democracy.

**21** A popular and well answered question in many cases. Most candidates displayed a sound grasp of the ways in which the aims of German nationalism changed across the period. Better answers analysed and synthesised thematic developments and were able to delineate support groups, changes in nationalism and developments in Prussia and other states. Less competent essays were narratives of one change after another with no thoughts of continuity. Several

candidates saw nationalism and unification as identical developments and some surprisingly failed to mention the *grossdeutschland* and *kleindeutschland* debate.

### **Russian Dictatorship 1855-1956**

**22** This question produced a range of responses but many candidates under-performed because they failed to read the question carefully. Many responded to 'living and working conditions' by offering vague descriptions or writing extensively about industrialisation and agricultural policies and the political circumstances in which people lived. 'Russian peoples' was also interpreted too narrowly as workers and/or peasants, with the latter receiving more detailed coverage. Strong candidates evaluated changes over time and gave good examples of pre-1917 and post-1917 conditions. Most of these argued that living and working conditions remained essentially poor and illustrated the point in a thematic and synoptic manner.

**23** A popular question but not always well answered. Many candidates interpreted 'ruled' as an opportunity to write about any policy pursued by the Tsarists and Communists rather than focusing on the nature of central and local government, the aristocracy, nobility, Orthodox Church, and methods of rule. Good answers drew out comparisons between the rulers in a thematic approach and many candidates identified similarities between Alexander III and Stalin. Only a few mentioned nationalities, the size of Empire, and needs of governments. The weakest essays were chronological descriptions of first change and then continuity across the period, with no reference to 'the ways in which Russia was ruled'.

**24** A well answered question by those candidates who evaluated Lenin before comparing him with other rulers. Almost all argued that Stalin did most to transform Russia. Almost all average responses devoted too little time to assessing Lenin and too much to describing the changes that occurred under each ruler. Weaker essays did not differentiate between tsars, knew little about Lenin and failed to focus on 'transform', often just looking at economic performances.

### **The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877**

**25** Very popular and generally well answered. Most candidates argued that although slavery was an issue, at least in the background for a large part of the period, for much of the period (notably after 1800) there were other issues at the centre of sectional conflict. The rights of states were generally well handled with discussion of detailed constitutional issues from the earlier part of the period. Weaker answers dealt exclusively with the issue of slavery.

**26** Knowledge of the Bill of Rights varied according to Centre. Some produced excellent essays, displaying command of the whole period and the ability to discuss specific modifications of the constitution alongside broader issues of political philosophy. Weaker answers were less assured handling the concept of turning point but could still assess the role of the Supreme Court in constitutional matters.

**27** A popular and well answered question. The best produced a thematic argument that established the checks and balances within the constitution and then analysed the role of the president and how it changed in relation to the main institutions of the state. Presidents receiving detailed coverage were Jackson and Lincoln. Less effective responses tended to run through American presidents and forget about 'at the expense of Congress and the Supreme Court'.

### **Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980**

**28** The most popular of this set of questions which produced a range of results. Weaker answers were narratives of African Americans and often stopped in 1965. There was very little precise knowledge of key legislation in the 1960s. A general assumption held by many was that there was little progress before 1945 and after this date the Civil Rights movement took off. The role of Presidents, Congress and the Supreme Court was assessed by good candidates who, in several cases, gave them precedence over the African Americans. Better candidates provided a more balanced assessment of the whole period and argued that many of the later developments were linked to those from earlier times.

**29** Knowledge tended to be very patchy on labour rights particularly for the 1945-80 period. Weaker candidates grouped labour and trade unions together, some began their essays in the 1920s and ended in 1947, and others produced a chronological survey with little linkage to the question. Most dismissed the 1920s as unimportant or linked 1929 with the New Deal and claimed the latter was the most important turning point.

**30** The key to producing a successful answer was to keep a coverage of the three groups evenly balanced. The tendency among most candidates was to focus on the Native Americans to the detriment of the Hispanics. Many essays were narratives of the earlier period with little or no reference to the improvements at the end of the period. Weaker candidates often failed to distinguish between Chinese and Japanese Americans and/or knew little about Hispanics. The best answers compared the three ethnic groups throughout their answer, rather than just in the conclusion, and explained varying levels and periods of social, economic and political discrimination.

## Units 2592/01-2593/01: Independent Investigations (A2)

### Main points:

- There is a difference between cross-reference and juxtaposition when comparing the interpretations of historians as evidence for an argument.
- Categorising historians is relatively meaningless unless it is made clearly relevant to the argument.
- *Ad hominem* evaluation of historians rarely succeeds. In most cases, the circumstances of the historian matter less than what he/she has written.
- Evidence from primary sources can be evaluated by explanatory commentary and/or by reference to a wider context of knowledge.

### **“Getting the coursework right” Coursework INSET**

A series of 5 half-day workshops will be held around the country in December 2005-January 2006.

Unit 2592 produces the best results every year. Nonetheless, with some fine tuning, many centres could significantly improve the coursework results. Meetings will consider both Units 2592 & 2593.

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.12.

### General comments:

#### Notes:

Teachers need also to read the section specifically on Unit 2593/01.

Text in italics quotes scripts or reports from examiners.

It is clear from both candidates' work and examiners' reports that the general standard of coursework is improving. The best work, as ever, is truly impressive, whilst good, solid work is characterised by well-constructed argument and by increasingly relevant and critical use of source material. An increasing number of centres are allowing their candidates the freedom to carry out local investigations; a majority provide opportunities to investigate valid topics of their own choosing; whilst a stubborn minority continue to offer them the deadening experience of the semi-structured (more or less) common essay. This begs the question that dare not speak its name, 'Who is the coursework experience for?'

As ever, there is a need to make clear at the outset of this report that, despite many examples of excellent work, the content of the report will consist mainly and necessarily of shortcomings of various kinds – always accompanied by advice about how to avoid them in future. This comes from a belief that coursework, like any other kind of formative assessment, needs to have an educative function. Otherwise, why do it? 'Who is assessment for?'

**Marking Notes:** To assist examiners and to provide further guidance to supervisors, marking notes were written for each of the 2005 Board-set questions. They offer the kind of guidance provided by Assessors of coursework Proposal Forms and are published with the summer 2005 markschemes. Examiners found them helpful so they will be written again in future years. We hope that they prove equally useful to teachers in showing how these types of questions need to be approached.

### Organisation of coursework component:

Despite a continuously rising standard of coursework overall, there is still an unacceptable number of inadequate proposals and poor studies. Where this occurs, it reflects as badly on the teacher as on the candidate and it may well be that some teachers are unaware of how much guidance they

are allowed to give. One way of thinking about this, as suggested by one of the examiners, is to divide the support strategy into three phases - the 'proactive', the 'reactive' and the 'inactive'.

**The Proactive phase:**

- Discussing titles and proposal forms – helping the candidate avoid obvious pitfalls; making sure all sections are fully completed.
- Giving advice on books – helping each candidate compile a bibliography, preferably comprising specialist 'big books' as well as general text books or pre-digested 'tertiary sources'

**The Reactive phase:**

- Reviewing the assessor's response to each proposal – discussing matters to do with methodology and content; rehearsing techniques for addressing AO2, etc.
- Ensuring that presentational issues are addressed – e.g. spelling, punctuation and grammar; word limits; footnotes and bibliography (see final sections).
- Monitoring progress made at regular intervals – answering candidates' 'working questions'; setting targets for completion of sections of the study; urging candidates to maintain the relevance of their argument and make sure it is supported by critical use of source material.
- Doing everything other than marking or giving written feedback on notes or actual drafts of the Investigation.

**The Inactive phase:**

- Allowing the candidate to complete and submit his/her study without interference or correction.

**The role of the teacher**

With immediate effect, the ban on teachers reading draft work is removed. Teachers may thus now read material to assist them in the on-going oral advice they give to their students in coursework tutorials – see the new specification pp.134 & 138.

This has been done to bring us into line with other subjects and Boards using examiner-marked A2 Level coursework, having discovered that the rule laid down for OCR History had not been imposed on the examiner-marked coursework for any other subject in any Board.

**NB** Teachers may still not mark anything, whether research notes or drafts of the Investigation. Written feedback is not permitted.

Discussing matters to do with methodology and content' is of crucial importance, as the following examiner points out: *Some direct instruction to students before they begin their investigations would have been of considerable assistance. It is not possible to assess the changing situation of women workers in the Black Country from the study of a single census of Dudley, however interesting this may be. Similarly, a study of the extent to which the railway affected the economy of Newton Abbot should have included data on employment figures, patterns of trade, industrial output, agricultural commerce etc. before the railway was built.*

**Finding and submitting questions:**

A persistent minority of centres neglect the opportunity to submit Coursework Proposal Forms to OCR Assessors – usually to the detriment of their candidates' completed studies. One examiner lamented a number of non-submitted titles from one centre: *These included 'To what extent does a photograph of the 1938 England World Cup Team suggest sport was a propaganda tool?' The answer did not even include a copy of the photograph but it finally emerged that it was one where they gave the Hitler salute.*

**Local History:** It was pleasing to note an upturn of interest in using the coursework component as a vehicle for local historical investigations, and particularly pleasing to see that so much of this was well done. An extract from the work of one such centre is featured later in the report. An **AS/A2 Teacher Study Day** on The Civil War and Oliver Cromwell – to be held at **Peterborough Cathedral** on Friday 13 January 2006 – will include an investigative tour of the Cathedral to **consider how a building can be used to make an effective local history study**. For details see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet.

**Candidate choice:** Old bad habits are proving hard to break. Some centres are still encouraging unacceptably high numbers of candidates to plump for the same title. The ruling against whole centres submitting investigations with the same title has reduced the problem of ‘teacher driven’ individual studies, but not eliminated it. In a centre of 15 students, 13 submitted work on the Elizabethan Settlement. The question was ‘To what extent was Puritanism/Parliament/the Queen’s own beliefs/ the Council the main factor in deciding the 1559 Settlement?’ The chosen factor may have been different in the title but the essays were much the same, using the same texts, presenting the same arguments and including the same source evaluation. Such practice may meet the letter of the regulations, but it flouts individual student choice and the individuality of the finished investigation – both bedrocks on which A Level History individual studies have been built over the past twenty years. By contrast, in one centre of 100, every candidate tackled a different question. That is ideal practice, fully within the spirit of A Level History coursework.

Another Examiner observed that, in a similar situation, candidates made reference to ‘fact sheets’ with titles relevant to the topic being answered by 23 out of 35 candidates. This could not be further from what is meant by ‘Independent Investigation’. More important, over-drilling of this kind is counter-productive. Centres should either let candidates choose their own questions or, in the case of large groups where this may be unrealistic, provide a range of questions that are **substantively different** from which to choose.

Over-preparation can also stultify candidates’ critical awareness and can be complicated by use of the tertiary source, as implied by the following examiner: *Condescending criticisms of John Neale could be accurate (the checks I carried out suggested otherwise) but candidates and/or their teachers should note that before dismissing an historian, it is well to read him/her. In no instance did I find any of Neale’s works in footnotes or bibliographies; his ‘revisionist’ critics, nonetheless, were assumed to be models of impartiality in their representation of Neale’s ideas and arguments. On a more encouraging note, one dissident in the group (probably the same person who asked why the Emperor was wearing no clothes) ventured to ask why, if the catholic bishops and peers were as powerful as Doran makes out, the 1559 settlement was Protestant. Here was a rare glimmer of originality from an over-drilled group. Clearly, those with a supervisory role should be asking whether it is in the real interests of their students to be regimented in this way, especially when so much more is achieved by placing trust in their intelligence and abilities.*

If the question states that the subject of the enquiry is the importance of the Austrian army in suppressing the 1848-49 revolutions in Italy, then it is reasonable to expect that there will be a study of the army as both a policing body, as a branch of the administration and as a fighting force. If it turns out that the necessary information is not easily discovered, then the candidate needs to change the question. A general account of Italy in 1848-49 will not answer the question chosen – and examiners must mark the answer to the question.

**Poor/Bad Questions:** Some candidates still set themselves (or are set by someone else) questions impossible to answer. Speculative questions were fewer, but the following illustrates the problem: ‘Could Nicholas II have prevented his own downfall by allowing reform to go further?’ Even the candidate admitted in the answer that the question was unanswerable.

One Examiner reminded us that questions beginning ‘Why ...?’ and ‘How ...?’ (as opposed to ‘How far ...?’) tend to produce lists of causes and descriptions of events respectively – e.g. ‘How did



Hitler's policy in Bohemia-Moravia lead to war?' She also commented on how some questions show that candidates not submitting Proposal Forms are being poorly advised bring their teachers, a classic being, 'Could the provision of more lifeboats have reduced the number of lives lost on the Titanic?'; the answer, presumably, has to be "Yes". Poor guidance by some teachers is shown equally by some candidates who set themselves/are set far too much to do in the space of 2500-3000 words, either by adopting too long a time period, or, in the case of, say, Hitler, Bismarck or Napoleon, trying to cover both domestic and foreign policies.

Though not as numerous as in previous years, several 'murder mysteries' were proposed, along the lines of 'Who killed Kennedy?' or 'Who was Jack the Ripper?' These never work very well, since the candidates who attempt them inevitably get sucked into someone else's investigation – quite often that of a journalist posing as a historian. This is not to say that topics of this kind cannot work at all; rather, that a more original 'angle' needs to be found that will permit a valid, more original investigation – for example, 'How far was the failure to find Jack the Ripper due to police incompetence?'

The only ones damaged by the adoption of unworkable questions are the candidates themselves. Consequently there is an increasingly compelling argument for making the submission of draft coursework questions compulsory.

#### **Quality of argument:**

A common weakness in the work of average and/or less successful candidates is that they apparently lack the ability to structure an argument. Quality of argument has tended to be neglected in recent reports – possibly because of a mistaken assumption that this is familiar ground and so less problematic than, say, critical use of source material or interpretations. It is important to redress this balance because coherence of argument counts for as much as source evaluation in the assessment of completed studies. Moreover, these are inter-dependent components of the finished work: the direction of an argument will determine the selection of evidence; and source evaluation cannot be rewarded unless it can be seen validly to be advancing the argument in some way.

The introduction should offer a rationale for the investigation and expose possible lines of argument within it. An important decision then needs to be taken about how the argument is to be developed and this decision will depend entirely upon the title of the investigation. For example, if a detailed, in-depth study is envisaged – for example, of the events of the Paris Commune or the General Strike – then a broadly chronological narrative structure may be indicated, however, one that incorporates relevant analysis or evaluation as the 'story' unfolds – pure description and nothing else will attract a very low mark. On the other hand, if there is a proposition to be tested – "How far was Hitler a 'weak dictator?'" or an event to be explained – "Was Charles I mainly responsible for his own downfall?"- a 'thematic' structure may be preferred, in which each paragraph might deal with one facet of the argument (e.g. Hitler's control of day-to-day administration in the former), or with one or other causal factor (e.g. Charles I's sacrifice of Strafford in the latter).

Once this decision is made, each paragraph should contribute to the course of the argument – be it evaluative, chronological or thematic - and the opening sentence should indicate what this contribution is to be, as well as, if possible, referring back to the substance of the previous paragraph – "For Charles to reject what he took to be the unreasonable demands of the Long Parliament was one thing (previous paragraph); to attempt the arrest of Parliamentary leaders was quite another (current paragraph).

As the argument moves towards a conclusion, the candidate must remember that the ending should do a lot more than summarise the preceding argument – usually with a concluding paragraph beginning with "In conclusion, I believe.....". Whilst reflecting the balance of the argument as a whole, the conclusion should also contain a *judgement* – e.g. an *adjudication*

between competing proposals, or a *demonstration* of why 'P' was a more important cause of Q than R'.

Of course, some candidates may validly conclude that no simple judgement can be made – for example, because the conflict between alternatives is more apparent than real, or because it can depend on variations to the timescale. For example, in an investigation assessing the achievements of Field Marshall Haig, a candidate might conclude that a limited focus on 1916 might give one interpretation, but a wider timescale encompassing 1914-18 might give quite another. When candidates attempt to resolve conflicts between apparently conflicting interpretations in this way, they are forming a *synthesis* - possibly the most demanding of all the skills of argument.

A weakness in studies calling for causal explanation is that they pay sufficient attention to causal factors that are 'conditional' but insufficient attention to those that are 'contingent' – or, rather, *very* contingent. Neglect of the latter is particularly important, as one examiner has interestingly observed: *My instinct is that candidates might be helped to come to a real conclusion if they took more interest in the 'final act'. Very few 'Suffragette' candidates take any interest in the 1918 debates that gave women the vote. Very few 'Rise of Hitler' candidates have a detailed knowledge of the events of December 1932 to January 1933. If they did explore the topic fully to the end they would be in a stronger position to weigh the significance of their chosen 'factor'.*

They would also, needless to say, be in a better position to assess the relative importance of conditional or contingent factors to the explanation.

Many candidates – particularly those who are 'visual' learners, could be helped to produce more coherent, well-structured arguments by finding a way of representing the argument visually. The 'mind map' is a familiar device for doing this and could be easily adapted to incorporate, evidence deployment and evaluation. The 'mind map' helps the candidate to see the shape of the whole argument before first draft and can therefore remove this impression some candidates give of feeling their way through each page in turn without any real sense of where they are trying to get to.

Finally, there is a need to mention critical narrative. Not every claim needs to be supported by a quoted source, critically used. Sometimes, candidates will wish simply to invoke contextual knowledge as 'evidence' to support a claim made in the text, or to suggest the plausibility of a relevant speculation: *The provision of adequate evidence for assertions is also an area for consideration. Too many candidates make assertions without any evidence to support them. The same can be said of speculation, with no suggestion as to why the speculation is reasonable. Neither case requires large amounts of information but some measure of support would lend more credibility to the argument.*

### **Use of sources:**

Overall, candidates are reported to be making both more and better critical use of sources. Methodology has been suggested both in these pages and in assessors' written advice and this seems to have been adopted in many cases, so that what tends to distinguish candidates' work is not so much the presence/absence of 'critical use' but its quality. How disappointing, then, to read the following observation from one examiner: *Astonishingly, some candidates still neglect this basic requirement of the mark scheme. In far too many scripts there was good quality argument, but little or no reference to sources, which prevented a number of otherwise good answers from gaining Band 1.*

This year's examination exposed both strengths and weaknesses in candidates' critical treatment of source material. There was some excellent and often sophisticated, critical use of sources this year. Discussion of why, for example, medieval chroniclers or Marxist historians might take a particular line were dealt with in an illuminating and often detailed fashion.

Most examiner criticism of candidates' use of secondary sources was directed against the fashion for categorising historians as e.g. 'Orthodox', 'Intentionalist' etc. This happens every year and candidates clearly pick up the habit from text book writers, who should know better – but this year, one examiner counted 37 separate designations, excluding the ubiquitous 'some', 'many' and 'few'. Quite apart from the fact that, strictly speaking, it is not the historian who is 'Intentionalist' but his/her interpretation, there seems to be an assumption that this sort of designation somehow counts as evaluation – 'pre/post-Glasnost' and 'prominent' are good examples of quasi-evaluation, as are the following:

*Keith Robbins is a reliable historian, as he is neither Revisionist nor Orthodox.*

*The Post-Revisionist view would be the most accurate, because of serious limitations to the interpretations of the Orthodox and Revisionist schools of thought. The Post-Revisionist conclusion on the origins of the Berlin Blockade being a combination of both western and soviet fears seems valid. The Post-Revisionist is more balanced and is less of a reaction than the Revisionist Interpretation was to the Orthodox viewpoint...etc.*

The point to make here, surely, is that historians are only as good as the evidence that they use and so **it is the opinions they express on the basis of this evidence that should be evaluated** – not the historian him/herself. This is not to say that historians themselves cannot be 'positioned' – either by circumstance or temperament – but 'ad hominem' evaluation is a difficult area and few candidates have sufficient grasp of historiography to do it well. The following example makes the point: *Candidates in one centre keenly identified sources on the Bolsheviks as Pre and Post-Glasnost but then criticised eyewitnesses such as Kerensky for being pre-Glasnost and not having access to recent research... One group assumed all Spanish historians, being Catholic, were biased towards Philip II of Spain but considered English ones on the same subject to be totally impartial.*

A further – and more important – weakness is a tendency to confuse cross-reference and juxtaposition when comparing historians' views. Cross-referencing of both primary and secondary sources is a valid facet of critical evaluation; indeed, it has been annually encouraged in these pages. However, it has always been stressed that cross-reference is a form of **evaluation**, not a means of listing historians, or 'reporting' their views in symmetrically matched pairs – this is merely juxtaposition.

*What was being argued was submerged beneath the welter of views put forward. Many of these often lacked much in the way of connecting narrative, so that the historiography of Philip II as an absolute ruler might be fully outlined, but there was no inkling of what he actually did.*

The point of cross-reference is to identify and explain *commonalities* amongst several pieces of evidence that will strengthen a view or line of argument. The point of counter-reference is to identify and explain *disagreements* that will indicate lack of consistency or a weakened line of argument – both are 'critical' in the sense that the strengths and/or limitations of the evidence are being exposed and this in turn serves the purpose of advancing or changing the direction of the argument in some way. The candidate can help the examiner to distinguish between cross-reference and juxtaposition by making clear his/her intention – *France's view, though at first sight far-fetched, is in fact supported by that of Riley Smith, who states ... Similarly, However, both DUBY and Finucane's explanations seem too uncomplicated, and there is a lack of evidence to back them up. What Riley-Smith more attractively argues is that ...*

The temptation appears to persist for using ready-made arguments to be found in tertiary sources. As one Examiner observed: *Examiners see this when a well written paragraph – sometimes inconsistent with the quality of the work as a whole – seems to be slightly at odds with the reason for its inclusion. The candidate in such a case is not so much in breach of the plagiarism regulations, as of failing to ponder her/his own argument, which should then be presented in*

*her/his own words. In short, candidates should ensure that the argument is their own – albeit informed at intervals by the attributed and evaluated work of others.*

Occasionally, candidates get confused by the competing demands of distance and familiarity: *Whether candidates are writing about the English Reformation, the English Civil War or the Chartists, Haigh, Hill and Evans, respectively, do not need to be prefixed by the label ‘the historian’.*

‘Ad hominem’ evaluation continues to generate generalised judgements that contribute little to the argument – indeed, they are often so inverted as to be virtually meaningless: *The information was obtained from a school text book written in the mid-nineties, which would suggest that there is no reason for the author to be biased in any way. It can also be concluded that the author had a wide range of evidence and resources in order to ensure that the information is correct.*

*He is well known, respected and also received the Pulitzer Prize for his biography [of Peter the Great]. Consequently, Massie has the overall stronger argument.”*

*Oxford Books were printed in Britain, so must reliably reflect a British point of view.”*

*The balanced Feuchtwanger says ...*

*“The equilibrator [sic] Susan Doran suggests that ...*

*Crankshaw’s views [on the Gestapo] may well have been influenced by his own opinions, but his language and approach in explaining is thorough and of no apparent bias.*

*Haigh’s view of Elizabeth is coloured by his experiences under another female autocrat – Thatcher”*

We can see how candidates without any real awareness of historiography will offer quite facile evaluations of this or that historian by focusing on e.g. his/her age, religious or political persuasion, or nationality. All of this is basically unhistorical. **The surest way of evaluating a secondary source is by testing it for consistency with an appropriate range of relevant primary sources.** Why more candidates do not do this is one of the abiding mysteries of Units 2592 and 2593.

However, this ought to remind us generally that a wider range of evaluative techniques are available. Both secondary and primary sources are capable of being evaluated **in context** - where the **plausibility** of the evidence in the source is assessed in the light of what is known about the period in question or about the circumstances surrounding the events described in the source. In the following extract, from an essay entitled, ‘To what extent is the traditional view of Richard III justified?’ the candidate is trying to establish Richard’s **capacity** for murder by discussing his role in the suspicious circumstances surrounding the earlier death of Henry VI in 1471. The paragraph amounts to an extended, in-context evaluation of Thomas More’s version of events.

*The death of Edward IV’s father [sic], Henry VI, appears to be a different matter. Henry was locked in the Tower after his defeat at Tewkesbury at the hands of Edward IV. Most sources, primary and secondary, agree that Richard, accompanied by many others, made his way into the Tower with the intention of killing the king. It is whether or not Richard carried out the act itself that is the debated issue. More is the prolific Tudor source on this charge, ‘Richard slew with his own hands king Henry’ is the accusation presented as fact.... The death of Henry would eliminate another figure in Richard’s path to the throne, but it is supposition to suggest that this was his motive. It is true to say that Edward IV would probably have had Henry killed anyway, as Ross puts it, as a matter of ‘political expediency’. So for Edward to let his own brother carry it out as opposed to a lesser noble is unlikely. This apart, the only reason Richard may have done it would be due to sheer cold-bloodedness, a motive that traditional historians would certainly not want to discredit.*

A further worrying trend caused by the current obsession with juxtaposing and labelling historians, is the apparent neglect of the primary source – the raw material of historical investigation. However, the evaluation of primary sources that is done, tends to be generally well done - and is improving. In particular, it was pleasing to see two types of evaluation that have attracted little previous attention.

The first of these is where the candidate *interprets the content of a source* in such a way, or with such insight, that it contributes relevantly to a line of argument. However, it needs to be emphasised that the outcome has to be something more than mere paraphrase, which, of course, cannot count as ‘critical use’. The following example is taken from a study that adopted the ‘open book’ title: ‘With reference to any major uprising against political authority, assess the relative importance of reasons why it was either successful or unsuccessful’. The candidate chose to focus upon the Easter Rising of 1916 and in this extract is trying to explain Pearse’s intentions, by reference to a source containing the words he spoke at his trial on 2 May 1916.

**The source:**

*We seem to have lost. We have not lost. To refuse to fight would have been to lose. To fight is to win. We have kept faith with the past and handed a tradition to the future. If our deed has not been sufficient to win freedom, then our children will win it by a better deed.*

**The candidate’s commentary:**

*Whilst Pearse acknowledged the failure of the rising by signing the surrender note, in reality he hoped that the rising would become successful after his death. These last words at his court martial deliver a clear message to all Republicans, stressing the importance of the need to continue the fight that they had just begun for independence. The source can be regarded as a justification for their actions, as it offers an explanation of what they hoped to achieve through failing.*

The first part of the extract could be regarded as paraphrasing, but the last sentence goes somewhere beyond this by making a generalised statement about the source that goes beyond face-value treatment and adds to our understanding of the line of argument being pursued – i.e. that one of the main reasons for the success of the Easter Rising was its failure.

The second method is cross-reference – more familiar amongst secondary sources, but also effective with primary sources. Consider the following example from a study of the usefulness of war poetry in assisting our understanding of conditions on the Western Front. In the quoted passage, the candidate is trying to do two things: to combine evidence in support of a claim; and to demonstrate how far war poets were ‘in touch’ with the experiences of ordinary soldiers. The key to success here is the careful choice of cross-referenced extracts:

*War verse is also informative in not only depicting, but also explaining, why there was considerable antagonism between the men at the front and civilians at home. In ‘Forgotten Voices of the Great War’, there are accounts which show women giving men who were either on leave from the front, or had been wounded, white feathers to label them as cowards:*

*‘A lady came along and put a white feather in my hand. I looked at it and felt disgusted, but there was not much I could do about it... I just sat there, on my own, while people looked at me and I looked at them. I should have liked to have jumped up and told them I had just come out of the trenches at Ypres, but I could not.*

*Sassoon captures this tense, often bitter relationship between soldier and civilian:*

*‘You smug-faced crowds with kindling eye  
Who cheer when soldier lad march by,  
Sneak home and pray you’ll never know  
The hell where youth and laughter go.’*

The general point being made here is that something more than the 'stock' methods of evaluating primary sources (*because this is primary source written by someone who witnessed the event ...*) are not only available but also rewardable.

Not to be outdone, the 'stock' evaluation measures of 'utility' and 'reliability' enjoyed freshening use in the aforementioned local studies of the Culford Estate in Suffolk, as the following extracts show.

First, however, it is worth pausing to look at the title of the study: ' "The main motive for change on the Culford Estate was the convenience of the landowners." How far is this true of the period 1793-1883?' This was one of several distinctively different titles offered by the centre and it shows how local historical studies can produce titles as valid as those dealing with other topics. This title permits of both argument and evaluation within a manageable time frame, which is fixed, presumably, to correspond with the main evidence sources available.

*The main area of change is where the village has been concealed. The village has been hidden according to Repton [a contemporary historian] 'as village hovels often obtrude on the dignity of the mansion.' However, Repton appears to have had a kind attitude as he believes in concealing the village to make it 'part of the improved scenery', rather than moving the village to a new location. Repton may not be a reliable source, however, as there are inconsistencies within his Red Books. The added footpaths that Repton talks about, 'winding footpaths and carriage drives will give the illusion of a park much larger than its size' are not shown on the maps which Repton produced. Repton also seems to speak generally about landscaping, rather than specifically about Culford ...*

*..... Twistleton [Assistant Poor Law Commissioner] says the best cottages he has seen were at Culford. It appears that he has been there as it says, 'It was this (the outward appearance of them) that first attracted my attention to them.' However, there is no evidence that he went into the buildings. The measurements of the buildings and general description seem to have come from the plans for the houses [plans fully referenced and included in study]. It seems unlikely he would have gone inside the houses and in his report on Culford he has not spoken to any of the tenants of the houses. The tenants, of course, may have been afraid to talk to Twistleton as it could risk them losing their houses if they spoke badly of the landowner .....*

*...David Davy [author of 'Excursions Through the County of Suffolk 1823-44] visited Culford in 1829. He wrote about his travels in an unofficial journal commenting on 500 other villages in Suffolk. According to Davy, 'the houses give an air of comfort, which is not often seen in country villages'. However, the main interests were the churches in each village, which may suggest he was less interested in the houses than in the church, so the source may appear to be reliable. However, having been accommodated by Benyon [the landowner] it is likely he would favour him...*

To reach Band 1, source evaluation need not be particularly elaborate – just relevant and well informed. Examiners are looking for a candidate's 'comfortable familiarity' with title, argument and use of sources. Consider the following extract from a study about the extent to which lay response to the First Crusade was motivated by piety. Notice in particular the effective use of contextual evidence to support the claim made by Riley-Smith in the opening line:

*Riley-Smith also successfully manages to quash France's implication of the Crusades as a colonial venture, through convincing evidence. Of the 791 individuals who Riley-Smith found evidence of having participated in crusades, a mere 57 stayed in the east permanently, many of these for religious reasons. This certainly seems compellingly to indicate a non-materialistic motivation. France argues that, though few Crusaders eventually benefited materially, they would not have known this when they set off. However, his approach seems wrong, the evidence of the expense of crusading seems to suggest they must have been ready to lose financially...*

*... Bull's research into the charters drawn up by the Crusaders before they left, proves important because it is the only source we have expressing these. They seem, he argues, to indicate particular fears of hell and desire for penance – both of which motivated Crusaders; these themes seem to be common throughout nearly all charters – this, it seems, shows genuine piety. However, as convincing as many of Bull's viewpoints are, they sometimes seem too idealistic. Knights' charters are somewhat limited as evidence, because they may not necessarily express knights' real motives. They all depict idealistic motives, they are hardly likely to express selfish ones – these charters were created for the benefit of religious communities and can thus be misleading; furthermore, they only show the motivation of the knightly upper classes, and only a small fraction of these as well. The evidence can perhaps work either way – charters could be interpreted as an attempt to justify in religious terms knights going to the East to make their fortunes.*

These extracts suggest a real engagement with the problem posed in the title, a sort of originality of argument that can often be missing in other scripts. This is because there is a sense of the evidence being worked and moulded to the shape of the argument. This matter of the *relevance of evaluation to argument* is critical: *What gives this Investigation its special quality is that the candidate utilises a series of techniques of source evaluation in the course of making the argument. When this works well, there is simply a seamless integration of source evaluation – by cross-reference, counter-reference, range of convenience, provenance issues or critical appraisal of historians' views. However, these techniques work best in respect of a **specific reference** and in the context of the candidate's **own argument**. They sit less comfortably amongst the generalised remarks about source types or 'schools' of historians that tend to characterise the weaker scripts.*

Constructing an Independent Investigation is not easy for some candidates – particularly those who are still working to GCSE 'rules of evidence'. The overall advice to such candidates, therefore, might be to try to see competing lines of argument 'in the round' – perhaps, literally, as built structures, in which the bricks represent the sources and the mortar the surrounding analysis. If they can see the sources they use (primary or secondary), not as discrete items, but as sets of bricks holding up two opposing walls, then they will begin to see what successful completion of the study requires.

Footnotes, appendices and bibliographies:

- Candidates should include relevant page references and dates in all footnoted references. Examiners will be instructed to look for page references next year, as a means of checking on overuse of tertiary sources.

For example, a letter from Whitelock to Cromwell on the subject of the Crown was referenced only as 'A. Leonard, Cromwell, p.23.' This reference gave no indication of whether the comment was made when Charles was still king, or when Cromwell was Protector, or at some time in between. **A precise date** would have given much more meaning (and more relevant purpose) to the quotation.

- When primary sources are taken from a secondary source, **both** sources should be acknowledged. This is particularly important where the distinction could be valuable to the argument. If the words of one historian are quoted in the work of another (the 'tertiary

source'), this should be referenced as, for example, 'Dickens A.G., quoted in Scarisbrick J.J., *The Reformation and the English People*, p.84.'

- An interesting problem that emerged this year was that some candidates did not seem sure about when/when not to offer a footnote. For example, one examiner observed: *The footnotes tended to give basic information (for example, a concise account of the Cold War – very scholarly but one might assume that an examiner might know this), while an interpretation, or opinion used in the argument (for example, 'He was convinced that soviet intelligence loops were undermining national security...') received no reference.*
- Two of the more bizarre footnotes to appear this year:

*Internet – didn't make a note and cant [sic] find it.  
The historian Ibid.*

- Appendices in the form of extended written sources are rarely required. They encourage candidates to see the Investigation as a sort of 'source-based exercise' and can result in the candidate exceeding the word limit. The appendix facility is occasionally useful for displaying visual or graphical images but should be used for no more than this.
- A bibliography listing **books actually used** (alphabetically by author) should be appended.
- Candidates should include date of publication for books cited in bibliographies or footnotes – in particular those dealing with post-war topics, as this can be a pointer to reliability. As one examiner observed:

*Some cited books were actually contemporaneous with the events being studied – but this did not seem to be appreciated.*

- Finally, candidates need to avoid uncritical acceptance of websites – e.g. David Irving was cited as a reliable source for work on Hitler.

### Grammar and presentation:

- **Plus ça change**  
*Standards of grammar remained poor in many cases. Sentences lacking verbs were common. Apostrophes were either scarce or proliferated in the wrong place. Is inappropriate use of upper case, or the lack of it for proper nouns a result of texting? Use of the spell-checker had eliminated most errors, apart from those it does not pick up e.g. 'both accounts are floored.*
- Please do **not** use plastic covers, transparent sleeves or cardboard folders.

### Old Chestnuts:

Candidates/centres SHOULD

- Choose workable titles.
- Make use of OCR Coursework Assessors.
- Make sure that source evaluation is relevant to the argument.
- Choose an argument that answers the question they have asked.

Candidates/centres SHOULD NOT

- Allow all (or even a significant majority of) candidates to answer the same question.
- Exceed the word limit. Examiners **stop** reading at 3000 words.
- Use sources merely to illustrate the narrative. Evidence from sources should critically used. It needs to 'work for' the argument in some way, earning its place.
- Use footnotes as a forum for conducting their argument.
- Provide footnotes without page references.



## Report on the Units taken in June 2005

- Include unattributed websites in footnotes or bibliographies.
- Use abbreviations without first writing the name in full.
- Submit 'finished' studies without proof reading them.
- Present finished studies in folders or files, especially with separate pockets for each page as well. A simple staple will suffice.

New howlers seen this year:

*Elizabeth was very fond of Burglary.*

*Essex proposed to Elizabeth and she reclined.*

*Mary had been declared a bustard.*

*This gave the Queen the right to style herself Empress of India at a politically incontinent time.*

*Many martyrs were burnt at the steak.*

### Board set questions for 2007+: World History – a reminder

As notified in *Newsletter 2* (Winter 2004-2005) p.5, the World History question from 2007 will sometimes have a more particular regional focus, e.g. on the history of Africa or of the Indian sub-continent.

### A2 ENTRY SUB-CODES starting with the June 2006 exams

Teachers are referred to pp.146-147 of the new Specification which details the sub-codes that your Exams Officers will use when Unit 2592 entries are made for your candidates sitting A2 exams, starting with the summer 2006 exams.

Details were circulated in *Newsletter 1* (Summer 2004), pp.10-11

### NEW Cover Sheet

Only our own declaration sheet should be stapled to the front of each Investigation.

Henceforth, please use only the new cover sheet in the new (2005) edition of the specification – see Appendix D of the specification, pp.148. This was pre-notified in *Newsletter 2* (Winter 2004-2005), p.4. Added to the teacher's/lecturer's/tutor's declaration is the sentence: "No research notes or Investigation drafts have been marked."

Please note that neither Form CCS155 (Centre Authentication Form for Coursework) nor Form CCS160 (Candidate Authentication Statement) are required – they relate to subjects with teacher-marked coursework.

### Unit 2593/01 Open Book exam (A2)

#### Notes:

Teachers need also to read the previous section on Unit 2592/01.

To assist examiners and to provide further guidance to supervisors, marking notes were written for each of the 2005 Board-set questions. They offer the kind of guidance provided by Assessors of coursework Proposal Forms and are published with the summer 2005 markschemes. Examiners found them helpful so they will be written again in future years. We hope that they prove equally useful to teachers in showing how these types of questions need to be approached.

Text in italics quotes scripts or reports from examiners.

General observations:

- A greater variety of questions were chosen than in previous years.
- Q3 (the Individual) and Q6 (Political History) attracted the highest number of candidates.
- There was a higher proportion of good scripts than in previous years, although mean GCSE scores showed the candidature as a whole to be significantly weaker than last summer.
- More successful candidates tended to be those left to make their own choice of study and to develop their own strategy for making critical use of source material.
- The use of source material in timed examination conditions emerged as an issue this year. An example of good practice could be observed in the case of a candidate from one centre who took with her a list of short, relevant, attributed quotations – 23 on a single side of A4, none more than 2 lines in length, and listed in order of expected use. Hence:
  1. *'No human activity [war] in so continuously and universally bound up with chance' – Karl von Clausewitz.*
  2. *'Had he attacked at daybreak, he would have had five extra hours in which to try and break the allied line' – Roberts*
  3. *'Time is irretrievable in war' - Napoleon*  
*etc.*
- As with Unit 2592, there were too many instances where most or all of the candidates in one centre attempting the same question – using the same example (with minor variations) to meet OCR requirements that candidates must be given choice. The Bolshevik Revolution (Q6) was the main culprit. It cannot be said too often that this sort of practice contravenes the spirit of an 'independent investigation'.

In the text of the essay itself, each source was written out, together with a brief contextual commentary and, where appropriate, an evaluation of the source as evidence for or against a line of argument. The 'list', therefore, helps the candidate to sustain the critical flow of his/her argument and provide a means of checking that the argument is being developed in the correct sequence.

Compare this with the following reported practice:

*Two large centres employed a more questionable method of using sources. Candidates had brought into the examination substantial and well prepared collections of (often lengthy) sources, all attributed and identified as 'Source A' etc. These were then referred to in the text without attribution or indication of content. In some cases there was evaluation, but in others none at all and no further comment; in other words, they were used as a kind of indirect illustration.*

This practice does not offend against the 'letter' of coursework regulations, which refer to candidates being allowed to 'pre-prepare the sources they will quote from in the examination, take them into the examination and attach them to the answer booklet with a tag'. When they wish to quote from them, 'candidates can then refer to them by cross-reference without wasting time copying them out'. However, candidates who do no more than is described in the second example above are not really using 'cross-reference'. Moreover, they are putting themselves at a disadvantage in respect of the mark scheme, since no 'critical use' is being demonstrated. Candidates presenting sources in this way (i.e. on a separate sheet) are advised, therefore, to go beyond a reference such as "see Source C". They should, in addition, offer a brief commentary on the source, including attribution, and, where necessary, evaluate it as evidence for or against a line of argument. "See Source C" is neither 'critical use' nor 'critical evaluation'.

### Comments on Individual Questions

1 Hardly any candidates attempted this question.

2 This was a question providing a good opportunity for a causal explanation of, say, a major revolution. Of course, candidates were not restricted to this, though some made rather questionable interpretations of 'major event'.

The best answers kept a sharp, substantial focus on 'long-term economic factors' and assessed these against other explanations and 'trigger' or short-term factors. The very best responses took on the dimension of relative importance. The most popular choices were the French and Russian Revolutions. On the French Revolution, the strongest answers linked shorter economic trends with deeper developments and then further linked these to issues such as the class structure, privilege, the financial weaknesses of the monarchy and the resulting political crisis. Some were able to perceive the extent to which different factors were inter-connected. In weaker answers, longer-term economic factors tended to be more quickly dealt with - to make way for the 'real causes'.

3 This was a question about 'historical significance', which is not necessarily the same as 'achievement' or 'fame'. In one sense, the 'Individual' question benefited this year from its apparent simplicity and from the explicit steer given to candidates, first to identify criteria for measuring 'historical significance'. However, success with the question did rather depend on (i) candidates establishing a valid method of measuring historical significance and (ii) applying it consistently to the individual in question. Examiners were looking for an understanding of historical significance that encompassed assessment of the impact of the actions of an individual both within **and beyond** their immediate context – be the adjustment spatial or temporal. Studies tended to fall into one of three categories: those that confused 'significance' with 'achievement' and produced an account, sometimes balanced, sometimes not, of their individual's achievements; studies that provided a good set of criteria for measuring historical significance, but did not apply it – writing again about the subject's achievements but in a 'local' or immediate context; and those who produced a valid definition *and* applied it to their subject, assessing achievement within a longer **historical** context, e.g. within a study of prior and subsequent developments. One examiner, commenting on the use of this question in Unit 2592, put the issue rather well:

*"In a world in which everything is significant, nothing is. Something can be significant only in the context of 'X' – and identifying 'X' is the thinking bit."*

The usual popular choices were evident – Lenin, Hitler, Stalin, Mao Tse Tung, Churchill, Peter the Great, Kennedy etc. but a handful of more enterprising candidates chose from figures such as Marie Stopes, Darwin and Brunel. There were very few individuals chosen from before 1500 – for which, amongst other things, the BBC's "Greatest Britons" may be largely to blame. The best answers demonstrated, from the beginning, a very clear idea of 'historical significance' – in terms of an influence on great events, originality and a lasting legacy. Such answers were also able to demonstrate a debate and a variety of interpretations – providing opportunities for critical evaluation. As already indicated, average and less successful candidates wrote about work and achievements with bolted-on comments about 'significance'. Some of these efforts consisted entirely of unadorned narrative. Other candidates tried to judge 'historical significance' on a very narrow basis: Stalin and the Great Terror; Chamberlain and Appeasement.

A more unusual but nonetheless successful study assessed the historical significance of Pope Paul III. The candidate showed good understanding of both the temporal and spatial dimensions of the term 'historical significance', dealing with the influence of this pope in his immediate context, in the wider context of the Papacy in general, and the longer context of a period of rapid change.

4 Few attempted the question on local history.

**Teacher Study Day**

An AS/A2 Study Day on The Civil War and Oliver Cromwell will be held at Peterborough Cathedral on Friday 13 January 2006.

**Included** in the agenda will be an investigative tour of the Cathedral to consider **how a building can be used to make an effective local history study.**

For details, see the 2005/2006 History INSET booklet p.15.

**5** There were some good answers, mainly on Waterloo and Balaclava/Charge of the Light Brigade. However, there was some stretching of the idea of 'chance'. The term 'chance' in the question indicates 'unexpected contingency' or 'something beyond the control of the commanders in the field'. Some candidates got tied up in counterfactual speculation – "If Napoleon had not given the order to....", but this cannot really be defined as a chance occurrence, since the order – good or bad – involved a deliberate action (otherwise, *everything* could be said to be determined by chance). Others took 'chance' to mean something akin to 'being prepared to take a chance'. Were the plans for these essays discussed with teachers? Either way, the candidates should have been saved from working with such basic flaws.

A major fault here was in choosing a conflict that was simply too wide (e.g. the whole of the First or Second World war). The result was, too often, an essay lacking sufficient argument, analysis or evaluation. More successful answers took an important battle, or a campaign – Agincourt, Third Ypres and the Armada all produced good answers. Since the title identified 'chance' as the key issue, a substantial coverage and assessment of this factor was to be expected. Very often, however, this played a very minor part in the discussion. Military history can produce excessively narrative approaches and this was no exception.

**6** As expected, this was a popular question, in which 'relative importance' tended to be the discriminating factor in the quality of candidates' responses. Many of those who wrote thoughtfully, even analytically, about the causes of this or that rebellion, still found it difficult to evaluate causal factors in such a way that they were able to *demonstrate* a hierarchy of importance, as opposed to merely *asserting* it. **[Please refer to the main coursework report for more advice on this.]**

For the most part, the choices were the Bolshevik Revolution, the Chartist Movement and/or the Pilgrimage of Grace and there were some particularly good answers on the Easter Rising. The question as a whole was handled well. Candidates were aware of two highly important components to this question; the variety of factors to be considered and the range of differing views and interpretations – leading to some good critical evaluation. The main weakness, as already stated, was a failure to address the dimension of 'relative importance'.

**7** Choices were almost entirely confined to the English Reformation and the French Wars of Religion. Answers to the latter were handled especially well. Knowledge was full and there was some good critical evaluation of the sources. Mixed motives were appreciated but there was rarely an understanding of the extent to which religion and politics can be separated then.

**8** The main problem with the few responses to this question was that candidates struggled to sustain the relevance of their answers. Most chose to write about the weaponry of the First World War or the dropping of the Atom Bomb. However, neither example quite fits the question, which is about factors that advanced or held back scientific progress. So candidates should have been asking, for example, whether weapons technology in each case was either accelerated or hindered by war, or whether factors other than war might have achieved the same outcome.

**9** Surprisingly few takers. Those who chose it tended to write narrowly about the Suffragettes.

**10** This question produced one of the most successful studies: 'How far did the influence of Spain benefit Mexicans in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century?' It avoided excessive condemnation of the Conquistadors and over-praising (or rubbishing) Aztec culture to achieve a genuine objectivity.

**Board set questions for 2007+: World History – a reminder**

As notified in *Newsletter 2* (Winter 2004-2005) p.5, the World History question from 2007 will sometimes have a more particular regional focus, e.g. on the history of Africa or of the Indian sub-continent.

### Question Proposal Forms

Submissions of coursework proposal forms in improving. Forms were received from 74% of candidates for 2005 (67% for 2004, 63% for 2003). Where are the others? The advice from OCR's coursework Assessors is second to none. They are all senior coursework examiners who use their expertise to act as friendly critics. The advice they offer is based on their direct experience of assessing hundreds of Investigations each year. They know the pitfalls. They have seen too many Investigations that would have been so much more successful if (a) advice had been sought, or (b) advice obtained had been followed.

We modified the Form a year ago, introducing 'Key issues' and 'Core arguments' to try to get candidates to explain themselves and their ideas more clearly. Unfortunately, many seemed unable to tell the difference between the two so we have changed the sections to:

- Research Plan – what further questions will help me focus my research?

and

- Essay Plan – how can I structure the essay to answer my question?

in the hope that the distinction in the information needed by an Assessor is now clear.

To provide further assistance, the next ten pages provide five exemplars, chosen by the Principal Examiner from among the real forms submitted for 2005. He has provided a commentary on each so together they illustrate what makes for an effective coursework Proposal Form. Every Form is reproduced verbatim.

The new Proposal Form may be found in Appendix D of the new specification (2005 edition, p.148) and will soon be on OCR's website. Henceforth, **please use only the new Form**. When a new stock of Forms sent to your Exams Officer in Spring 2006, they will look different (OCR is modifying all its forms as part of the QCA/NAA modernisation programme - see the exemplars on the subsequent ten pages), but these two headings will be the same.

**As requested before, please also send us an addressed envelope with your Forms for their return.**

Example A

<b>History</b>
<b>OCR Advanced GCE 7835 Units 2592 or 2593 Independent Investigation Question Proposal Form</b>
<i>For completion by a candidate – please ring 2592 or 2593, as appropriate</i>

<b>Exam: Summer 2006</b>	<b>Candidate</b>	First Name	Rosemary
		Surname	

<b>Centre Number</b>					
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

*If this is a re-submission, please attach your previous form showing the Assessor's comments.*

<p><b>My proposed question:</b> How significant was the divorce scandal in the fall of Parnell?</p>
<p><b>Research Plan – what further questions will help me focus my research?</b> Would Parnell still have fallen without catalyst of divorce scandal? Was divorce scandal only a short term catalyst in Parnell's fall, ie were there long term reasons for his fall which would have brought about his downfall anyway?</p>
<p><b>Essay Plan – how can I structure the essay to answer my question?</b> - Short term impact of divorce on party, Parnell and Public. - Long term impact ditto - Other causes for fall: Time's scandal, Gladstone, failure of Home Rule Bill 1886, 1887 Constructive Unionism. - Losing balance of power. - Parnell's own reaction to divorce scandal. - Position of Parnell's career at time of scandal.</p>
<p><b>Core sources (primary &amp;/or secondary) I will evaluate to answer my question</b> 1 P. Bew – 'Charles Stewart Parnell' (Gill &amp; Macmillan, 1991). 2 Michael Davitt – 'Fall of Feudalism' (London: Chapman &amp; Hall, 1904). 3 Tim Hodge – 'Parnell &amp; the Irish Question' (Longman, 1988). 4 Nick Pelling – 'Anglo-Irish Relations 1798-1922' (Routledge, 2003). 5 Grenfell Morton – 'Home Rule &amp; the Irish Question' (Longman, 1980). 6 Conor Cruise O'Brien – 'Parnell &amp; his Party' (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1957). 7 Paul Adelman &amp; Robert Pearce – 'Great Britain &amp; the Irish Question' (Hodder &amp; Stoughton, 2001).</p>
<p>You cannot complete this form successfully until you have undertaken some reading &amp; thus already have some understanding of both the subject and the available sources. Unless you complete all boxes on this page, your proposal cannot be judged effectively.</p>

**SPACE FOR OCR ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS**

Rosemary

This is an excellent proposal, showing a clear awareness of relevant issues and of the requirements of causal explanation. Your list of books is strong and your lines of argument clearly defined.

This is typical of its type – a causal explanation requiring comparison of the significance of short and longer-term causal factors, and assessment of their relative importance. If I were to supply an example of what I mean by this, I could not improve on your comments under 'Research Plan'.

Pay particular attention to the longer-term factors: there is often a tendency to consider short-term factors as more important because of their proximity to the event being explained. Putting the question counter-factually, is it likely that Parnell could have survived, despite the O'Shea scandal, or fallen if the scandal had not occurred? If the answer is 'yes', then this reduces the importance of the scandal to the explanation (and vice versa, if the answer is 'no').

Remember, finally, to make **critical** use of source material (primary and/or secondary) in building your explanation.

AK

**Principal Examiner's Commentary on this Form**

"This is an example of a very well crafted proposal, copiously supported by relevant references. The question is well focused on a specific event, and the candidate's treatment of Research Plan indicates a clear intention (i) to set the O'Shea scandal within a wider context of prior developments and concurrent events, and (ii) to investigate other possible causes of Parnell's fall.

Selection of issues immediately suggest good subject knowledge – and until that is in place no Form can be filled in effectively (We see far too many Forms from candidate who clearly know little or nothing about the topic they suggest). The proposed Essay Plan link directly to the Research Plan and shows a really good understanding of the methods of causal explanation.

As the Assessor's response shows, he was left with little to add, apart from a few refinements to the kind of analysis already suggested by the candidate.

The list of Core Sources is strong and is set out with unusually clarity and accuracy – a model for virtually every student to copy.



Example B

<b>History</b>
<b>OCR Advanced GCE 7835 Units 2592 or 2593 Independent Investigation Question Proposal Form</b> <i>For completion by a candidate – please ring 2592 or 2593, as appropriate</i>

<b>Exam: Summer 2006</b>	<b>Candidate</b>	First Name	Jack
		Surname	

<b>Centre Number</b>					
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

*If this is a re-submission, please attach your previous form showing the Assessor's comments.*

<p><b>My proposed question:</b> To what extent did the conditions of the labouring class improve between 1760 and 1848?</p>
<p><b>Research Plan – what further questions will help me focus my research?</b> measurements of living conditions</p>
<p><b>Essay Plan – how can I structure the essay to answer my question?</b> The conditions did not improve as factory work imposed health risks and restricted Freedom of work.</p>
<p><b>Core sources (primary &amp;/or secondary) I will evaluate to answer my question</b> E P Thompson “The making of the English working class” Trevor May “An Economic and Social history of Britain 1760-1770” Christopher Hill “Reformation to Industrial Revolution”</p>
<p>You cannot complete this form successfully until you have undertaken some reading &amp; thus already have some understanding of both the subject and the available sources. Unless you complete all boxes on this page, your proposal cannot be judged effectively.</p>

**SPACE FOR OCR ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS**

Jack

This is a perfectly valid proposal, but one that is insufficiently supported here to enable me to respond to your ideas. You have the beginnings of an appropriate list of sources, which will no doubt expand as you research the topic (5 or 6 solid books should be regarded as the minimum).

The argument you present is a valid one, but you need to include a competing view, so I can see how you intend to balance the overall argument in your final piece of work.

Will you be writing about living conditions or working conditions? I would suggest one or the other, and specify which in your question. You will need to be able to balance the argument, e.g. by showing how, for some regions and/or industries, conditions (living or working) can be shown to have improved, perhaps at different rates.

Finally, remember to make **critical** use of sources (primary and/or secondary) in building the argument in your answer.

AK

**Principal Examiner's Commentary on this Form**

This illustrates a weak, incomplete Form. The obvious problem is that there is simply not enough information provided for the Assessor to respond effectively. There is a reasonable question, but it is probably too broad in scope so it needs to be compacted – as suggested – to either living or working conditions.

However, no useful Research Plan is identified and there is very little included within the Essay Plan. Consequently, the Assessor has had to 'fill in the gaps', e.g. by suggesting a series of ideas. That is not part of his/her responsibility.

No candidate should be submitting such a Form and no teacher/lecturer should be allowing Jack to submit such a Form.

Example C

<b>History</b>
<b>OCR Advanced GCE 7835 Units 2592 or 2593 Independent Investigation Question Proposal Form</b>
<i>For completion by a candidate – please ring 2592 or 2593, as appropriate</i>

<b>Exam: Summer 2006</b>	<b>Candidate</b>	First Name	Caroline
		Surname	

<b>Centre Number</b>					
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

*If this is a re-submission, please attach your previous form showing the Assessor's comments.*

<p><b>My proposed question:</b> How far was Richard III's defeat at Bosworth of his own making?</p>
<p><b>Research Plan – what further questions will help me focus my research?</b> His reputation after the Princes in the Tower His reputation after his death The cause of the War of Roses The likely hood of Lancastrian challenge Over mighty subjects</p>
<p><b>Essay Plan – how can I structure the essay to answer my question?</b> The Betrayal of Richard by Lord Stanley &amp; Sir Stanley The conspiracies of Elizabeth Woodville and Henry VII The actions of Richard's 'allies' at the Battle of Bosworth</p>
<p><b>Core sources (primary &amp;/or secondary) I will evaluate to answer my question</b> The Betrayal of Richard III V. B. Lamb Richard of England D. M. Kleyne England in the later Middle ages MH Keen</p>
<p>You cannot complete this form successfully until you have undertaken some reading &amp; thus already have some understanding of both the subject and the available sources. Unless you complete all boxes on this page, your proposal cannot be judged effectively.</p>

**SPACE FOR OCR ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS**

Caroline

The question is a good one, allowing you to explore the extent – if any – of Richard's unpopularity, and whether – if it **did** exist – it was sufficient to influence the actions of the 'key players' either before or during the Battle of Bosworth.

Try to avoid getting 'bogged down' in details of the 'Princes' controversy – keep your focus on what contemporaries **believed** that Richard III had done/not done.

The focus of your Investigation (as you indicate) has to be on Richard's reputation – not on whether he did/did not murder the Princes – and the extent to which this (rather than some other factors) caused the protagonists to act as they did.

No doubt your list of books will expand as you research the topic (5 or 6 solid books should be regarded as the minimum) - at present, it is too short for a successful investigation.

Remember, above all, to make **critical** use of source material (primary and/or secondary) in building your argument in your final piece of work.

AK

**Principal Examiner's Commentary on this Form**

This is not a particularly good submission – for example: No questions are raised. Some of the text is vague or ambiguous. How does "cause of the War of Roses" link to possible explanations for Richard's defeat? Consideration of Richard's own culpability is not listed. The Assesor is left to puzzle many things out. As in exams, candidates must take the trouble to make themselves clear.

Everything suggests that Caroline has given insufficient time to thinking about her question and the issues that relate to it. She should have read more before filling in the Form. She should have discussed these issues with her teacher/lecturer before filling in the Form.

**Example D**

<b>History</b>
<b>OCR Advanced GCE 7835 Units 2592 or 2593 Independent Investigation Question Proposal Form</b> <i>For completion by a candidate – please ring 2592 or 2593, as appropriate</i>

<b>Exam: Summer 2006</b>	<b>Candidate</b>	First Name	Owen
	e	Surname	

<b>Centre Number</b>							
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*If this is a re-submission, please attach your previous form showing the Assessor's comments.*

<p><b>My proposed question:</b> To what extent was Japan's power in SE Asia through 1941-45 upheld by the Imperial Navy?</p>
<p><b>Research Plan – what further questions will help me focus my research?</b> The internal conflict between the army command and the navy administration. The war with America &amp; the use of the imperial fleets. The need for Japan to forge an empire. The initial conquest of China. The rise of the Japanese navy to international acclaim.</p>
<p><b>Essay Plan – how can I structure the essay to answer my question?</b> That without the existence and efforts of the powerful imperial navy, war with America would have been impossible. That Japanese control over much of SE Asia required the various fleets to sustain such control. Although the navy was subordinate to the army in national pecking order, without the navy the army would have had little success.</p>
<p><b>Core sources (primary &amp;/or secondary) I will evaluate to answer my question</b> 'Pearl Harbour' by H P Willmott 'War in the Pacific' by C G Reynolds 'World War II at Sea' by J Costello 'Japanese High Seas Fleet' by R Humble 'When Tigers Fight' by D Wilson 'Long the Imperial Way' by H Tasaki 'Midway, the Japanese Story' by M Fuchida &amp; M Okumiya</p>
<p>You cannot complete this form successfully until you have undertaken some reading &amp; thus already have some understanding of both the subject and the available sources. Unless you complete all boxes on this page, your proposal cannot be judged effectively.</p>

**SPACE FOR OCR ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS**

Owen

This is an interesting & well presented proposal. In your outline argument, I can see the makings of a convincing case in favour of the proposition but few, if any, arguments about the insufficiency of inadequacy of the Imperial Navy. So my first advice is to remember that the question begins with “To what extent ...?” and you will need to find a counter-argument (e.g. by magnifying the role of the Army or, as above, highlighting limitations in the capacity &/or strategy of the Navy.

The structure of the assignment should be quite straightforward – a two-sided argument, including on each side pieces of primary and/or secondary evidence, used **critically**. For example, you will be able to compare and evaluate secondary comments from both US and Japanese perspectives (latter listed overleaf), or assess the value of primary sources interpreted in context.

Remember to make **critical** use of sources (primary and/or secondary) in building your argument in the Investigation you submit.

Finally, think about the exact meaning of “upheld” in your question – links with “sustain” in the second part of your essay plan.

AK

**Principal Examiner's Commentary on this Form**

Owen's Form illustrates a 'solid' proposal. It is neither remarkably strong (unlike Rosemary's – example A) nor very weak and is typical of the majority of the Forms we receive.

The question suggested is valid and the timescale indicated is manageable. Notice also that Owen has included secondary references representing both American and Japanese interpretations. That gives direct access to the Unit's Assessment Objective to make critical use of secondary sources – in this case, presumably, by looking for (and attempting to explain) areas of agreement or disagreement about the significance of the navy's role.

My only concern might have been with the word “upheld” in the question since it might be difficult to deny that Japanese power was, to some extent, “upheld” by the Imperial Navy. However, Owen has effectively pre-empted this concern in comments he makes in his Essay Plan. Here, he tries to find a distinction between *seizing* and *sustaining* (or, upholding) control of S. E. Asia – which seems to provide the basis of a valid argument in response to the question asked.

**Report on the Units taken in June 2005**

Example E

<b>History</b>
<b>OCR Advanced GCE 7835 Units 2592 or 2593 Independent Investigation Question Proposal Form</b>
<i>For completion by a candidate – please ring 2592 or 2593, as appropriate</i>

<b>Exam: Summer 2006</b>	<b>Candidate</b>	First Name	Tom
		Surname	

<b>Centre Number</b>					
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--

*If this is a re-submission, please attach your previous form showing the Assessor's comments.*

<p><b>My proposed question:</b> Using the example of an Individual from any period, examine the view that “We manufacture heroes simply because they occupy great positions.”</p>
<p><b>Research Plan – what further questions will help me focus my research?</b> What were Churchill's successes (WW2, speeches etc) What were Churchill's mistakes (Unreliable, disloyal) Why was Churchill voted the BBC's greatest Briton?</p>
<p><b>Essay Plan – how can I structure the essay to answer my question?</b> Despite Churchill's international war leadership, he was not the infallible 'hero' some make him out to be. Despite some mistakes Churchill's successes were monumental and satisfy his selection in the greatest Briton vote.</p>
<p><b>Core sources (primary &amp;/or secondary) I will evaluate to answer my question</b> Internet “Churchill” by Roy Jenkins “A life” by Martin Gilbert “Churchill”, the ITV series Heinemann Advanced History, Britain 1890-1939</p>
<p>You cannot complete this form successfully until you have undertaken some reading &amp; thus already have some understanding of both the subject and the available sources. Unless you complete all boxes on this page, your proposal cannot be judged effectively.</p>

## SPACE FOR OCR ASSESSOR'S COMMENTS

Tom

This is a valid proposal, but why not incorporate Churchill into your question (e.g. 'How true is it of Winston Churchill that we manufacture heroes ... ?').

Then you must give **very careful** attention to the scope of your enquiry. Churchill had a very long political career - he held Cabinet post before 1914 – much of which might be judged to have been less than successful. So you have to decide whether to cover the whole career, or just his role as war leader 1940-45. Either will work, but the former option helps to place the latter into perspective (so parts should be included, even if you choose 1940-45).

At all costs, avoid the kind of uncritical hero worship that tends to occur with Churchill. Mention 'Great Britons' in passing, if you wish, but then leave it alone – it is entertainment, not evidence.

Finally, remember to make **critical** use of source material (primary and/or secondary) in building your argument in your finished work.

AK

### Principal Examiner's Commentary on this Form

The strength of this Form is in the Research Plan (as far as it goes) and in the clear lines of argument in the Essay Plan, both of which show understanding of the need for a balanced treatment of two sides of an argument. – leading, we hope, to a balanced judgement.

However, there are several weaknesses. Tom has used a Board-set question but has not adapted it to include the name of the 'hero' he wants to investigate. Nor has he considered the scope of the investigation he wishes to undertake. Churchill had a very long political career and some clearer focus on part of it would help him manage.

The brevity of the Research Plan does not suggest a secure grasp of the subject matter at this stage – that is not good enough. Some reading and some thinking both need to have been undertaken before Forms can be filled in effectively.

More serious is Tom's apparent inability to distinguish entertainment from evidence in his citing of 'Great Britons' as a viable source. This is compounded by the appearance of the single word 'Internet' under Core sources. The methods of investigation to be inferred from this Form do not seem consistent with the conventions of historical enquiry. When students pick very modern (often military topics), exactly the same can happen when they rely on dubious journalism rather than serious historical enquiry.



### **OCR winners of the Royal Historical Society Frampton Prize**

Each of the six UK exam boards is asked by the Royal Historical Society to nominate each summer its highest scoring A Level History candidate for award of a Frampton Prize. The name and centre of each winner is published in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*.

Year	Candidate	Centre
2002	Laura Venning	Somervale School, Midsomer Norton
2003	Henry Ellis	Eton College, Windsor
2004	Natalie Whitty	Camden School for Girls, London
2005	Austen Saunders	Countesthorpe Community College, Leicester





**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

