

Mark Schemes for the Units

June 2006

3835/7835/MS/R/06

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 2006

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (7835)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3835)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Marking Instructions	1
2580-2593	Generic Mark Schemes	6
2580	Document Studies 871 – 1099	25
2581	Document Studies 1450 – 1693	35
2582	Document Studies 1774 – 1945	46
2583	English History 1042 – 1660	65
2584	English History 1780 – 1964	107
2585	European History 1046 – 1718	133
2586	European and World History 1789 – 1989	183
2587	Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	225
2588	Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	235
2589	Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	253
2590	Themes in History 1066 – 1796	283
2591	Themes in History 1763 – 1996	319
2592 - 2593	Independent Investigations	357
*	Grade Thresholds	369

Marking Instructions

June 2006

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'** (i.e. 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;
- 'Ref' 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 (e.g. 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 (e.g. 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 e.g. '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, e.g. 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, e.g. '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.

- 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: Comparison

- I (18-20) 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 (15-17) 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 (12-14) 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 (9-11) 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 (6-8) 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 (3-5) 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 (0-2) 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 (b)
BAND/40: 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 (36-40) 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 prerequisite for Band I.

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

II (30-35) 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 (24-29) 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 (17-23) 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 (11-16)** 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 (6-10)** 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 (0-5)** 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 (e.g. 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 Passages 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.

PASSAGES 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.

PASSAGES 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 (i.e. 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.

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 evaluate primary and/or secondary source material relevant to their question, and/or must 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 (i.e. they fail completely to address AO2) may not be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis/evaluation.
- The Investigation does not require high-level research or specialist resources (such cannot be expected at Advanced GCE).
- Investigations must be based on an historical period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
- 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.
- Glosses in [] have been added to aid "a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme" (*Code of Practice 2006, #4.17*).

NOTES (Unit 2592)

1. **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 and, intentionally or not, thus circumvent the limit. **If such footnotes take the total length beyond 3000 words then they must be included within the word-count after all and the excess material 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].
2. **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.
3. **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 **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.

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

Band I (72-90)

The response is not perfect, but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve in A Level.

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.

[This means that sources are well referenced, interpreted in context using knowledge of the period, cross referenced as evidence to strengthen or weaken a case and/or evaluated for reliability and/or utility as evidence to support or undermine a line of argument.]

The response is focused clearly on the demands of the question (e.g. causation, change over time, evaluation).

[This means that the response must be consistent with the requirements of the question posed. In an evaluative proposal – ‘To what extent ...?’, the requirement is for a two-sided argument, in which various interpretations and/or a range of source material are discussed and a balanced judgment reached, having used the evidence critically. Alternatively, the question may be answered by means of a synthesis, in which the apparent conflict in the original argument is resolved. In responses calling for an explanation, the relative importance of causal factors needs to be demonstrated at this level – as opposed to being merely asserted.]

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.

Band 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.

[‘more unevenness’ means that while the level of argument may be similar to that of Band I, that level is not sustained across the Investigation – be it by omission, by imbalance and/or by inconsistency. For example, in an evaluative argument, some important issues may be ignored or overlooked; the argument as a whole may be unbalanced; or source evaluation may not always be relevantly linked to the demands of the question. In addition, the techniques of evaluation may be less evident and there will be less justification for the judgment, making the conclusion less effective. In a causal explanation, causal factors may be identified and evaluated, but not in relation to each other.]

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.

[If there is sustained discussion of interpretation within a generally relevant argument the answer will be Band II].

Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Band 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.

['limited critical sense' means that the source evaluation is superficial, unsupported and/or mechanical. Some sources may be cross-referenced, but with intermittent relevance to a line of argument. Typically, source extracts are used as information – i.e. to illustrate a point being made in the text – rather than as evidence that will either advance or undermine part of the argument.]

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.

[The key characteristic of a Band III answer is that of an argument that is reasonably competent but limited or unbalanced in some way. For example, two sides of an argument may be discernible, but there is little sense of an investigation driven by critical use of evidence. Similarly, several causal factors may be identified but there may be little evaluation of their importance to the explanation – or this may be asserted or 'bolted on' to a conclusion.]

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.

Band 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.

['largely uncritically' and 'bolted-on' mean that 'stock' evaluation of sources predominates and/or most sources are used to illustrate the text. There is little awareness of the purpose of cross-reference or evaluation supported by contextual knowledge. Sources may not figure prominently or will not be used to propel an argument; there will be little evaluation or merely assertion about interpretations.]

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 argument will not be developed enough for Band III but will be more than a description. 'Depends more on ...' means that narrative begins to predominate – producing an account, as opposed to an argument. In questions calling for an explanation, causal factors may be mechanically 'listed' or organized chronologically - for example, candidates confuse causal reasoning with 'the order of prior events' and/or assume that short-term causes are always more important than longer-term causes].

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.

Band 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.

['poorly understood and used uncritically' and 'may be "bolted-on"' mean that there is no sense of the sources being used as evidence of something. Source content is taken at face value, poorly understood and/or used inaccurately. Answers may use only one or two source references – usually for purposes of illustration.]

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 dominant characteristic of Band V responses is heavy reliance on uncritical or irrelevant narrative. Despite 'pockets' of relevance, there may be a general mismatch between the question and the answer and/or a gradual disintegration in the reasoning. Any sense of explanation will be lost or subsumed in an uncritical narrative.]

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.

Band 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.

[This means that the beginning of disintegration seen in Band V answers is completed in Band VI answers. This is the point at which the question and the answer part company for good and at which the answer itself becomes seriously confused.]

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.

[This means that there will be a clear sense of the candidate having lost control of his/her material.]

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.

Band VII (0-18)

The answer demonstrates a completely unsatisfactory attempt to meet any of the demands of the Unit.

['completely unsatisfactory' means that a response is either chaotic or irrelevant. There is no intelligible argument.]

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 2006

Unit 2580 Document Studies 871-1099**The Reign of Alfred the Great 871-899****1(a) Study Sources A and B**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the means by which Alfred defended Wessex.

[20]

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.

The provenances of the two offer points of comparison: Source A comes from his biographer and can be expected to be praiseworthy, though not necessarily biased or excessively partial; Source B is an official document and sets out a somewhat formulaic set of terms. Both Sources are useful, approaching the question from different standpoints. Two different methods are presented here. Source A features the building or re-building of fortified strong points (*burhs*) and restorations or innovations while Source B features Alfred's agreement with the formidable Guthrum, by which a boundary line was created between Saxon-held and Viking-held territories. Furthermore, in Source B, a form of arbitration to settle disputes is created. While Source A could be seen as a sign of strength or growing strength on Alfred's part, Source B could be seen a sign of weakness in that an agreement was necessary. Then again candidates will know that the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum came after Alfred had defeated him in 878 and secured baptism of him and his family. The two Sources provide contrasting evidence of ways by which Alfred sought to defend his kingdom after the attacks of 871-878.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using **all** these Sources **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred's achievements against the Vikings were remarkable but incomplete. [40]

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 argue for and against the proposition with a good focus upon 'remarkable but incomplete'. The defence of Wessex was vital to Alfred, above all in his early years but, by the latter stages of his reign, he had enlarged Wessex by advances in Mercia and was determined to build his power and defences across a wider area. Sources A and B focus on defence and security while Source C suggests an expanded area of operations and Source D points to expansionism. These two Sources aid the argument for major success while Source B points to limits to success to 878. The tone of source C is of note: balanced, not excessively enthusiastic over Alfred's achievements. Source D provides a good overview as to Alfred's defensive schemes (militia, fortified towns, rotational military service) and points up the concept of effective defence in depth via the system of *burhs*, leading to a 'more stable base'. It can be linked to each of the other Sources. The tone of D is almost eulogistic ('achievement ... remarkable'). Source A refers to the building and fortifying of *burhs*, with Athelney an early example (the religious needs of the monastery are set out as well). Source B gives a part of the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum that bought Alfred time to begin his military reforms and source C shows land operations against a new wave of Viking attacks (892-896) when Alfred's military reforms were tested. Source D is very positive about the successful outcome of these reforms. Own knowledge can be used to support, e.g. the burghal programme or operations of 892-896. But Sources B and C can provide something of a counter-argument. Source B acknowledges Viking settlement and the necessity of trying to live with the new settlers; it acknowledges their control of large areas. It points to parts of Mercia becoming subject to Wessex. Source C suggests successes but points up the rotational nature of Alfred's armies (troops had to go home) and the ability of new Viking attackers to escape and deploy their still formidable seapower. Indeed, Northumbrian and East Anglian forces are mobilised to attack as well. Although Wessex may have appeared safe enough, the fighting took place inside the kingdom and own knowledge could be used to substantiate Viking attacks along the coasts or inland in these years. Alfred's forces never inflicted a decisive defeat on Hastein and his armies. Therefore, the extent of success and achievement can be questioned. Own knowledge can be adduced to support and illustrate: e.g. Alfred's strong personal leadership and that of his son Edward and his thegns, uses made of the period of relative peace prior to 892, *burhs*, the *fyrd*, submission of London, submission of many Mercians, support from Wales, naval reforms, territorial defence, changed strategy and tactics, loyalism, changing Viking threat after 892. Here the success of aims was mixed and contrasts between 871-878 and 892-896 (and end of the reign) can be used to judge 'achievements' and their extent. Sources B and C can be used to rein in the praise of Source D.

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 Normans in England 1066-87**2(a) Study Sources A and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the methods used to meet William I's military needs. [20]

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.

The provenances need comparison: Source A is a rather technical, legalistic, factual document; Source C comes from an author considered reliable and balanced in his opinions.[NB The mistake in the introduction to Source C (Orderic was born in England, not Normandy) may affect comment here. Candidates who draw from this an entirely pro-Norman view are not to be penalised.] The content of C suggests a stance favourable to the King and opposed to rebellion, seen as a sin; the content is more specific and example-based. Source C may be seen as the more useful of the two Sources, though the two together do straddle lay and ecclesiastical societies and show the range of military demands upon both. Source A presents a feudal summons while Source C features a mixture of Norman-French and Anglo-Saxon forces fighting the rebels of 1075. In Source A we have what is assumed to be a normal mode of ordering the arming and appearance of knights in service both of their lord and the king while Source C shows that more than feudal forces were used to deal with crises. Thus while Source A suggests the anticipated and standard means of creating an armed force to serve the king's needs, Source C reminds us that William and his deputies relied on a mixture of military components. The use of native English forces (*fyrð*) against Norman-French rebels in Source C is notable.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the success of William I's military organisation depended primarily upon the development of feudalism.

[40]

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 argue for and against the proposition, deploying a range of other factors in their evaluation. The use of 'primarily' demands a range of factors in assessment. Source D provides a good overview as to different methods William used and the varied sources of his forces. Knight service, the deployment of the feudal host are mentioned but so, too, are other means of raising forces, not least native English forces. And those forces served outside England as well. Sources A and B provide details about feudal levies, the uses of knight service and features of military feudalism, with Source B particularly useful. Indeed, Source B can be cited as the type of normal feudal contract it is assumed existed for so many knights, settling on the land and bound closely to their immediate lords and their superior lord, the king. Parts of Source C can be so used and there are clear links with Source D's content. But Source C points to the use of non-feudal forces (the English *fyrd*) and can be linked to similar points in Source D. Own knowledge can substantiate all this and provide details, too, of mercenaries being used from an early stage. Indeed, it is possible that the traditional concepts of a feudal army being the core of William's military success inside England were likeliest in reality only in the very early stages of the takeover period. Then again, there could have been longer-term planning. Mercenaries were used early on to supplement household knights. Source D says that William used a variety of forces while 'establishing the formal institutions of feudalism'. Own knowledge that can be used might include: William's decisive leadership, the place and value of castles, the extent of progressive Normanisation, the role of the Church, the tactics deployed by William on occasions of unrest or threat, the uses of naval forces and traditions of native English loyalism to their ruler. Sources A and B reflect a Norman perspective while Source C is quite balanced in tone and content. Source D adds in a wider perspective.

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 First Crusade and its Origins 1073-99**3(a) Study Sources B and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the views of Westerners about the Byzantine Emperor. [20]

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.

The provenances will be compared: although both crusader authors, they offer different perspectives. Source B offers a more unfavourable view than Source C, which is more measured in tone; they both wrote within a short space of each other, soon after the completion of the Crusade. Outwardly, the two Sources suggest similar views but there are differences and this point reinforces their combined usefulness as sources. Tone and language are important here. Source B presents a hostile view: the Emperor uses 'fraud and cunning'; he has a 'crafty plan'; there is a sense of false promises of help and support. Source C says that the Emperor feared the crusaders but, importantly, adds that they had to deal with him; they needed aid and were prepared to trust him. Thus while Source B sees the Emperor as cunning and deceitful (or more), Source C is prepared to give him some benefit of the doubt. Source C suggests that the crusaders will try to work with the Emperor but Source B makes clear the depths of suspicion and fear on the part of crusader leaders. The issue of the oath pledged to the Emperor – and so of its validity and importance – is raised in Source C.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the alliance with the Byzantine Emperor contributed little to the success of the First Crusade. [40]

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 will need to address the proposition and argue for and against, though they are likely to argue more for. The phrase 'little to the success...' is important. Some reference to other reasons for success should be given, though not necessarily at great length. Sources A, B and C in their different ways portray the very uneasy relations between the Byzantine Emperor and the crusaders. Mutual hostility and suspicions are prevalent. These three Sources can be used to question the nature and effectiveness of the 'alliance'. Source A indicates a clear fear of crusader forces and their intent; they have plans to 'deprive the Emperor of his kingdom', they bear an 'old grudge'. Sources B and C offer some differences of perspective: Source B is very suspicious of the Emperor. In contrast to Source A (bound to favour the Emperor given the provenance), Source B says that it is the Emperor who has plans and is determined to act against the crusaders. Source C is more measured, pointing up a need for mutual cooperation and the dependency of the crusaders upon the Emperor. Source D provides something of an overview and can be linked to the other three Sources since it corroborates elements of their contents. Source D suggests Emperor Alexius was genuine in his desire to support the Crusade but was unsettled by the news that deserters brought to him. He decided not to proceed in support of the crusaders but the news that they had captured Antioch shocked him and made it very likely that the tensions with the crusaders would grow; this 'breakdown in relations' would lead to deepened hostility. On both sides, clearly, there was much antagonism and suspicion, if not hostility. Own knowledge can support this, probably centred on an outline of the issue of the oaths given (or not given) to the Emperor by some of the crusader leaders and the subsequent arguments over this area. Source D suggests a determination on the part of the crusaders to succeed, independent of the Byzantines, and their military strategy and tactics did bring success in 1098 and 1099. Wider knowledge that could be used here might be: Alexius' appeal to the West for help; crusader suspicions of the sincerity of Alexius' offers of help and attendant suspicions he wanted to use them to regain lands; Alexius' fears the crusaders intended talking over lands he saw as part of his Empire; the importance of supplies and transport from the Emperor; reasons why Alexius was suspicious of Bohemond in particular, given past campaigns and enmities (e.g. 1083); damage caused inside Byzantine lands by earlier popular crusading expeditions (e.g. People's Crusade); feelings amongst some that Alexius had abandoned the People's Crusade to its fate; religious schism between the Western (Catholic) and the Eastern (Orthodox) Churches. Yet success ultimately lay with other factors – religious, military and with the nature of a Muslim threat that weakened (through inner divisions) on the way to Jerusalem.

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 2006**

Unit 2581 Document Studies 1450-1693**The Wars of the Roses 1450-85****1(a) Study Sources B and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes towards the Queen's relatives, the Woodvilles. [20]

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 agree that there was hostility to the Woodvilles in 1483. The key point of agreement between them is that Hastings was at daggers drawn with the Woodvilles. Source C is the more precise, naming Dorset as the member of the Woodville family with whom Hastings had quarrelled and claiming that the hostility persisted despite Edward's dying attempt to reconcile them. Source C also differs from B in seeing hostility to the Woodvilles as a key factor in Richard's usurpation. Both sources are contemporary: B is described as well-informed, but the information given to candidates about Mancini (Source C) leaves open the question of his reliability. They may know that he is a major source but of questionable reliability but this is not required. However, he does not claim to do more than report what he has heard and since this accords in general with B, we may conclude that both are reliable and that they complement each other.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that, on his death in 1483, Edward IV left his son a secure throne. [40]

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, with its emphasis on the success of Edward's financial policies, supports the proposition. It is also supported by the modern historian (Source D), who concludes that he was 'master in his own realm'. Source B, however, while referring to Edward's glory, hints at trouble to come with the jealousy between Hastings and the Woodvilles. Source C amplifies this. These two Sources in themselves do not invalidate the proposition, but they point to the unresolved problem of relations between the Woodvilles and Richard. Candidates may use own knowledge of the events which led to the usurpation to develop this point. They may, however, also use own knowledge of subsequent events in Richard's reign and his eventual overthrow and death to argue that it was Richard's behaviour as king which undermined the strength of the Yorkist monarchy at the death of Edward.

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 German Reformation 1517-30**2(a) Study Sources A and B****How far does the evidence in Source A support the view of Luther as expressed in Source B?****[20]**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 is from Luther's own writings and the text shows his great concern not to offend Pope Leo X. At that stage (1518), he had not developed his (later) extreme anti-papal views and it is true that he was surprised by reactions to the views he expressed in the 95 Theses. Candidates might comment on his self-deprecating attitude confirmed in both Sources and perhaps question the complete sincerity of what Luther says. Source B, written over a year later, is sympathetic to Luther. Mosellanus has a high regard for Luther's intellectual abilities – which certainly contrasts with Luther own very modest description of himself. The final claim in Source B that Luther is too extreme in his response to criticism challenges Luther's claims in Source A to moderation and raises questions as to whether he really would accept the judgement of the Pope. Both Sources agree that Luther faced major hostility and that provides some context to the pressures he was under.

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.

(b) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that hostile reactions to Luther were caused more by his aggressive manner than his teachings. [40]

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 C and D confirm the claim and whilst one can doubt the absolute reliability of Source C as being Erasmus's impression, Source D is a reputable account of the exchanges in the 1529 debate between Luther and Zwingli. But Source B also refers to Luther's unwillingness to accept criticism and it is useful because it is written by somebody who sympathised with him. Luther's bonhomie only went so far. Source A gives a different side, but it was written at an early stage in the quarrel with the Papacy so it can be used to demonstrate Luther's developing ideas. In using their own knowledge, candidates can use Luther's responses on successive occasions e.g. the debates with Eck and with Cardinal Cajetan, and at the Diet of Worms. Luther was also unwilling to moderate his stance in relation to other reformers whether catholic (e.g. Erasmus, Source C) or reformed (e.g. Zwingli, Source D); some may point out that Erasmus, the author of Source C, was sympathetic to quite a lot of Luther's views. On the other hand, it can be argued that he was pushed into a corner in 1519-21 by Catholic authorities who insisted on his denial of his writings and who probably saw wider heretical implications in them than Luther intended. Equally, it can be argued that he was pushed from the other side by more radical reformers, e.g. Karlstadt. Luther felt that he had to shout loudly to make it clear that his teachings did not encourage rebellion and did not threaten the social order (especially during and after the Peasants War 1524-26). Perhaps aggression was, in part, necessary for the defence of Lutheran teachings as 'moderate'. Sources A and D could also be used to demonstrate hostility arising from his teachings.

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.

Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58**3(a) Study Sources B and C****Compare these Sources as evidence for the motivation of the rebels in 1549. [20]**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.

The Venetian ambassador in Source B sees the major reason for the troubles as opposition both to enclosure and to reformed religious ideas, but Somerset himself in Source C sees the reasons as more wide-ranging. Enclosure, it argues, was a major reason while religion is dismissed as a pretext, but class hostility, the wish to lord it as gentlemen, and the prospect of plunder are all also seen as important factors explaining the rebellions. The final sentence of Source C summarises Somerset's dismissive attitude to the rebels ('the vilest and worst sort of men' lines 19-20). The Venetian ambassador is a reliable and well-informed source. The additional motives in Source C, elaborated on in dismissive tone, are very much Somerset's attempt to divert blame from his own religious and economic policies.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using **all** these Sources **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that Protector Somerset's mistaken policies were the **main** cause of the instability in 1549. [40]

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 provides some powerful evidence of Somerset's mistaken policies, although it also adds that some of his policies had been backed by the whole council. Source C, amplifying the remarks about enclosure in Sources A and B, suggests underlying, long-term economic grievances behind the rebellions (enclosure, depopulation, price inflation and poverty) which Somerset was trying to tackle through his agrarian commissions (Source D) - though in a manner that, as Source D points out, proved to be counter-productive. Source B mentions economic grievances but also sees conservative opposition to religious reforms as a factor, which of course lay behind disturbances in the South-West. Was Somerset's policy here 'mistaken' in its timing or its very nature (in other words, was the imposition of protestantism bound to produce rebellion or did Somerset move too far too fast)? Candidates are going to consider the significance of various issues in relation to the given factor, and many are likely to concentrate on considering the alternative possibility that it was economic problems and/or religious changes that was the main cause of instability in 1549. Within that, some may consider whether longer-term social/economic and/or religious 'problems' were more significant than more immediate factor(s).

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 English Civil War 1637-49**4(a) Study Sources A and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to the idea of the supreme power of the people. [20]

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 assert the supreme power or sovereignty of the people, but they do so in different ways reflecting different political ideas. Source A is a satirical account of Leveller principles, and implies the sovereignty of all ('we'll level all alike') while stating opposition to monarchy and rule by social superiors ('lord or peer'). Candidates who question its veracity and observe that it mirrors royalist fears rather than Leveller opinion in 1647 should be well-rewarded. Source C is also a clear statement of the sovereignty of the people but, crucially, that sovereignty is vested in Parliament as the representative of the people; neither Lords nor the King can touch it. The concepts of political sovereignty are thus very different: a popular sovereignty in Source A as opposed to a parliamentary sovereignty (based on a very restricted franchise) in Source C.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that hostility to monarchy was the main reason for the execution of Charles I. [40]

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 (albeit from a hostile witness) and Source C would seem to support this view; but other views emerge in Sources B and D: Charles I's unwillingness to negotiate in good faith in 1646-48, his part in causing the Second Civil War, and his identification with 'the man of blood' by the New Model Army which came to believe that his trial and execution was demanded by God. Stronger answers may draw a clear distinction between the person and the institution: Sources B and D emphasise the failings of this particular monarch rather than failings in the monarchy as an institution and some may develop that line to consider the personal responsibility of Charles I himself. Some may focus their consideration of the opposition to Charles in the person of Oliver Cromwell, looking at his reasons for supporting and even leading the call for the king's execution. Source D is useful here in distinguishing different reasons among the regicides: ideological or practical. Candidates who interpret the question to be about the particular actions and personality of Charles I and seek to balance this by reference to faction at the time (Parliament, Army, etc.) can reach **the bottom of Band I (36 marks)**.

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.

Louis XIV's France 1661-1693**5(a) Study Sources B and C****Compare these Sources as evidence of Louis XIV's attitude to Colbert. [20]**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.

The provenances of the Sources are the same: letters from Louis XIV and both persuade us that they are reliable. However, they show different aspects of the King's relations with Colbert. Source B shows his insistence on absolute obedience. Louis XIV was angry but expressed what he always thought about obedience from ministers. Source C demonstrates his reliance on the minister. Yet they are not contradictory. Source C does not show Louis XIV as weak or subservient to Colbert, but dependent on the services of an able and trusted minister when he is well away from the seat of government. It does not, therefore, contradict the basis of Source 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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Colbert had limited influence over Louis XIV. [40]

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 B see Louis XIV as ruling without any prime minister. Source C sees the King regarding Colbert as virtually filling this role but it was at a particular time when Louis was away from Versailles. Source D shows that Colbert was largely responsible for the building of Versailles and he took his responsibilities seriously (although there is probably exaggeration in the Source). Candidates' own knowledge may well revolve around Colbert as the mainstay of France's economic policies until his death in 1683. He was certainly the most essential of Louis' ministers although he was not unchallenged. On the other hand, the King gave little support to Colbert's economic policies; Louis XIV had other priorities. His wars and the expense of Versailles and the court were all severe hindrances to Colbert's attempts not just to increase the wealth of the government but, more basically, to balance the books.

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 2582
June 2006

1 The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-92**(a) Study Sources B and D****Compare these Sources as evidence for the impact of Enlightened ideas in France. [20]**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 sees the nobility as having been 'destroyed' by the Enlightenment ideas that they adopted so enthusiastically and then used to attack authority and undermine the monarchy and social structures. By contrast, Source D downplays the role of ideas by setting them in a wider context, putting the blame squarely on financial crisis in causing revolution. Rousseau and Voltaire are central to the analysis in Source B whereas Source D does not mention them (or any other *philosophes*). Neither does Waller think in Source D that Enlightenment ideas could in themselves have brought about a revolution – whereas financial crisis did. Source D assesses the impact of Enlightened ideas as providing no more than background context. They might have brought reform to France, but they were extremely unlikely to be able to bring revolution. Source B is looking back after a bleak period for the nobility; the Count's own experiences may have coloured his judgement, with the nobles and their ideas taking centre stage. Source D takes a more objective view, looking at only 'some signs' of Enlightenment influence. Source B may be expiating guilt through memoirs, a motive that Source D does not have.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the ideas of the Enlightenment were the main cause of the French Revolution. [40]

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 discussion is about the role of ideas as opposed to other elements, such as the political weaknesses of the crown exposed by the financial crisis, or social unrest. Ideas feature prominently in the Sources, but the practical need for money led the crown into having to consider reforms. Opposed by vested interests, the government was driven to accept demands for a widespread consultation with the nation by summoning the Estates General which was the beginning of the revolution. Social unrest drove the events on at an unexpected pace. However, there is the view that without the interest in ideas in liberty and equality, the demand for consultation would not have been made and the hopes for a new and more enlightened France which would come from the Estates General would not have been so encouraged. Also, the impact of the American war and the example of the American fight for liberty is connected with Enlightenment constitutional theories. Three of the Sources put the stress on ideas while Source D is 'the odd man out': cross-referencing between Sources A, B and C is open to candidates. Source A suggests the primacy of ideas with Rousseau looking down as a sort of inspiration on various enlightenment symbols. Rousseau had died, but his ideas of the general will and the social contract were potent. Note the republican image of the axe and fasces and the Tree of Liberty suggesting ideas propelling change rather than immediate political factors, but the purpose of the artist must be considered: the symbols were potent and the need to legitimize change by going back to 'authorities' like Rousseau may lead to overstressing ideas. The pamphlet of 1792 (Source c) is by an educated administrator more likely to blame ideas and it is interesting that he stresses the abuse of the ideas. By 1792, the middle classes were under pressure from the power of the urban masses and the hysteria of war, so the ideals of 1789 were seen in a different light. Source B with an even longer perspective portrays the seduction of the nobility by ideas, but again distance may distort: the cahiers of 1789 have a limited reflection of enlightenment ideas and the political weaknesses of the crown are not really considered. The first three sources fail to put the ideas in real context. Source D offers a more balanced view, but some argue the 'noble revolution' gets insufficient attention. States have had financial crises without cataclysmic revolutions. Social unrest is not treated by any Source, but some may wish to consider this dimension.

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 Condition of England 1832–53

(a) Study Sources A and B

How far does Source A support the account of the aims and events of the Newport Rising of 1839 as given in Source B? [20]

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’s view of Chartist aims is precise and particular – simply the release of unfairly arrested local leaders. The Chartist newspaper (Source A) supports this but comments on a much wider purpose –wreaking vengeance and actively liberating them to raise first Wales and then England in a national Chartist rising. The provenance is important here. Source B may have more local horizons and as an eyewitness is in a position to judge more accurately than the newspaper in Source A whose sources of information are not known. Lovett’s paper has a moral force agenda –to assert peaceful, constitutional methods as the way forward for Chartism. It is keen to comment on the futility of physical force, and a national rising. It is unclear whether Source B had Chartist sympathies but it may be the better evidence given the moral force typicality of Source A, its distance from events at Newport and its more embroidered account of aims. On the sequence of events Source B is generally supported by Source A but there is disagreement on specifics and on the issue of who fired first. Different numbers are cited; Source B is keen to stress that not all were armed with guns, Source A implies most were. Both stress the crowd were not riotous, Source A perhaps because of its concern to stress peaceful methods. The main difference is over the firing. Source A takes the side of the authorities and, rather inconsistently, asserts that the Chartists first broke windows and fired, possibly an attempt to distance Chartists from such methods. In contrast, Source B is more uncertain but the implication of the smoke suggests the authorities fired first. He does not mention the required reading of the Riot Act (perhaps read by the magistrates to themselves inside the Hotel?) so judiciously referred to in Source A. Thus Source A only partly supports Source B on both aims and events, the clue lying in their provenance.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that decisive action by central government and local authorities was the main reason for the failure of the Chartists in the period 1839 to 1848. [40]

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.

Chartist failure has been explained in many different ways. Most candidates are likely to argue that the action of the authorities was the main reason. All four Sources refer to it and are a representative set of pro- and anti-Chartist evidence. Source A reporting on the Newport Rising points to firmness of action, Sources A and B to the strategic arrests of key Chartists, revealing given their Chartist sympathies. Russell's comments in Source C reveal considerable foresight – Queen Victoria was removed, forces were stationed at key points, O'Connor confronted and prevented from crossing the Thames. Own knowledge may refer to the use of large numbers of Special Constables. The modern historian (Evans in Source D) confirms this – that the authorities were well informed, had rapidly expanding new Police forces and could transport military force more rapidly via the new railways. Evans also comments on the wider strategy of using the 1832 Reform Act where government sought, with success, to split the middle from the working class. His reference to avoiding creating Chartist martyrs is given substance by the eventual fate of Frost – transportation for life. Own knowledge on decisive action could use the Bull Ring Riots in Birmingham in 1839, the fate of the 1st and 2nd Petition or the Plug Plot. JPs and central government possessed confidence in themselves. However, it could be argued that other factors were just as important and candidates will have to consider some to set against government action. Chartists were divided over strategy and methods, Lovett's paper in Source A stressing the importance of moral force to the extent of siding with the government, set against the obvious physical force of a 'rising'. There is also the failure of leadership – Frost's record at Newport in both Sources A and B and O'Connor's apparent volte-face at Kennington in Source C. There is no reason to doubt Russell's comments about O'Connor's eagerness to obey the Chief Constable or the embarrassment of his craven speech to the Chartists telling them to go home. Also Chartism could easily be fragmented and regionalised, unable to appeal outside its labouring and artisan core, whilst the economy could undermine it. Local authorities could panic on occasions (the Westgate incident in Sources A and B could be interpreted in this way). There were difficulties in restricting the Chartist press and controlling arms, (Sources A and B) whilst numbers could be intimidating (15,000 at Kennington; 200 - 8,000 in comparison to only 40 soldiers at Newport). The Sources provide points to support a variety of views on failure and it is up to candidates to determine between them.

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 Sources B and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the importance of the Piedmontese monarchy during the process of unification. [20]

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 claims that the Piedmontese monarchy was primarily concerned to preserve its authority and by implication its freedom of action, thus stressing the monarchy as a crucial ingredient in unification, whereas Source C suggests that its authority was compromised by being forced to accept unity by Mazzini and Garibaldi. Both agree, however, that the steadfastness of Cavour and Victor Emmanuel to resist the demands of Mazzini and Garibaldi was crucial to the cause of unification if for different reasons. Source B suggests that their stand prevented revolution, preserved the support of England and France and the unity of Italians. Source C suggests that the stand of Cavour and Victor Emmanuel against precipitate unity ensured that the princes did not side with Austria. The provenance of the Sources can be evaluated. As the intention of the author of Source B was to vindicate the action of Cavour it is not surprising that he gives a negative assessment of the demands of Mazzini and Garibaldi. Equally, it is not surprising that the author of Source C, as a former Mazzinian, should try to credit Mazzini with having influenced the Piedmontese monarchy. However, writing at a time when the Piedmontese monarchy had asserted its control over Italy might explain why a man with obvious political ambitions should also acknowledge the wisdom of the king in resisting Mazzini's call for a proclamation of unity at an earlier time. Candidates who interpret the question to be solely about Cavour may **not be placed above the top of Band III at best.**

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour were equally important in achieving the unification of Italy. [40]

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.

Many may interpret Sources C and D as supporting the view that all three figures were of equal importance. The final sentence of Source C is important here and suggests that each contributed in a unique way, amplified in the earlier part of the source. Mazzini's faith and constancy is acknowledged and candidates might refer to the idealism of Young Italy and Mazzini's role as a prophet of unification as well as Mazzini's early exploits in Rome (1849) and subsequent attempts to keep revolution alive in failed risings in Lombardy and Piedmont in the 1850s. Garibaldi's boldness is emphasised and candidates might refer to his exploits in Rome with Mazzini, the risks he took in 1860 and his later exploits against Papal Rome. Cavour's common sense is stressed and the way he handled events in 1860 might be mentioned. Source D clearly indicates that all three were important, although the reference to Garibaldi as 'the hero who sacrificed most for Italy' might be used to suggest that he was more worthy than the others. Yet in both sources there is a sense that Mazzini and Garibaldi were more of the same standpoint. They are linked in their appeal to Victor Emmanuel in Source C and, in Source D, it is Mazzini who offers words of welcome to Garibaldi whilst Cavour appears to distance himself from them and to be more concerned to restrain Victor Emmanuel from too close an association with the other two. The figure on the House of Savoy pillar may be interpreted as having given too much to the aggressive Republican figure on the left. Arguably Sources A and B suggest less equitable contributions. Source A accords Garibaldi the lead role, acting with a plan and vision which candidates can validate with reference to their knowledge of events in Sicily and Naples and the final hand over of his conquests to Victor Emmanuel at Teano. Cavour's contribution is recognised but it is clear that the author regards him as being tied – to England and France - in a way that Garibaldi was not. Reference to Cavour's agreement with France at Plombieres might be made to illustrate this. Source B acknowledges the value of Mazzini and Garibaldi but it is made clear that their roles were less important than that of Cavour. The implication is that Cavour kept the national movement alive and saved it from disaster. Even so, there is a clear hint that Cavour was 'obliged' to support, and was more concerned with preserving, the authority of the monarchy rather than unification. This might be illustrated by referring to Cavour's well-documented hostility to Garibaldi crossing to Naples and the fears he had for what such an action would mean for the monarchy and for French occupation of the Papal States. There is clearly much scope for different interpretations of the sources and a variety of lines of argument can be expected. Answers that attempt to evaluate the contributions of all three should be rewarded more than those that are imbalanced in their treatment of the three figures or that omit to deal with one or two of the characters. The Sources B, C and D are, to a varying degree, partisan. Source A, the English journalist, is less so although he is referring to events in the south; hence the stress on Garibaldi. It is interesting to note that he makes no mention of Mazzini.

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 Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61**(a) Study Sources A and B**

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes towards the Supreme Court of the United States. [20]

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.

The two Sources take completely opposite views. Source A regards the Supreme Court with contempt – 'a propagandist for human slavery'. By contrast, Source B regards the judges as 'learned, impartial and unprejudiced'. These opinions are reflected in the different tone of the two Sources – Source A is sarcastic, while Source B attempts to seem measured but cannot help adopting a rather triumphalist tone. These contrasting views are not surprising since although both come from newspaper editorials written at almost exactly the same date and almost immediately after the Supreme Court's decision in the Dred Scott case, Source A comes from a Northern newspaper while Source B comes from a Southern one. Both Sources are typical of the views of their respective sections of the divided Union.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Dred Scott decision did more harm than good to the Southern cause in the period to 1861. [40]

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 only Source which clearly suggests that the Dred Scott decision of 1857 was good for the South is Source B, which comes from a Southern newspaper editorial expressing an immediate Southern reaction. The immediate reaction from the North, expressed in Source A (also a newspaper editorial of almost exactly the same date), also views the decision as good for the pro-slavery cause. Source C goes further than Source B, suggesting that the implication of the decision is that slavery will ultimately be extended by the Supreme Court to every state. These two Sources, however, also indicate why the Dred Scott decision may in the long term be bad for the south, for they both suggest that the north will make every effort to overturn the decision. Source D, however, argues that the consequences of the Supreme Court's decision were not as serious as Abraham Lincoln suggested, as the extension of slavery would depend on local enforcement in each state. From their own knowledge candidates, should be aware that the Lincoln-Douglas debates, from which Source D is extracted, played a major part in the rise of Abraham Lincoln to national prominence. In this way, the Dred Scott decision in 1857 was a crucial step in the sequence of events leading to the outbreak of civil war in 1861 – and thus, some might argue, the short-term advantage that the decision brought (or was seen to bring) to the South was outweighed by the longer-term outcome of events in the USA.

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 The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93

(a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these sources as evidence for views on Gladstone's First Home Rule Bill in 1886. [20]

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 come from opponents who were senior Liberals. In Source B, Chamberlain argues that the measure is too revolutionary and will lead to a constitutional break up of the UK. By contrast in Source C, James argues that the problem lies in the Bill not being likely to satisfy nationalist opinion and therefore not ending the Home Rule agitation. Chamberlain is using the constitutional issue to encourage widespread opposition. This is an article aimed at public opinion and exaggerates Gladstone's 'devolution' plans. There is a considerable degree of rhetoric about 'absolute destruction' of the constitution and 'violent ... revolution'. This is absent from the speech in the Commons (Source C) where a different style prevailed and James stresses the lack of radical change, with no separate Irish flag, armed forces and foreign policy. The argument here is different in that such a limited measure is not likely to satisfy Ireland so the agitation will increase. Thus Chamberlain is seeking to portray the measure as more radical than it really is, whereas James is underplaying the radicalism: given contemporary attitudes, the Bill may have been more advanced and politically risky than he gives it credit for. Both were senior Liberals and both eventually left the Party, but Chamberlain had already clashed with Gladstone on other issues whereas James had to this point been a firm supporter of Gladstone. Chamberlain's opposition was more bitter; James' opposition was more sympathetic – he does not see a plan to dismantle the constitution, but questions whether the 1886 Home Rule Bill will actually meet Irish aspirations.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Gladstone's Home Rule Bill was opposed in 1886 because of fear of constitutional change. [40]

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 debate here is about why the Home Rule Bill failed. One element, especially stressed in Source B was fear that the UK and the Empire might be weakened by a sort of general devolution of power. However, that rather cerebral argument was not the only reason. Closely linked to it was the fear that the rights of Irish Protestants would be sacrificed; Ulster set up a highly emotional campaign, encouraged by elements of the Conservative Party and which can be seen satirized in Source A. Splits within the Liberal party about the thrust of social policy and the Empire also contributed. Chamberlain was already impatient with Gladstone and the whole way in which Gladstone had recently been converted to Home Rule which was seen as weakening Imperial status; and giving in to extra-parliamentary agitation and extremism caused opposition and a split in the Party. For the House of Lords, Home Rule had come to be more than just a constitutional issue and was about wider issues of authority. The violence in Ireland and the tactics of the Home Rulers had provoked considerable opposition. Source A is less about Churchill using constitutional arguments and more about exploiting deep-rooted religious bigotry and distrust; at root these have been provoked by proposed constitutional change, but the opposition goes far beyond that. Source B is more centred on the constitutional issue, but does not explore Chamberlain's wider political agenda – fear for the Empire and opposition to Gladstone's whole style and philosophy. Source C underplays constitutional effects of change, but believes there is deep seated desire within Ireland for more radical constitutional change, even independence. The author was a former ally of Gladstone and did not want, perhaps, to stress more fundamental issues. Source D stresses the effective opposition based on religious agitation, stressing the widespread use of a phrase that suggests that Ulster would be justified in extreme resistance to constitutional change – again stressing that the issue is more than is suggested in Source B. Some may use own knowledge to argue an important dimension to opposition was Chamberlain's on-going feud with Gladstone: Gladstone used Home Rule to defeat Chamberlain and prevent him becoming the next leader, while Chamberlain (the great radical) was trying to undermine Gladstone and become leader in his place.

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.

6 England in a New Century 1900-1918**(a) Study Sources A and B****Compare these Sources as evidence for causes of the political crisis of 1916. [20]**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.

The context of both Sources is the events of late 1916 which ended Asquith's time as prime minister, and saw him replaced by Lloyd George. Source A is a private letter while Source B is a private diary entry. The Sources take opposing views of Lloyd George: in Source A, Asquith defends his position and criticises Lloyd George while in Source B, Stevenson (as one would expect) attacks Asquith and praises Lloyd George. They also take differing views of the role of Bonar Law in these events: in Source A, Asquith regards Bonar Law as a friendly political opponent and perhaps a potential ally in his personal struggle with Lloyd George, while in Source B Bonar Law is seen as being in clear partnership with Lloyd George. On the other hand, these Sources agree to some degree on Asquith – Source B supports the evidence in Source A that Asquith was working in 1916 to secure his own position as prime minister. However, Source B is very clear that Asquith is not a good war leader and should be replaced by Lloyd George, who has public opinion on his side. Answers may note the dates – although written only a few days apart, they indicate a deepening of the political crisis.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that it was the internal divisions of the Liberal party rather than the impact of the War which weakened the Liberals during the years 1914-18. [40]

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.

Some may see that it may be difficult to separate these elements: the impact of the War increased Liberal divisions, and (possibly) vice versa. However, it is possible to find evidence for either view. Sources A and B are clear on antagonisms between Asquith and Lloyd George. Source C is useful for illustrating Lloyd George's role in confirming the Liberal split in the 1918 'Coupon Election', but there is also reference to the part that the War (still going on in July 1918) had played in his dominance as leader. Source D can be used on either side of the argument: although the end of the source leans towards the Asquith-Lloyd George split as having been the decisive factor. Own knowledge used on various Liberal splits might include: divisions over entering the War in 1914; events early on in the War (e.g. shell shortages 1915, the setting up of Asquith's coalition in May 1915, Fisher's resignation, Lloyd George at the Ministry of Munitions). Also, more details on the 1916 crisis may be used. Possible reference may also be made to on-going splits after 1916, e.g. the Maurice Debate of May 1918 when Lloyd George treated Asquith's call for an investigation as a vote of confidence in his government. On the other hand, some may argue the Liberals were already an uneasy coalition before 1914 (e.g. New Liberalism v Gladstonian Liberalism; divisions over social policy, decline in support shown by the 1910 elections compared to 1906). Equally, answers may argue that the War gave a massive boost to the Liberals opponents: it helped the growing Labour party (e.g. Henderson) and it allowed the Conservatives to revive. Answers may also refer to the detrimental impact of the massive extension of the franchise in 1918.

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.

7 Nazi Germany 1933–1945**(a) Study Sources A and B****Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to the Nazi Revolution. [20]**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.

Written a year apart, there is a clear difference between the Sources on what constituted a Nazi Revolution. For Röhm in Source A, it is a National Socialist revolution, the socialism clearly still lacking and thus requiring immediate implementation. The SA was the vanguard of such a revolution and intended to achieve it through violence against ‘class’ enemies. In contrast, von Papen has a much narrower definition, a mere national revolution focusing on discipline and order in opposition to Socialism and Communism. As far as he is concerned, this has been achieved but it is threatened by a radical section of the Nazis. Both Sources are delivered publicly, Röhm via the press presumably as an appeal to the people, von Papen to a more select audience of academics, middle and Upper Class conservatives in a respected and protestant German university. This is significant for the differences in attitude to the Nazi Revolution. One is clearly a response to the other, albeit a year apart, von Papen ironically referring to democratic institutions (‘government must represent the people as a whole’; a ‘share in making decisions’) which would then restrain SA violence (‘hardline radical fanatics’). The context is an appeal for Hitler’s mind and approval, in Source A for a real national socialist revolution and in Source B to keep the achievement at a national level, rallying around order and anti-communism. By June 1934, von Papen and the Conservatives could appreciate how Hitler had turned the tables on them and he is making a series of moves, as Vice Chancellor, to regain some of the initiative, even invoking a previously despised Weimar democracy. His approach is a cynical one.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, how far would you agree that the Nazi Revolution was complete by August 1934? [40]

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.

Collectively these are a very useful set of Sources coming from three of the main contemporary protagonists in the debate over a 'Nazi Revolution' – Hitler, Röhm and von Papen. Two Sources, von Papen (Source B) and Röhm (Source A), go public whilst a third, Hitler (Source C), a private Source, is a conventional vote of thanks, in effect a traditional statement of conservatism which announced the completion of revolution in August 1934. Röhm in Source A, the earliest comment, takes a positive view of revolution, demanding radical social and economic change rather than calm, order and discipline. He promotes a more hands –on approach. Although the other three Sources confirm a termination of revolution and speak authoritatively, own knowledge could be used to argue that revolution continued in the form of a racial one, underpinned by *Volksgemeinschaft* (inventing a racially pure national community) with important ideals on women and the role of youth. The opposition here would be religious. A more explicitly dictatorial approach was *gleichschaltung*, a co-ordination of political and social life. This is different to that envisaged by Röhm and evolved throughout the 1930s. Sources B, C and D all comment and contribute to the end of National Socialism by August 1934. Von Papen in Source B is keen to stress a limited view of a purely 'National' revolution, stopping communists and restoring order. National unity should not be endangered again. Von Papen represents big business, the Catholic Church, the Civil Service and the Army and is implying the Nazis should share power, as originally envisaged in January 1933. Von Papen's message opposes revolution of any sort and Hitler was furious, marking his conservative allies out for demotion. General von Schleicher was killed while von Papen was sent to Austria as mere German ambassador. Alan Bullock confirms this in his remark that Hitler 'dispensed with his allies'. Hitler in Source C is particularly valuable as in it he terminates a 'socialist' revolution in August 1934. In acknowledging the support of the Army, a bastion of the conservative elite, Hitler indicates that on 'socialism' he has capitulated to them. They alone bear arms! The Nazi Revolution is complete although if they acknowledge his supreme power he can, presumably, exercise that at will and could easily start another revolution. Bullock in Source D confirms this by commenting that the revolution has only been about power and dictatorship. To Bullock, Hitler is politically motivated. The SA are axed and with them the socialist agenda of the 'outsider'. The implication, confirmed by events, is the development of a hybrid, racial state. Bullock also confirms the fate of von Papen's conservatives, victims like the SA. Von Papen in Source B was trying to stir up a conservative backlash for his own ends, a restoration of the conservative-dominated coalition with the Nazis 'knowing their place'. By standing against a socialist vision of the Nazi Revolution he is forcing Hitler to call an end to his own revolution in the interests of the greater good of traditional Germany. In April 1934, leading generals had called on Hitler to disband and discipline the S.A. Von Papen is clearly emboldened by this, feeling the backing of the Army and President Hindenburg whose memory Hitler later invokes in Source C. He was obviously also aware of Röhm's Nazi enemies, Göring and Himmler. The sources are clear. The victors in August 1934 were Hitler (as dictator) and the Army. The losers were the conservatives and the radical national socialists in the SA. The Nazi Revolution was to be a short-lived political one and would then develop as a racial one under the SS, the instrument of 'justice' in the Night of the Long Knives.

Candidates who argue that the Nazi revolution was purely political and use the Sources to support such an argument can **reach the very bottom of Band I (36 marks)**. Some reference to the defeat of the social and economic agenda of the SA's radical National Socialist revolution or to an impending radical one (i.e. using what Röhm says in Source A) is **necessary for higher marks in Band I (37 - 40)**.

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 2006

England 1042 - 1100**1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066**

(a) Assess the problems that faced Edward the Confessor in controlling the Godwin family.

Focus: Assessment of important problems of a ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might consider the strength of the Godwins and the complementary weaknesses of Edward the Confessor. The Godwins had their centre in Wessex, historically a strong earldom. They had connections with other powerful families through marriage. Earl Godwin's criticisms of the prevalence of foreigners especially Normans, at Edward's court and in the Church evoked a popular response. There was a danger of civil war in 1051 before Earl Godwin fled to the continent and was outlawed before being restored a year later. The succession of Harold as head of the family in 1053 continued the importance of the Godwins. By 1063, Harold was the dominant English noble and candidates can explain his claim to the throne, which caused problems to Edward. The King himself was often unable to assert himself. He had to rely on the co-operation of others who were hostile to the Godwins. Although his final years were peaceful, this stability was at the expense of recognising the position of Harold and the Godwin family.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why the Normans had influence in England during the reign of Edward the Confessor.

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

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the third Key Issue and associated Content in the Study Topic, 'How important was Norman influence upon Edward? Edward the Confessor's Norman connections, the advancement of Normans in England, William of Normandy and the succession to the throne'. Edward the Confessor's upbringing made him susceptible to Norman influence. The King felt comfortable in the company of Normans at court. Another motive might have been that Normans could be a counter-balance to strong Anglo-Saxon nobles. They might be of help in dealing with dangers from Scandinavia. Foreigners were given earldoms and other estates. Normans were appointed to high positions in the Church (although the number of appointments can be exaggerated). For example, Robert of Jumièges became Bishop of London and then Archbishop of Canterbury. Ulf became Bishop of Dorchester. The succession issue meant that Norman influence saw William of Normandy as a prime claimant to the throne after Edward.

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

2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072**(a) How far was the leadership of William of Normandy responsible for the defeat of the Anglo-Saxons at the Battle of Hastings?**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important military victory.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far ..?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on the stated factor. It is undeniable that William's role was important although there is debate about the sequence of events: the planned retreat of the Normans at one point or a disorderly and hazardous flight that was stemmed by William personally? William had prepared well for the invasion and strengthened his position after landing. He was an experienced military commander. On the other hand, Harold's role should be examined. He also had a high military reputation but candidates might wonder whether he was wise to advance so quickly on the invaders after Stamford Bridge. Candidates might compare the respective strengths of the armies at Hastings. Some might consider the element of luck; William benefited from the simultaneous invasion of Harold Hardrada.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why there were rebellions against William I from 1067 to 1071.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for rebellion in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most disorders were local and reflected local grievances, rather than wholesale and co-ordinated resistance against William I's government. The rebels have been described as 'aimless malcontents, selfish adventurers or freebooters' (not a quotation that candidates are expected to pick up but a fair assessment of their usual qualities). Reference might be made to Edgar Aetheling and Hereward the Wake. The distant provinces saw more unrest, including the Welsh Marches, Devon and Cornwall, and the far north. The Scots were willing to chance their arm. Some risings were assisted by discontented men such as Eustace of Boulogne. The Danes resumed their threats, for example sacking York. After 1067, William I took steps to assert his authority over the whole of England, but was not fully in control until about 1071.

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

3 Norman England 1066 - 1100**(a) Assess the most important changes in land tenure from 1066 to 1100.**Focus: Assessment of important social and economic changes.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There was a change of ownership of land. The king claimed overall ownership and below him Normans and some others held land directly from him. By 1086, only two Anglo-Saxons held land directly. Beneath the great nobles, the change was probably greater in the south than the north, where native tenants held on to land, although in a subordinate position. Freeholders came under particular pressure in a system that emphasised allegiance involving large and small fiefs. Candidates might examine the system of land tenure, or feudalism, and assess whether 1066 marked a significant change. However, examiners will note that candidates are not expected to discuss the views of individual historians. Historiography is not an AS level assessment criterion although accurate references should be given credit. William himself stressed the continuity of his rule. Changes were introduced without marked differences in legislation. There was no uniformity in practice by 1100.

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

**(b) How far did William I change Anglo-Saxon methods of governing England?
(Do not discuss his relations with the Church in your answer.)**

Focus: Assessment of change in government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

‘How far ..?’ means that candidates should consider change but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of change. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on change. William I claimed to rule by succession. At his coronation, he promised to rule by the laws of Edward the Confessor and confirmed the traditional rights of London. He employed Anglo-Saxons in administration. He used the Anglo-Saxon Chancery, treasury and writs. Sheriffs and reeves continued, sometimes under different names. This continuity was based on William I’s understanding that Anglo-Saxon government was fundamentally sound (and probably more orderly than that of Normandy - although no comparison is required). On the other hand, there were changes. Normans displaced Anglo-Saxons at the head of government and were superior on the provinces. Normans often filled ‘Anglo-Saxon’ offices such as that of sheriff. The power that the King accrued was far greater than that enjoyed by Edwards the Confessor. ‘Government’ is a wide concept and some answers might consider social change but candidates should be careful to make the link with the key issue in the question.

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

4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042 - 1100

(a) How far did architecture and the arts change during the period from the Norman Conquest to the end of the eleventh century?

(Select one or more of ecclesiastical architecture, embroidery, illumination and metalwork in your answer.)

Focus: Assessment of cultural change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

‘How far ..?’ means that candidates should consider change. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the change. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on change. The number of artistic forms that are discussed will not affect the mark awarded to an answer. The discriminating factor will be the quality of the argument. In architecture, there were major changes with the building, or re-building, of smaller Anglo-Saxon churches and their replacement by larger Norman buildings. Stone tended to replace wood as the primary building material. This was characteristic of larger centres of population. Smaller villages tended to retain their earlier changes, perhaps with some minor modifications. However, some earlier patterns of decoration survived in the new churches. Some candidates might refer to castle architecture. There was probably more continuity in embroidery, illumination and metalwork. Anglo-Saxon England had a high reputation on the continent for these arts and there was no reason to discourage them, in contrast to church building. Candidates might mention the production of the Bayeux Tapestry with its Anglo-Saxon input.

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

(b) Assess the claim that the English economy became more prosperous during the period from 1066 to 1100.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about the economy in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers in **Band II** and certainly **Band I** can be expected to examine evidence of prosperity and signs of decline. Some towns became more prosperous when they were centres of Norman administration, perhaps in the vicinity of a castle. As order was restored, markets developed. In some places, Norman building of urban monasteries and rebuilding of cathedrals promoted economic development. Other English towns, however, declined. Trade with Scandinavia suffered and was not immediately replaced by greater trade with the rest of Europe. There were significant regional differences. The south and east were comparatively prosperous, but Domesday Book is evidence of the effects of William I's devastation of parts of the north and the economic effects of that destruction continued to the end of the century.

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

England 1450 - 1509**5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450 – 1470****(a) Assess the reasons why the Yorkists had won the crown by 1461.**

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

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The alternative approaches that examiners should look for are represented by the variety of reasons suggested for Yorkist success. The assessment that is required comes from the development from a mere list of reasons to some view of their importance. Candidates might consider the positive aspects: the strengths of the Yorkists. They can also consider the negative aspects: the weakness of the Lancastrians. Richard of York proved a determined leader. He was supported by Warwick. By 1461, the military engagements turned decisively in favour of the Yorkists with a battle at Northampton. On the other hand, Henry VI did not give effective leadership to the Lancastrians. The role of Margaret of Anjou might be examined. Lancastrian extremists at the Parliament of Devils (1459) added to sympathy for the Yorkists. Although York was killed in battle, the Lancastrians could not build on their advantage and Edward IV was able to declare himself king, his primacy confirmed by victory at the Battle of Towton (1461). In their assessments, candidates might be expected to show judgement in providing priorities to reach the highest marks.

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

(b) How far was Edward IV personally responsible for the problems that he faced as king during the years 1461-1470?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a ruler's problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue that Edward IV was mostly to blame for his problems or they might prefer other reasons. No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How far ..?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on the stated factor. Edward IV was personally more effective than Henry VI as a ruler. His personal qualities were attractive. However, his rule to 1470 was beset by problems. Some nobles, especially Warwick, were very powerful (overmighty?). It can be argued that Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville was a grave political mistake. The Woodville influence became detested. Edward miscalculated the chances of winning over Lancastrian sympathisers with concessions. Margaret of Anjou was implacable. Clarence was to form a powerful alliance with Warwick. Heavy taxation was unpopular. It might be argued that Warwick's ambition could not be restrained and that the Lancastrians continued to represent a danger to Edward in spite of the incapacity of Henry VI. However, Edward did make serious mistakes and mishandled the situation.

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

6 The End of the Yorkists 1471 – 1485

(a) How strong was Edward IV's government by the end of his reign in 1483? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the condition of a government at a specific point.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some latitude might be allowed about the relevant period involved in 'the end of his reign'. Certainly the outer limit will be the second reign from 1471, but the better answers should provide a clear view of the situation by 1483. On the one hand, Edward IV was comparatively rich financially. The King's handling of money became more efficient with the transfer of responsibilities from Exchequer to the Chamber although it is possible to exaggerate his success. Opinions vary about a 'new monarchy' under Edward IV. (This is not to imply that candidates should be aware of the historiographical debate but reminds examiners of the need to consider carefully alternative explanations.) He kept control of the great nobles and dealt ruthlessly with actual or potential rivals, such as Clarence. He rewarded supporters including Richard of Gloucester (future Richard III). Whilst some feuds continued between families, Edward settled most of the disputes against him. The nobles continued to play an important role but the King's personality was effective in ensuring obedience. Some candidates might consider foreign policy but this is not a requirement for any mark band. On the whole, Edward's foreign policy was comparatively unadventurous but at least it did not cost money. However, the King's marriage continued to be a problem as did particularly the young age of his heir when he died. The reign of Richard III is outside the scope of the question except that a valid point can be made about the significance of the troubles that quickly followed Edward IV's death. The apparent stability of his government quickly disintegrated.

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

(b) How much support was there for Richard III after he became king? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of support for a controversial ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

As always, examiners should consider the validity of alternative explanations carefully. Some candidates might argue that Richard III enjoyed no support and write answers that are entirely critical. These responses might deserve a high mark but it is difficult to envisage them gaining **Band I**. Whilst a **Band I** answer might argue that the opposition far outweighed the support, marks in this band will require some view of the support for the King. Richard of Gloucester had a high reputation when Edward IV died. The Woodvilles were unpopular and the protectorate of Richard was preferred to that of the Woodville minions. Hastings and Buckingham gave him their support. The claim about the illegitimacy of Edward V was accepted by many. Richard's coronation seems to have been well received. Richard gained some support by ending benevolences. He attempted some reforms in trade and justice. However, the contrary case for his opposition is easy to make. The accusations about the murder of the Princes that soon surfaced, the return of royal exactions, and the evidence of animosity from powerful nobles such as Buckingham are ample evidence of this opposition. Above all was the support that grew for Henry Tudor.

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

7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485 – 1509

(a) Assess the reasons why Henry VII was able to overcome the threats to his throne from the Pretenders and other Yorkist plots.

Focus: Assessment of a king's success in overcoming threats to his throne.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might consider the threats from Simnel, Warbeck and such Yorkists as Lovell, the Staffords and Egremont. Henry used a combination of moderation and firm action. For example, the followers of Lovell and Stafford were offered pardons, which seem to have been successful in weakening the revolt. The same tactic did not work with Lambert Simnel's followers. Henry VII had to fight a battle at Stoke. In the aftermath, Henry again showed his moderation by the way in which Simnel was treated. However, Warbeck was executed. Candidates can supplement discussions of these specific developments with explanations of wider measures that helped to strengthen the King and undermine those who threatened his throne. For example, he took firm action to establish his position against the nobility. The powers of the nobility at the centre and in the provinces were not destroyed but Henry centralised authority and enhanced the roles of sheriffs and JPs to bring the provinces under closer control. However, in their explanations, candidates should be careful to link general points to the issue of the threats to the throne. In their assessments, candidates might be expected to show judgement in providing priorities to reach the highest marks.

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

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

Focus: Assessment of success in foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far ...?' invites a variety in the assessments. Higher credit will usually be given to answers that attempt to define specifically Henry VII's aims in foreign policy than to answers that assume them. Henry was aware of the importance of foreign policy in stabilising his position on the throne. Other countries had the ability to destabilise his hold on power. He sought to encourage trade. He did not wish to exert the traditional claims to the throne of France. He wished to enhance his prestige but to avoid needless and expensive war. He tried to counter French support for the Yorkists with an alliance with Spain. Medina del Campo (1489) also agreed a marriage between Arthur and Catherine of Aragon. Initially a success, the marriage negotiations were still unresolved at the end of the reign because of the death of Arthur and incomplete negotiations to marry Prince Henry (VIII) and Catherine. Invasions of France were modest in execution and success but Etaples brought money to Henry. Trade agreements enhanced trade with the Netherlands (*Magnus Intercursus* 1496) but changes in relations between France and Spain threw English policy off course. There were tensions between England and Spain in 1509 and England might be regarded as isolated in Europe at that point. Relations with Scotland were apparently secured by the marriage of Margaret and James IV. (Future developments are outside the scope of the question unless referred to very briefly.)

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

8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509**(a) Assess the condition of the Church in England during the period from 1450 to 1509.**

Focus: Assessment of the condition of the Church in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most people maintained their beliefs in traditional forms of worship, including the liturgy, veneration of the saints and pilgrimages. The veneration of the Virgin Mary increased significantly, including the building of lady chapels. Religious writers were popular with the growing numbers of the literate. The foundation of chantries was strong and growing, and vast numbers left money in their wills for obits. There was little open heresy; surviving Lollards were mostly underground although there were regional differences, including evidence of Lollard sympathisers in London among merchant groups. Church building/re-building and decoration progressed very significantly – mostly funded by the laity themselves. Gifts to the Church continued in very substantial quantities. On the other hand, there was a significant gap between the higher and lower clergy, many of whom were usually poorly educated (although the work of the friars made up to some degree for the inability of many parish clergy to preach). Clerical absenteeism was frequent. Some bishops were, however, vigorous reformers of the parish clergy. Tithes were unpopular and a source of significant dispute between clergy and laity. Church courts reveal a mixed picture – they were unpopular in their drives against immorality ('office' business), although popular as a vehicle for personal litigation ('instance' business). Monasticism was generally out of fashion, but criticism of monks/nuns/friars was limited and some religious orders were flourishing in both new recruits and lay support (especially the Carthusians).

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

(b) Assess the claim that overseas trade made the most important contribution to the English economy during the period from 1450 to 1509.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about the economy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue that other features of the economy were more important; this will allow them to give less attention to overseas trade. However, marks in **Band III** and above will need an adequate understanding of this factor. As a broad guide, one substantial paragraph will be the minimum requirement to demonstrate this adequate understanding. Candidates might consider the importance of the wool trade, with much wool being exported to the Low Countries to be worked. By the end of the fifteenth century, a change was apparent with more cloth being exported but this added to, rather than impeded, trade. Merchants generally did well, especially when they were connected to trade companies. However, foreigners were influential, for example the Hanseatic League and there was enmity between them and English merchants. The civil wars had adverse effects but there was a recovery by the end of the relevant period. There was also trade in some other commodities such as leather. Overseas trade provided employment indirectly for many people, including spinners, weavers, dyers and fullers. Candidates might refer to regional differences. London was the most important town and trade was important it. Newcastle depended on trade with London and the south-east rather than trade overseas. Nevertheless, most people depended on self-sufficiency. Small towns were local centres and markets, making little contribution to overseas trade. In terms of numbers, most people were probably less dependent on foreign trade. In terms of profit, overseas trade was paramount.

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

England 1509 - 1558**9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509 - 1529****(a) Assess the reasons why Wolsey stayed in power for so long.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the prolonged power of an important minister.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The range of Wolsey's responsibilities was very wide: the second king? He was Chancellor from 1515 and dominated the council. He had power over the judiciary. He handled administration and finance. He had considerable power in the field of foreign policy. Wolsey was the leading churchman, holding several important offices including the archbishopric of York. From 1515, he was a cardinal and he was papal legate from 1518. Warham, the archbishop of Canterbury, was in some ways less important. Successive bishoprics gave him tremendous wealth. Wolsey's power derived from the king. Henry VIII was mostly content to let Wolsey handle affairs. Wolsey's ability and diligence meant that he could use power fully. He lived a full public life, loving display and luxury, which helped him to maintain the appearance of power. He made enemies at court but stayed in power as long as he enjoyed the support of Henry VIII. The question is focused on the positive aspects of Wolsey's rule: why did he stay in power? It will be relevant to explain why he fell but this should be a post-script, perhaps in a conclusion. It is not a necessary issue for any mark and its omission should not be regarded as a gap. Successful answers should consider a variety of reasons and the best answers might be expected to offer some priorities in their assessments.

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

(b) Who was more important in directing foreign policy from 1515 to 1529: Henry VIII or Wolsey? Explain your answer.

Focus: Comparative assessment of a king and minister in directing foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A valid case might be made for either Henry VIII or Wolsey. Henry VIII was a strong king who was not a cipher to be controlled by any minister. One of Wolsey's major concerns in foreign policy was to meet the wishes of Henry. Wolsey was charged with the execution of policy and had considerable leeway, for example in dealing with diplomatic despatches. The explanations should be supported by appropriate knowledge drawn from the period from 1515 to 1529. The later years showed the decline of Wolsey's influence. However, examiners will note the length of the specified period and will not expect a complete chronological coverage. As always, the quality of the argument will be most important in the assessment. High marks can be achieved by answers that are well argued but contain succinct factual references. For example, answers can focus on particular developments to substantiate their claims.

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

10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529 - 1558

(a) Assess the claim that Thomas Cromwell had carried out a 'revolution' in Tudor government by 1540.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about change in government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the first Key Issue and associated Content in the Specification, 'How significant was the work of Thomas Cromwell? The nature of Tudor government and administration in 1529, the reforms of Cromwell'. Some candidates might tackle the question historiographically, others without any reference to the historiography. Both are equally valid and examiners are reminded that historiography is not an AS Level assessment criterion. A problem of the historiographical approach is that it sometimes leads to name-dropping when candidates cannot support their claims by specific knowledge. Cromwell was the most influential minister from 1531 to 1540. He was interested in the workings of government. He promoted the absolutism of Henry VIII and took an active interest in the effectiveness of the Privy Council as Principal Secretary from 1534. He was also Chancellor of the Exchequer, Master of the Rolls and, from 1536, Lord Privy Seal. During his ministry, Parliament arguably became more important with the increase in legislation but as the servant, not the rival, of the King. Provincial councils were reformed and strengthened (for example the Council of the North). Revenue courts were re-organised. The focus should be on government. It is possible, but not necessary, to refer to religious changes but only within the context of government, for example the royal supremacy. It is difficult to deny that there were considerable changes under Cromwell. The central issue is whether there was a revolution or, perhaps in AS terms, there was more change than continuity and how important was the change? The Study Topic begins in 1529; the specification mentions 'The nature of Tudor government and administration in 1529'. Candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of the workings of government before that date.

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

(b) How far did relations with France affect England's domestic affairs from 1543 to 1558?

Focus: Assessment of the domestic effects of foreign relations.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The central issue is the link between Anglo-French relations and domestic affairs. The question is based on the second Key Issue and associated Content in the Study Topic, 'What was the impact of foreign relations on domestic affairs? The main events (and the effects on politics and finances), wars ... with France (1543-6, 1547-50 and 1557-8)'. A major effect might be seen in the costs incurred. Conflict with France from 1543 was expensive, forcing Henry VIII to make peace. The outcome was an increase in the crown's debt, more taxation and further debasement. The pattern continued under Somerset, who was also pushed into the dissolution of the chantries. Northumberland's negotiations with France limited expenditure and agreed a marriage for Edward VI (which never took place). Mary I's reign saw relations with France deteriorate, linked with England's Spanish alliance. The effects were to make the Queen more unpopular, especially when Calais was lost. A common thread is the political weakness that resulted from a series of unpopular policies. Another is the cost.

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

11 Church and State 1529 - 1558

(a) How widespread was criticism of the Church in England in 1529? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the reputation of the Church in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some candidates might tackle the question historiographically, others without any reference to the historiography. Both are equally valid and examiners are reminded that historiography is not an AS Level assessment criterion. A problem of the historiographical approach is that it sometimes leads to name-dropping when candidates cannot support their claims by specific knowledge. Criticism might seem to have been based on the inadequacies of the clergy, typified by Wolsey. The wealth of the Church was considerable but there was a gap between the resources of the higher and lower clergy who were more in touch with the general populace. Church dues and Church courts were unpopular. Hunne's Case (1514) caused an outcry. Some might refer to Simon Fish's criticism of the clergy. Many monasteries were in decline. On the other hand, it might be argued that the problems, whilst real, were no more serious than in previous generations. Church dues might have been unpopular but people were willing to donate voluntarily to the Church. Henry VIII was faithful to the Church and opposed Protestant teachings. The court fell in line. There were important Humanists, such as More, but they did not criticise the Church in general. More was to die because of his Catholic beliefs. Some very good candidates might point to regional differences. Anti-clericalism was probably stronger in London and the south-east than in more remote regions. Candidates need to take great care in referring to developments after 1529. If they do so, the material needs to be used as proof of the situation in 1529. For example, action against papal exactions proved fairly popular. But the course of the Reformation will very probably not be relevant.

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

(b) How much support was there for Protestantism in England by the end of Edward VI's reign in 1553? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the religious condition of England in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue that most people conformed to Protestantism. The acceptance of obedience to government was a strong factor. Both Somerset and Northumberland promoted Protestantism not only through the Prayer Books but also by the deprivation of Catholic-minded bishops such as Gardiner and the appointment of men such as Ridley and Hooper who enforced changes. On the other hand, there is evidence of resistance. For example, the rising in Cornwall was a protest against the 1549 Prayer Book. Ket's Rebellion in Norfolk had some religious connections but was more a protest against agrarian conditions. It can be claimed that convinced Protestants were in a minority. This was proved by the failure of Northumberland's plot to supplant Mary Tudor as Edward VI's successor.

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

12 Social and Economic Issues 1509 - 1558

(a) Assess the claim that towns became more prosperous during the period from 1509 to 1558.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about urban prosperity.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the Third Key Issue and associated Content in the Study Topic, 'How were towns affected by economic and social developments? Impact on towns of plague, famine, inflation, changing trade patterns'. Plague was recurrent but localised. Larger urban centres such as London and Norwich were more prone to infection than rural areas. On the other hand, the numbers of the dead could be replaced more easily in such places. Famine was less common in larger towns than in the smaller towns or countryside. London was by far the largest city and it continued to outstrip other urban centres. The size of its population provided a market and employment for many trades that helped to insulate it from setbacks. The wealthiest were based there. Provincial towns such as Norwich, Bristol, Newcastle and Exeter were regional centres of trade and gained some prosperity. The larger towns could engage in profitable overseas trade. On the other hand, some smaller towns failed to benefit to any great extent. However, even small towns could contain a multiplicity of trades. Inflation was a problem but did not affect everyone adversely. Some town dwellers benefited because they could charge higher prices. Their incomes could increase.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why governments faced problems in their attempts to limit enclosures during the period from 1509 to 1558.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for governments' problems in dealing with an economic and social phenomenon.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Alternative explanations must be considered carefully although it is difficult to see how candidates can argue that governments did not face any problems in dealing with enclosures. However, it is possible that the problem can be exaggerated in this period because enclosure was limited in scope nationally and even had limited effects in the most enclosed regions. It was a matter of concern, perhaps not particularly during the reign of Henry VII, in spite of his legislation against new enclosures, but Wolsey took it seriously, as did his successors in government. Enclosures results in several problems of which governments, like others were aware, including the displacement of people and the consequent drift to towns. Wolsey took illegal enclosers to court, including Thomas More. However, Wolsey, like his successors, was hamstrung by the fact that enclosers were often influential; Wolsey was himself an encloser. He had to end his efforts in order to obtain parliamentary subsidies. Legislation of 1549 followed the same pattern. Somerset's anti-enclosure measures (for example the Hales Commission and a tax on sheep) ran into trouble and increased his unpopularity among the rich. Riots and revolts broke out. Reference might be made to Ket.

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

England 1547 – 1603**13 Church and State 1547 - 1603**

(a) Assess the reasons why the governments of both Edward VI and Mary I faced popular opposition in introducing religious changes.

Focus: Assessment of religious problems of diverse rulers.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might tackle this question sequentially, considering first the reign of Edward and then the reign of Mary I. This approach might achieve a high mark, including **Band I** but it unlikely to merit the top of this Band. The very best answers should make some links, noting some common factors. From 1547 to 1553, there was resistance from conservative forces, for example in Cornwall (1549). Most people conformed but without much enthusiasm. During Mary's reign, her policies to restore Catholicism were not initially unpopular, but the extent and speed of the changes aroused controversy. The Queen resisted the advice of those who preferred a more cautious and slower pace of change. The restoration of papal authority caused trouble. Mary's marriage to Philip of Spain caused unrest (most notably Wyatt's rebellion 1554). There was a link between religious policies and an unpopular war. The persecutions/burnings alienated people rather than suppressed opposition. Whilst Edward VI's changes proved unpopular with determined Catholics and Mary's policies alienated the more Protestant forces, there were common aspects. Most people conformed in both reigns, but the changes in both directions revealed the splits in the country. Minorities were difficult to suppress. Tudor governments did not have the means to enforce obedience in the provinces. The issue revealed regional differences in religious commitment. Protestant moves were more popular in London and the southeast than elsewhere; Catholicism and conservatism were much stronger in the north and the west.

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

(b) Assess the claim that the most important reason for the influence of the Puritans in Elizabeth I's reign was that they had support in Parliament.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about a religious group.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue that other factors were more important; this will allow them to give less attention to support in Parliament. However, marks in **Band III** and above will need an adequate understanding of this factor. As a broad guide, one substantial paragraph will be the minimum requirement to demonstrate this adequate understanding. There are mixed opinions about the importance of the 'Puritan Choir' in Parliament. Its influence has probably been exaggerated. However, the Puritans in Parliament enjoyed some influential support from men such as Knollys and Mildmay. The Puritans were influential in the making of the religious settlement. However, the limits of Puritan influence in Parliament can be seen when MPs themselves took action against radicals although Elizabeth I herself had to stop or veto bills. Among other reasons that candidates can explain and assess was the popularity of the Puritans' anti-Catholic stance. The movement included well educated and vocal people. Preaching and Bible study were effective in winning support. Puritanism enjoyed some powerful support at court, for example from Leicester and even from Burghley. There were enthusiasts in London and the prosperous southeast. The lengths to which Whitgift had to go to enforce orthodoxy are evidence of the strength of the movement.

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

14 Foreign Affairs 1547 - 1587

(a) Assess the problems in foreign policy that Elizabeth I faced when she became queen in 1558.

Focus: Assessment of a ruler's problems in foreign policy in a particular period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Elizabeth I's reign began with the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis which ended an unpopular and expensive war. Mary I, not Elizabeth, was blamed for the loss of Calais. But the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis, essentially between France and Spain, did not end the rivalry between these two powerful countries and an immediate problem was how to chart a course that would avoid England falling into either camp. A positive feature was that neither France nor Spain was hostile to England in 1558; both saw the advantages of friendship, even favouring an alliance, with Elizabeth I. Mary, Queen of Scots, was a problem. Married to Francis II, which threatened a potentially dangerous alliance between France and Scotland, Mary was also believed by some committed Catholics to have the stronger claim to the English throne, and certainly as long as Elizabeth had no direct heir. The crown's finances were in a poor state. The navy was weak and the army was negligible. Fortifications along the southern coast had been neglected. Overall, the military situation was parlous, a hazard in foreign policy.

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

(b) How far did Elizabeth I's policy towards France change during the period from 1562 to 1584?

Focus: Assessment of change in foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far ..?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor of change but also examine the alternative of continuity. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of change. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on change. Reference might be made to Elizabeth I's relations with France before 1562, for example the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis and the Scottish crisis of 1559-60, but it should be brief to allow for a concentration on the specified period. Elizabeth's general policy was to remain on good terms with France but not to get drawn into dangerous continental politics. However, she was forced to change on a number of occasions especially because of religion. The outbreak of the French Wars of Religion brought pressures on the Queen to favour the Huguenots from men such as Dudley/Leicester. Others saw a greater advantage in maintaining good relations with Spain. There was also the possibility of regaining Calais. The Huguenots were promised loans and soldiers (Treaty of Hampton Court). The failure of the expedition confirmed Elizabeth's suspicions of foreign involvement and she returned to a policy of peace with France. Reference might be made to marriage proposals (Duke of Anjou - Alençon) and to the link between Mary, Queen of Scots and France. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew (1572) destroyed hopes of a close Anglo-French friendship (Treaty of Blois) but Elizabeth was soon trying to restore good relations, especially with the danger of Spanish hostility and the repercussions of the Dutch revolt. The pattern continued to 1584 with Elizabeth trying to steer a course through difficult circumstances, usually responding to events on the continent rather than dictating policy.

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

15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558 - 1603**(a) How far do you agree that Parliament usually co-operated with Elizabeth I?**

Focus: Assessment of the relations between a ruler and Parliament.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far ...?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor of co-operation but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on the stated factor. It will probably not be advisable to take a chronological approach but answers that do so should not be underestimated and consigned automatically to a lower band. A potentially better and perhaps more manageable approach might be to look at examples of co-operation and disputes and weigh which were more important. Many candidates might find it easier to challenge the claim in the question. It is easy to support their viewpoint by referring to the making of the religious settlement, pressures on Elizabeth I to marry and to execute Mary, Queen of Scots, disputes over Puritan demands and Parliamentary freedoms, and the unpopularity of monopolies. On the other hand, most members of both Houses were loyal to the Queen and deferred to her monarchy. Disputes were often with a minority. (Some would claim that heated debates were sometimes the result of councillors wanting to pressurise the Queen rather than spontaneous examples of opposition.) Peter Wentworth was arrested by order of the Commons and he always protested his personal loyalty to the Queen. The crown had the means of encouraging obedience, for example in the appointment of the Speaker and by the leading presence of ministers. Elizabeth was usually able to defuse trouble by concessions, as well as by more forceful vetoes.

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

(b) Assess the claim that the rebellion in Ireland was Elizabeth I's most serious problem from 1588 to 1603.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about a ruler's problems in a particular period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue that other problems were more serious; this will allow them to give less attention to Ireland. However, marks in **Band III** and above will need an adequate understanding of this factor. As a broad guide, one substantial paragraph will be the minimum requirement to demonstrate this adequate understanding. Elizabeth faced considerable trouble in Ireland especially in the 1590s with the resistance that was led by O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone. Ireland was in disorder and there was a real danger of support for the rebels from Spain, which launched two abortive Armadas. Essex's attempt (1597) to suppress the rebellion proved fruitless, but Mountjoy succeeded in restoring order by 1601. The Irish Rebellion was a very serious financial problem as well as a major military difficulty. The range of other problems that might be discussed is wide and examiners should look first at what is discussed before looking for gaps. Candidates might consider the war with Spain. They might examine increasing financial problems and unrest in Parliament. The 1590s were a period of social hardship, worsened by poor harvests. Elizabeth I was becoming isolated at court with the death of men such as Leicester and Burghley. Reference might be made to Essex's rebellion (1601). Religion was probably less of a problem in the 1590s but it might be assessed.

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 Social and Economic Issues 1547 - 1603

(a) Assess the main reasons for changes in industry during the period from 1547 to 1603.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an aspect of economic change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question does not ask candidates to assess the extent of industrial change but to look for reasons. A discussion of extent will not be grossly irrelevant but might best be limited to an introduction or conclusion. Among the reasons was prosperity but this was intermittent and often confined to particular regions. Periods and places of prosperity encouraged industrial change. Some immigrants (including religious refugees) brought skills, mostly to towns in East Anglia or Kent. A shortage of timber led to more reliance on stone and quarries. Brickmaking flourished as fashion turned increasingly to brick-built houses – for the aristocracy downwards. Coal became a more popular fuel among the wealthy. The metal industry in its various forms was encouraged, again especially by and for the rich. The production of luxury goods, whilst always small in total size, grew during this period. Some may point to the underlying peace of these years: England was not convulsed by war (civil war or foreign invasion).

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 the reign of Elizabeth I a period of expansion in trade?

Focus: Assessment of the extent of economic expansion on trade.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far ..?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor of expansion but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of expansion. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on expansion. Trade was in difficulties at the beginning of the reign because of the problems with wool and cloth. Antwerp fell into decline from the middle of the sixteenth century and was hard hit as the Dutch revolt developed, for example in the Spanish Fury (1576). England had to develop other markets and trade routes. The Muscovy Company was formed just before Elizabeth I's accession (1555) had had some modest success. More successful were the Levant Company (1581) and the East India Company at the very end of the reign (1600). Newfoundland became more important. Some seamen and sponsors were ready to challenge the Spanish monopoly in the New World. Reference might be made to Hawkins's voyages; the first two were profitable, the third was disastrous. Some candidates might examine the limited success of attempts to establish trading in north America, for example Virginia where the hopes for bullion and trade with the natives proved abortive. Some candidates might refer to internal trade although this is not required for any mark. (It is more unlikely that sound answers will deal only with internal rather than external trade.) Internal trade was also at the mercy of economic tides but trade to London increased. Some provincial trades increased, such as coal from Newcastle for the new or rebuilt large Tudor houses for the wealthy. Overall, candidates might well come to very different conclusions.

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 James I handled foreign policy badly?**

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about a ruler's handling of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far ...?' invites candidates to consider both sides of the argument and come to a justified conclusion. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on James's mistakes. Answers might argue that James I's foreign policy was in theory wiser than that of his critics because he wished to avoid confrontation and war. On the other hand, it might be claimed that his policy divided England unnecessarily especially because it appeared to favour England's enemies. Peace was made with Spain very soon after his accession (Treaty of London 1604), ending an expensive and fruitless war but it was not widely popular. Further pro-Spanish moves such as the prosecution of Raleigh and the pursuit of a Spanish match caused hostility within England. James might be defended for his wish to improve relations with Spain but allowed Gondomar too much influence. His initial unwillingness to interfere in the Thirty Years' War might be seen as a wise reluctance to be involved in a dangerous conflict. On the other hand, he did not recognise the Protestant sympathies of many, especially with the marriage of his daughter Elizabeth to Frederick of the Palatinate.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why James I and Charles I, to 1629, quarrelled with their Parliaments about financial issues.

Focus: Assessment of reasons for quarrels between rulers and Parliament over finances.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Because of the different lengths of the relevant reigns (Charles I – four years to 1629), examiners will not look for a balanced argument. One sound paragraph on Charles I to support a convincing assessment of James I's reign might be enough to merit **Band I** although normally at least two paragraphs will be necessary. It might be argued that the Stuarts invited criticism. James I was believed to be extravagant. His court was costly and money was spent on favourites. His impositions were unpopular. For example, Bate's Case (1606) followed the revision of the Book of Rates. Benevolences aroused criticism, as did monopolies. Charles I resorted to forced loans, one of the grievances highlighted in the Petition of Right and repeated in the Three Resolutions. A contrary case is that Parliament was unwilling to grant the Stuarts enough money. Taxes were insufficient to meet the crown's expenses and the increase in the Book of Rates was probably overdue. The negotiations for a Great Contract (1610) failed although responsibility for this should probably be shared. Charles's first Parliament gave him no leeway but immediately refused the supplies that were traditionally granted to a new monarch. It might be claimed that Charles I had no alternative but to resort to arbitrary taxation.

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

18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629 - 1649

(a) Assess Charles I's most serious problems in achieving his aims during his personal rule (1629-40).

Focus: Assessment of a ruler's problems in achieving his aims in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should explain Charles I's aims, primarily his unwillingness to call Parliament until relations between him and his people were improved, to manage his finances without the taxes that Parliament supplied and to put an end to religious indiscipline. The achievement of all of these aims was problematic and answers should assess the importance of Charles I's problems, preferably indicating some order of importance or priority. Parliament contained some of the most influential men in England. Even when Parliament was not meeting, members contained to have a local influence. Charles's personal rule alienated rather than won over his subjects because it was regarded as a form of (continental and Catholic?) absolutism. The King personally was not trusted and he lacked the personal qualities to win over large numbers of supporters. Financial policies proved unpopular. The resort to medieval levies such as knighthood fees and forest laws alienated people. The revival of monopolies contracted earlier undertakings by the Stuart kings. Ship Money was controversial. John Hampden lost his case but won public support. Laud's religious policies were difficult to enforce. To many they smacked of Catholicism, especially with a Catholic Queen at court. Heavy-handed prosecutions such as that of Prynne, Burton and Bastwick increased Charles I's problems in this area. In the end, the most serious problem was Scotland. The outcome of the Scottish rising was the Short Parliament and the end of personal rule.

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

(b) Assess the claim that the most important reason for Parliament's success in the First Civil War (1642-46) was that it had better generals.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue that other reasons were more important; this will allow them to give less attention to the generals. However, marks in **Band III** and above will need an adequate understanding of this factor. As a broad guide, one substantial paragraph will be the minimum requirement to demonstrate this adequate understanding. In dealing with generals, one might expect references to Charles I and Rupert as royalists and to Cromwell and Fairfax as Parliamentarians. Cromwell proved an inspiring leader but Fairfax's contribution should not be underestimated. Others such as Hopton and Waller would be a bonus. Candidates might point out that Essex and Manchester, the early Parliamentary leaders, were not particularly successful. The later years of the civil war saw Parliament's generals prevail. Other factors that might be discussed are money. Charles I was increasingly at a disadvantage compared with Parliament in harnessing resources. Organisation, especially the establishment of the New Model Army, was crucial. The role of the Scots was important; Charles failed to obtain equivalent foreign or Irish assistance.

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

19 The Interregnum 1649-1660**(a) Assess the reasons why Oliver Cromwell became Lord Protector in 1653.**

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

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The end point is clear (1653) but some latitude is allowed when candidates select a beginning. Many might choose the establishment of the Rump and the execution of Charles I (1648-49). Some might take a narrower approach and focus on 1653. Both of these kinds of answer might merit the highest marks. It is difficult to see why earlier material should be relevant unless it is used as a brief introduction. There were positive and negative reasons. The Instrument of Government offered a balance (but not equality) between Protector, Council and Parliament. The powers of each were defined. It provided an income for the army. Cromwell had come to believe that the role of one man as leader was essential but also that the rule of law should prevail. Negative reasons might include the failure of alternatives. The Rump had proved to be unsatisfactory. It had not agreed the settlement that was hoped for after the execution of the King. The Barebones Parliament/Assembly of Saints would not be a permanent solution and Cromwell quickly became disillusioned with it. Examiners will look for a series of reasons with the most successful answers including some indication of importance or priority.

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

(b) How far do you agree that Oliver Cromwell's religious policies were the most successful aspect of his domestic rule from 1653 to 1658?

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about a controversial ruler.'

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

They should note the relevant dates and developments before 1653 will not be relevant. 'How far..?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. Candidates might argue that Cromwell was more successful in other areas; this will allow them to give less attention to religious policies. However, marks in **Band III** and above will need an adequate understanding of this factor. As a broad guide, one adequate paragraph will be the minimum requirement to demonstrate this adequate understanding. 'domestic rule' clearly excludes foreign policy but Scotland and Ireland might be considered grey areas in assessing relevance. Examiners should be willing to give them some credit but not regard their omission as gaps. The range of other factors that can be considered is wide. Candidates might consider his government, including relations with Parliament. They might examine relations with royalists. As always, credit should be given to the quality of what is written before looking for omissions. In religion, Cromwell sought toleration. Recusancy laws were abolished. Although the Instrument of Government excluded Catholicism and Anglicanism, Cromwell would have allowed some private exercise of these beliefs. Jews were readmitted to England. However, others were less tolerant. Various groups claimed toleration for themselves but would not allow it to others. Some groups such the Quakers led by Fox tested his patience. It might be argued that he failed to reach a religious settlement but he did succeed in avoiding the danger of further religious conflict that was a real danger if the intolerant policies of others had prevailed. An alternative approach might be to claim that Cromwell was completely unsuccessful, implying that the question is invalid. This view might be maintained but it does not disallow the need to distinguish between various degrees of failure.

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

20 Society and the Economy 1603 - 1660

(a) Assess the reasons why London remained so important in the English economy during the period from 1603 to 1660.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important economic phenomenon.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might explain and assess reasons such as the large population of London: the city was by far the most populous urban centre in England. The figure might have increased from 250,000 to about 400,000 in this period. Bristol and Norwich had fewer than 100,000. It contained practitioners of almost every trade. London was the most important English market. It was an outlet for internal trade and an important base for foreign trade. London was the centre of the royal court and the republican government - an important part of the London economy. Although there was extreme poverty because of the influx of the unemployed and vagrants, there was also considerable wealth. The richest were there, providing employment and income for many. The period from 1603 to 1660 saw economic changes, including periods of depression which affected London like everywhere else, but the city was more insulated from the downturns.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why there was a growth in radical religious groups during the period from 1640 to 1660.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the growth of religious radicalism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question asks why and examiners will award the higher marks to answers that offer a series of reasons, preferably indicating some order of importance. The period from 1640 to 1660 saw a weakening in the power of established religious authorities. For example, the Court of High Commission was abolished (1641). Laud was impeached (1641) and executed (1645). This allowed unorthodox religious groups to develop without the fear of persecution. The First Civil War and the defeat of Charles I 'proved' to many that God favoured the radicals rather than the 'popish' tendencies of the royalists. There was a feeling that the civil war was largely a war of religion. In the aftermath of the First Civil War (1642-46), the absence of a strong and cohesive central government allowed radicalism to spread. It was also a time of some social fluidity that was linked to religious change. Millenarianism might be explained: the feeling that the time of Christ's return was near. When Cromwell ruled (1653-58), he favoured toleration although the radicals often tested his patience. Some elements in Parliament were less sympathetic and favoured tighter discipline, but still without the repressive machinery of previous monarchies. Candidates might support their explanations with some examples of radical groups although detailed examples are not expected.

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

**Mark Scheme 2584
June 2006**

England 1780–1846**The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783–1830****1(a) How far do you agree that Lord Liverpool brought new ideas to the problem of dealing with the radical challenge from 1812 to 1822?**

Focus: Assessment of the anti-Radical policies adopted by Liverpool's governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might point to continuity between the two periods. The key figures in the 1810s (Lord Liverpool and Viscount Sidmouth) had held minor and major office in Pitt's governments and the former, especially, saw Pitt as a mentor whose policies he invariably followed. Their reaction to increased discontent in and after 1815 was exactly the same as Pitt's had been in the 1790s and was thus not new – legislation was passed making mass meetings more difficult (Seditious Meetings Act of 1795 and 1817), Habeas Corpus was suspended (during 1794 – 1817 and again in 1819), leading radicals were temporarily locked up as a result, workers' combinations were banned from 1799 onwards and Pitt's regulation via increased Stamp Duties on the press were maintained. Spies were used by both governments to infiltrate radical societies and report back to the Home Office. Pitt's governments were the obvious model to use given the constraints of the time although there was no Treasonable Practices Act in the 1810s. Arguably Lord Liverpool faced the greater threat – he could not use loyalist associations and mobs once the French War ceased in 1815 and the economic dislocation of the transition from war to peace were considerable. They were no 'Marches' or 'Peterloos' in the 1790s, but then the 1810s had no Tom Paine. Both governments were backed by large majorities in Parliament. However, it is possible for candidates to point to some new aspects – the use of the military and an awareness of the need to stabilise the economy. On balance, before 1822 Liverpool used methods that were traditional. Most candidates will probably assert that, but they also need to demonstrate it.

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

(b) Assess how liberal were the domestic policies of the Tory governments from 1822 to 1830.

(Ireland should be included in your answer.)

Focus: Assessment of the domestic policies of Tory governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will have to address the question.

Candidates might address the nature of Toryism (landed, Anglican, pro status quo) and what could be defined as liberal at the time (moderate reform, freer trade, catholic emancipation and possibly parliamentary reform) to establish criteria for assessing domestic policies. Some may seek to identify Liberal Tories (Canning, possibly Peel, Huskisson, Robinson, even Liverpool himself), or argue that better economic conditions created a chance to reform liberally in less tense times, or even that the above underwent some sort of conversion to liberalism post 1822. Some may proceed via the policies themselves – commercial and tariff changes, revised Corn Laws in 1822 and 1828, Home Office Reforms 1823-4, Repeal of the Combination Acts 1824-5, Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts 1828, and Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829. They can be seen as 'liberal', but equally as being within a Pittite tradition or simply a response to specific circumstances, campaigns or as administrative measures. Ministers could be against some of these (Peel on Catholic) but pro on others (Peel on gaols and trading issues). All opposed Parliamentary reform. 1822 did not see new men and new policies, merely reshuffles and promotions of those who had often been behind policies pre 1822 as with Huskisson on economic and financial issues.

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

War and Peace 1793–1841

2(a) To what extent did coalition diplomacy prove to be the most successful strategy Britain undertook in the French War of 1793 to 1815?

Focus: Assessment of reasons for British success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might balance diplomacy against other strategies, naval, military, financial and trading (the Decrees in Council). It could be argued that coalition diplomacy was only of secondary importance before 1813. The first four coalitions consisted of changing European powers who did not necessarily wish to oust Napoleon and where war aims were varied. Whilst Britain was radical in engineering all of these they all failed to defeat Napoleon on land, serving only to point to the need for Britain to play a larger role in Europe. Nonetheless they did keep Napoleon militarily preoccupied in Europe. Only in 1813 was the crucial coalition formed with a determination not to disband until Napoleon was removed and it was subsidised by Britain to the tune of £26 million, a nod in the direction of British financial and manufacturing muscle, partnered by a naval blockade that cut Europe off from world trade. Diplomacy therefore was effective only at the end and in conjunction with other strategies that were of varied success during the wars – at sea a bluewater strategy had triumphed by 1805 but had been put under pressure 1793 – 1805 (especially 1797), a large scale military strategy did not click in much before 1807, whilst financially from 1798 Britain was able to raise much more money than France. Better candidates will need to see the links between diplomacy and money and their role in the wider strategic picture.

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

(b) How far do you agree that, in the period to 1841, Canning was a more successful Foreign Secretary than Palmerston?

Focus: Evaluation of the relative success of Canning and Palmerston.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Both are similar (Palmerston had been a Canningite), using the press to build images of success. A useful area of comparison would be the emerging Eastern Question. Canning appeared to be successful over the Greek question, negotiating agreements with France and Russia to control Greek-Turkish antagonism in the 1827 Treaty of London, but he died before its failure at Navarino after which Russia gained the advantage. Palmerston inherited this disadvantage in 1830 and failed to reverse it until the Straits Convention of 1841. He was much criticised for his attitude to France and her diplomatic isolation and the risks of war he ran in 1839-41, but he did eliminate the threat posed by Mehmet Ali to the Ottomans. Like Canning he had successfully checked French and Russia ambition in the Near East for the moment. Both took similar attitudes to Spain and Portugal and were successful. Canning's real success lay in Latin America where he secured trading interests and recognised newly independent countries. Palmerston succeeded in blocking absolutist rulers in both Spain and Portugal and successfully continued Canning's policy of destroying and checking the Congress System, providing a balance with the Eastern Powers (the 1834 Quadruple alliance). Palmerston also dealt with new problems – Belgium's separation from the Netherlands (with success), and promoting new trade in the East (Opium Wars with China from 1839) to partner Canning's achievement in Latin America. Both had less success with curbing US power and Slavery. Candidates who produce separate accounts cannot go beyond Band III at best. The focus is on which was the more successful.

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

The Age of Peel 1829–1846

3(a) How successfully, to 1846, did Peel adapt his party to the challenges posed by the 1832 Reform Act? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the success of Peel as party leader.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will have to address the question.

Candidates might identify the challenges posed by the Reform Act and the disastrous election of 1832 such as the need for greater management of the electoral system (the registration societies supported by Peel's adviser Bonham); the Political Clubs like the 1832 Carlton Club for the Tories. Most are likely to argue that Peel was the more successful here (his 1838 'Register' speech) although better candidates may give more credit to Bonham and then Peel's very traditional views on patronage and ministerial royal government. Another post-1832 challenge could be the stress on party affiliation and discipline. Again Peel's sense of duty could be emphasised, although he continued to believe in supporting Whig measures if deemed necessary and went on to divide his party in the 1840s. A challenge posed by the 1832 Act, particularly its passing, was property owners frightened by radical activity. Peel was very successful in appealing to both urban and rural property owners stressing a broader conservatism than a narrow landed Toryism (Tamworth Manifesto of 1834). This contrasts with a Whig government which appeared in the hands of Radicals. He continued this with much less success within his own party in the 2nd Ministry. The elections of 1835, 1837 and 1841 demonstrate his success although better candidates may draw attention to the 1841 election as presenting him with too Tory a majority to govern as a conservative, despite it being the first time a sitting government with a majority were defeated. However, in 1841 he failed to make inroads into the larger industrial constituencies. He also failed to sell his ideas permanently to his party. This is a wide question, accompanying both the 1830s and 1840s, so comprehensive coverage is **not** expected.

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

(b) 'The success of Peel's second ministry of 1841-46 was mainly the result of its ability to accept and deal with industrial change.' How far do you agree?

Focus: Assessment of the importance of factors in Peel's success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might establish some criteria for success – popular and effective legislation, preserving traditional government and maintaining law and order in the age of the Chartists, feeding more cheaply an expanding urban population, persuading his party and Parliament of his policies, etc. Candidates who argue for the assertion could use elements such as the following to support their case – that Peel's legislation gained Parliamentary majorities latterly with Whig support, that he sought to deal with industrial and economic problems via a freer trade (his Budget of 1842-43, the Sugar Duties and the repeal of the Corn Laws), creating cheaper bread and boosting exports at a time of terrible depression in 1837-44. Clearly Peel is accepting industrialisation as a key aspect of Britain's future by embracing Free Trade, dealing with industrial and financial problems via the Bank Charter Act, taxation, the Companies Act, a controversial stance on Factory Reform in 1843-44 and the Poor Law. Much could be made of his attempts to balance interests (worker and employer, the State v private initiative, greed v proper regulation of various areas such as the railways and the currency. Candidates however do need to consider other factors – his mastery of detail and ability to dominate the House of Commons and the inheritance of Whig debt and the severe economic depression of 1837-45 which enabled him to force his earlier legislation through. Maintaining law and order, both in Ireland and on the mainland, was also seen by many at the time as his main success. Better candidates in **Bands I to III** might also point to the limitations of his ability in dealing with industrial change, notably the destruction of his party following much bullying on such matters as trade, education and factory reform.

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

The Economy and Industrialisation 1780–1846

4(a) Assess the claim that social factors were the most important reason why Britain became an industrial nation during the period 1780 to 1846.

Focus: Assessment of the importance of factors explaining industrial change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The focus requires a relative evaluation of the importance of social factors in industrial change. Candidates can usefully comment on looser class structures than in Europe that aided social mobility, which were open to talent and with an aristocracy that was not closed to marriage or to the practice of trade, mining or commercial agriculture (Peel senior and Arkwright were assimilated in this way). A more open society allowed capital to be invested in trade (especially sugar, cotton and tobacco) which fuelled industrialisation. Coal profits from land were not siphoned off to monarchs as in Europe. This encouraged entrepreneurial attitudes and unlocked wealth. However candidates could challenge this, some successes being atypical and landed values still a dominant, restrictive and conservative hindrance throughout the period. Some candidates could also be given to the view that Protestantism advantaged Britain by being more closely linked to a work and saving ethic whilst Dissenters were prominent as a business community because they were politically excluded. This too could be challenged – most successful businessmen were Anglican, and Catholic areas abroad, like Belgium, were early to industrialise. Other factors may be far more persuasive – a rising population and demand, capital available from overseas trade, the role of inventions, geographical smallness and diversity. All could be set against the view that social factors were the most important in triggering and sustaining industrialisation.

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

(b) How serious were the problems of rural change in the period 1780-1846? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the extent of rural problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might establish the problem of rural change before discussing their extent. One was a structural imbalance where employment in rural areas could not match the growing population. This was regional – Southern England contained almost 40% of the population, largely employed in agriculture and its associated trades. This drove wages downwards and, on top of enclosure created an agricultural proletariat whose poverty was a constant issue in the period. This was less so in the semi industrial Midlands and especially the North, where wages could be double. In the latter areas pastoral farming had always prevailed and change was much less than in the enclosing South and East. Alternative employment in the South (woollen textiles) was declining in the face of new northern methods. Enclosures from 1780 and mechanisation from 1800 led to more efficient agriculture which reduced the need for labourers, drove them from the villages and led to seasonal and under employment (casual labour). Poverty increased, the southern rural areas were over-populated and bread prices rose because of the French Wars (1793-1815). Problems increased after 1815 because although bread prices fell, landowners employed fewer. The Swing Riots occurred in areas little affected by enclosure). One could point to Speenhamland before 1834 as a mitigating failure, in dealing with rural problems and to migration to industrial cities as a safety valve.

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

Britain 1846–1906**Whigs and Liberals 1846–1874****5(a) Assess the importance of Palmerston's domestic policies in his political dominance of the period 1855-65.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for Palmerston's political dominance.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Those who give prominence to the role of his domestic policies may stress that his relative inaction here suited the needs of a socially more stable and more economically prosperous period (his refusal to tackle Irish issues were popular). Yet with Gladstone as Chancellor after 1859 Palmerston could rely on reforms of administration, university and savings. Free Trade and low taxation were popular policies. Better candidates could point to Palmerston's misgivings over the Paper Duties and his ruling out of Parliamentary Reform. Also important is the final fusion of Whigs, Peelites and Radicals into a Liberal Party headed by Palmerston in 1859 which in the 1860s saw much uncontroversial consolidation measures such as the Poor Law, Health and local government reform. It is likely that candidates may give more importance to war and foreign policy issues – Palmerston's victory over Russia at the Treaty of Paris, his dodging of responsibility for Crimean ineptitude, the role of the Opium Wars in winning the 1857 election and the failure of a poor handling of the Schleswig Holstein question to unseat him in the 1865 election. All suggest his image, cultivated by press contacts, as representative of Britain at its zenith worked unless candidates point to the Orsini 'mistake' in 1858. They could also comment on the weakness of Derby and Disraeli's opposition in marked contrast to Palmerston's ability to keep a Liberal coalition in place (using Italy in 1859).

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

(b) How important was Gladstone in the creation of a successful Liberal party during the period 1846-68? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the creation of a Liberal party.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might assess the relative importance of Gladstone in the creation of a Liberal party. They could stress his abilities as an administrator and a leader, first of all of the Peelites then, after 1866, of the Liberals. It could be argued that many of their distinctive policies were also his – the stress on peace, retrenchment and reform. He was an electoral asset from 1859 and extremely ambitious. However one could point to his essential Peelite conservatism in the years before 1859, his aloofness from governments 1846-53 and especially 1855-1859, the mistrust he engendered in many circles, from Radicals to Whigs, and his penchant for raising for embarrassing moral questions pursued at the cost of party. All of these cast doubt over his importance to an emerging party led initially by Palmerston, who stood for a rather different type of liberalism. Candidates could stress the importance of other factors based around the view that the Liberals could have done without Gladstone. The leadership for a large part of the period lay with others (Whigs like Palmerston and Russell, Peelites like Aberdeen). Aristocratic Whiggery remained important socially and electorally something Gladstone encouraged. Radicals provided ‘energy’ but pursued their causes regardless of Gladstone. They tapped into a variety of electoral assets – from workers to Nonconformists. The Celtic Fringe was another key electoral asset where liberalism was able to tap regional identity, although Gladstone played a role here too.

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

The Conservatives 1846–1880

6(a) Assess the claims that the main feature of Disraelian Conservatism to 1880 was ‘one-nation Conservatism’.

Focus: Assessment of the nature of Disraelian Conservatism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might examine Disraeli's brand of conservatism over the period, assessing whether the ‘one-nation’ stress was the key ingredient or whether others were more important – the traditional Toryism of Church, Monarchy and landed Aristocracy; a sharper policy of national prestige and power; a new commitment to forward policies in the Empire; or an adaptation to a moderate Liberalism as Gladstone became more ‘radical’. The argument that a ‘one nation Conservatism’ was the main feature is suggested by Disraeli's own background – his social novels (Sybil and the Two Nations) arguing that a divided Nation of rich and poor could be stitched together through social reform (Tory Democracy) binding aristocrat, labourer and worker, supported by the 2nd Reform Act and the social and individual legislation of 1875-76. Candidates could well challenge this. Could any coherent policy be detected in the novels? Much reform associated with Disraeli was of a moderately liberal nature (the increasingly orthodox and free trade budgets, partnered by permissive administrative legislation). Whether he was committed in a genuine sense, for example, his political motives in the 2nd Reform Act saw Disraeli make little attempt to include the working class in the system. Much evidence might suggest traditional Toryism - his stress on the rural areas his concerns with patronage, his determination to defend the Church of England (Ritual Act, Sanderson's Education Act, anti disestablishment) and his cultivation and use of Queen Victoria. After 1870, candidates could also point to a picking up of the Palmerstonism mantle on foreign issues as Gladstone appeared to sell out British interests abroad. The Conservative party wrapped itself in the flag with Disraeli determined to restore British influence in Europe (over both the Eastern Powers and Russia during the Eastern Question. Imperial concerns involved the Suez Canal, South Africa and Afghanistan. The Crystal Palace and Manchester Speeches of 1872 could form a useful area of discussion for determining the key feature of Disraelian Conservatism.

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

(b) Assess the main problems that faced Disraeli in pursuing foreign and imperial policies from 1874 to 1880.

Focus: Assessment of relative importance of problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can choose from a wide variety of problems but will need to determine their relative importance for the higher bands. The general focus will be on the Eastern Question in foreign policy and Africa, India and Afghanistan on imperial policy. Candidates can separate the two or integrate them according to their argument. One problem likely to be considered is Disraeli's view that in both areas Gladstone had weakened British power and prestige. Germany and Russia were in the ascendancy in Europe, (*Dreikaiserbund* of 1873) ignoring British concerns and Disraeli's task was to reassert British diplomatic importance and her strategic interests. Another would be to counter Russian power, power in Central Asia, with the implied threat to India and curtail Russian influence in Afghanistan, the Balkans and the Mediterranean where Turkey was particularly vulnerable. This was exacerbated by the nature of British power, naval rather than military. Britain would find it difficult to obtain allies should she fight Russia in 1877-8. It also raised the question of attitude to the Turks. Should they be supported, in which case the Ottomans could resist pressures for reform, or should their demise be planned with an orderly partition, as Russia and Austria threatened to do? Domestically Gladstone could exploit this, as he did over Disraeli's apparent lack of concern over the Bulgarian atrocities in 1876 (which the Russians could exploit) and again over South Africa and Afghan problems in the Midlothian campaign of 1879. There were also serious divisions in the cabinet where the Foreign Secretary Derby and the Colonial Secretary Carnarvon thought Disraeli went too far in threatening war with Russia in 1877 and 1878. Both had resigned by 1878 and had gone far to stop Disraeli informing the Russian ambassador of British intentions. It could be argued that Disraeli was lucky by 1878 that other powers, including Russia herself, were having second thoughts about the Treaty of San Stefano. In the Empire, Disraeli continued with existing policies (white self government, protection of India) but was faced by a semi independent Colonial Office and Indian Viceroy (Lytton) and the actions of ambitious politicians on the spot (Bartle Frere in South Africa) who provoked local rulers. This led to embarrassing defeats and the need to restore 'prestige'. In form of relative importance most are likely to cite Russian power as the most important problem in both Europe and in Afghanistan and India. The others, policing, power and 'men on the spot', could be a main factor at any particular crisis or moment.

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

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846–1902

7(a) How far did the balance of power remain the main principle governing British foreign policy in the period from 1846 to 1902?

Focus: Evaluation of factors determining British foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but the candidates will need to address the question.

Most candidates are likely to discuss the balance of power and Britain's strategic needs as the main principles governing foreign policy, but equally they could make a case for the promotion of trade, a forward policy on the Empire and continued naval supremacy. The question is also about whether such principles changed relative to each other, over the period. The importance of the balance of power lay in its perceived ability to pacify Europe, preserve reasonable trading conditions and prevent the need for British military intervention. Candidates could stress that the favourable balance of 1846 – 53 was destroyed by the Crimean War when Russia and Austria fell out, and by the unification of Italy and particularly Germany. Britain sought to disrupt the *Dreikaiserbund* in the 1870's but remained reluctant up to 1902 to seek security in military alliances as the European powers did in 1879 and 1894. Candidates could argue that such events strengthened the importance of obtaining a balance as the period progressed. Arguably strategic security was less important as a guide to foreign policy given the above. There were invasion scares, mainly involving France in the late 1850's (Ironclads) and 1890's (Fashoda), but the strategic threats lay overseas from Russia (the Crimea in 1853-56, the Straits in 1876-78, Afghanistan in 1878-79), the Franco-Prussian war, 1870, similarly produced scares closer to home and prompted military and naval review. Some candidates might make a case for priority over the maintenance of naval power, of particular concerns between 1858 and 1863 and at the end of the period but equally such power was often neglected in a cost cutting age, especially in the 1870s and 1880s. Nonetheless the Navy was vital to diplomacy and power. It was used to extract concessions from China, Russia (Eastern Question 1876-78) and the Ottomans (Cyprus 1878) and to control the Empire (bombardment of Alexandria) and to police trade. Some candidates might discuss the New Imperialism as of increasing importance although this is not a requirement given the foreign policy focus. Trade and raw materials were part of this and some candidates could again treat this as the main principle, especially the promotion of Free Trade and safe global communication (Asian policy, India, raw materials in Southern Africa, Cobden Chevalier Treaty in Europe) although Protection in Europe increased. Better candidates will appreciate the links between the various principles and the changes over the period, especially given the deterioration of Britain's international position after 1870.

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

(b) To what extent was imperialism a popular policy in Britain throughout the period 1880–1902?

Focus: Evaluation of the popularity of Imperialism in Britain.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Better candidates should be able to provide a balanced account assessing the 'extent' of imperialism's popularity and whether it was popular 'throughout'. Certainly in 1880 Gladstone had just won an election based, in part, on the Midlothian campaign which had condemned the imperial expansion and mistakes of Disraeli's government. Much of the Liberal provincial press had supported him on this. In contrast the Khaki elections in 1900 at the end of the period appeared to endorse Chamberlain's imperialism. Those who opposed imperialism appeared to be an intellectual or older Cobdenite minority. The Liberal Imperialists were gaining ground within liberalism, as Chamberlain did within a more receptive Conservative party. When Gladstone bombarded Alexandria he was popular, when he conceded to the Boers in the Convention of Pretoria or appeared reluctant to back Gordon at Khartoum he was unpopular. This rise of the lower middle class and the predominance of the conservatives would suggest imperialism was popular amongst those who could vote. A new mass circulation press was supportive and elementary education via the Board Schools used the Empire to instruct ('wider still and wider'). Comics fed on imperial heroes and Seeley lectured on the 'Expansion of England'. Imperial incidents could be blown out of proportion, as at Fashoda in 1898. Nonconformity had opposed the empire but issues such as the persistence of slavery and the role of missionaries could grip 'moralised' Victorians, as could their appetite for exploration and its categorisation in large scale museums and its celebration- the Diamond Jubilee of 1897 and the hysteria of 1900. The popularisation of Social Darwinism, with its racial imperatives, could be usefully referred to. The new socialist movement, the Trades Unions and many middle class people were also doubtful, especially of the costs. 'Slum Toryism' might have been more susceptible to imperialism but by the end of the Boer War in 1902 the popularity of Imperialism was dented.

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

Trade Unions and Labour 1867–1906

8(a) How successful were the methods adopted by the Conservative and Liberal parties to deal with the Trades Unions in the period 1867–1906? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the success of the political parties in dealing with unions.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Better candidates might point out that before the late 1890s, neither particularly felt it necessary to consider the Unions as an important political factor, especially in the late 1870s, 1880s and for part of the 1890s. At the start of the period, there was a desire to recognise the New Model Unions as respectable Victorian institutions. Gladstone and the Liberals especially had idealised the upper working class as moral and respectable and been prepared to extend the vote more universally to them. Disraeli, too, had followed such a policy in the Second Reform Act, penetrating even further into the working class vote. Both were keen to recognise and encourage the self help aspects of Unions in their legislation of the 1870s although again Disraeli went further in condoning peaceful picketing as a strike weapon. Yet the Liberals were the more successful in gaining the political support of the Unions, most of whom were Lib Labs throughout the period despite the onset of some Depression. After 1880, Chamberlain was one of few politicians who wished to woo the Unions and the upper working class (his unauthorised programme) but both main parties showed little interest in the New Unionism, supporting the employer backlashes over the Match Girls in 1888-9 and the disputes of the 1890s. This seemed to have no political cost as independent Labour politics remained weak throughout the 1890s. The turning point proved to be 1900 where the TUC, following the indifference of both parties to the implications of Taff Vale and the need to change the law, joined the LRC. At this point the conservatives proved very successful. Chamberlain's strategy of combining Imperialism with social reform via tariffs collapsed following the impact of the Boer War. His decision to launch a campaign after 1903 to promote Tariff Reform failed and served only to weaken and divide the Conservatives. Liberalism was more responsive, reviving both the cheap food and Free Trade option so attractive to workers in the 19th Century, and moving to reabsorb 'labour' into liberalism via the Electoral pact of 1903. Their victory in 1906 was a testament to both their success and their awareness of Union issues, legal, moral (Chinese Slavery) and social (the New Liberalism of Lloyd George). Nonetheless better candidates could point out that the Conservatives had much less to gain from association with the Unions as a party of the middle and upper classes.

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

(b) How far was leadership the most important factor in the emergence of a Labour party during the period from 1886 to 1906?

Focus: Evaluation of the importance of factors in the rise of Labour.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates who wish to stress the primacy of leadership could contrast the traditional Lib-Lab MPs with the drive and determination of Hardie, MacDonald, Henderson and the Webbs. Hardie especially pushed for separate and independent Labour Party, forming firstly a Scottish one in 1888 and inspiring the ILP in 1893. He became the first independent Labour MP in 1892 and later pushed for the TUC to become involved without which numbers, finances and institutional structure would forever be lacking. His role was pivotal in forming the LRC. As an individual he embodied the Labour ideal. MacDonald, as its secretary, then gave it coherence, negotiating a pact with Liberalism in 1903. However image, rhetoric and policies (socialism) were not always harmonious. Some candidates could challenge its importance stressing poor leadership (Hyndman and the SDF; Webb caution over independent representation and plotting with existing policy makers), the Labour Party's reluctance to accept strong leadership given their democratic tradition and the tendency to produce a variety of 'leaders' from a variety of traditions. MacDonald it could be argued, betrayed 'independence' in 1903. The relative importance of other factors needs stressing. Without the employer backlash of the 1880s and 1890s the TUC would have remained with an evolving Liberal Party despite the New Unionism. A maturing industrial economy created a more sophisticated Trade Union movement involved in 'wider' labour questions. It was accepted that the electorate was expanding and with it the share of working class votes. Either the Liberals or the Labour movements would benefit. By 1906, it remained uncertain who this would be. Some candidates could stress policy as the most important, especially as debates on poverty and efficiency came to the fore in the 1890s and the early 1900s. Here however the appeal of socialism was not universal. The other parties had different solutions but before 1900 the decline of Liberalism and the longevity of Conservative rule did assist the emergence of a Labour Party.

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

Britain 1899–1964**Liberals and Labour 1899–1918**

9(a) How successful were the Liberal reforms in dealing with Britain's social problems to 1914? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the success of the Liberal reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to establish criteria for success – whether the political motive of containing Labour and Socialism was achieved (arguably yes, according to the Webbs), and whether social problems were tackled or just ameliorated (poverty, old age, unemployment, low wages, poor housing, education and especially health). An understanding of these problems is also important. The Liberal approach was to make the existing system work more efficiently and competitively. They rejected the Minority Report on the Poor Laws. Whilst affording more legal protection to Trades Unions (1906 and 1913) the Liberals were unable to ward off industrial unrest between 1912 and 1914. Action was taken to deal with the very vulnerable in the sweated industries, although the Board created would find enforcement difficult. Labour mobility was encouraged via Labour Exchanges and some relief was provided successfully via these instead of through the workhouses. The independent elderly were spared through the introduction of OAPs, although abler candidates could stress the limitations (70 plus, relatively small amounts). For those ill and in work national insurance was Lloyd George's answer. The contributory element was there to reduce costs but also to encourage and force worker investment to ensure the continuance of self reliance. It was opposed by Socialists who stressed its limitations, especially to the better off trades. Poorer workers would be unable to pay. Perhaps more was achieved with the health of children (nursery schools, medical inspection and Free School meals), spurred on by fear of race survival and the need to compete industrially and, militarily. However nothing was done about secondary education or about housing and general urban improvement (Gas and Water Socialism was left to charity and the initiatives of local authorities). Candidates are free to stress either a major effort given the limitation or a piecemeal muddle.

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

(b) 'The trades unions were the main reason for the growing challenge of the Labour party to the Liberals'. How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1900 to 1918?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the growing challenge of Labour to the Liberals.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many candidates are likely to agree with the assertion, stressing that in terms of MP numbers Trade Union affiliation was crucial. There were 168 unions between 1901 and 1903, the most important being the Railway Unions. The Miners in 1909 almost doubled the number of 'Labour' MPs without even an election. Union power was growing (the Triple Alliance pre 1914) and industrial unrest was serious. Churchill's actions at Tonypandy harmed the Liberals. However, some candidates may point out that the Liberals took action to deal with this, reversing Taff Vale in 1906 and seeking to overcome the Osborne Judgement on the political levy payable to Labour. Such Syndicalism could do as much harm to Labour as good, although the benefit could be more to the Conservatives than the Liberals. Labour made few advances in the 1910 elections on their pre 1910 positions. During the War the picture is mixed and again the Unions could be seen as either a hindrance or help to Labour. They became more involved with a vastly extended membership and collective ideas were more accepted. Most now backed Labour and their representative, Henderson, joined the War Cabinet. Yet their leaders could be and were portrayed as potential pacifists for their stance on their need for a negotiated peace (Henderson's sacking in the Doormat Incident). Many new workers were women, politically an unknown quantity. Dilution of labour harmed Trade Unionism. Other factors will need to be compared for their importance as against the Trades Unions. Liberal mistakes could be stressed, especially the Asquith – Lloyd George split in 1916 (and here the impact of the War is a clear candidate for the 'main reason' for Labour growth.) The issues of class politics could fruitfully be discussed as could the franchise factor in the 1918 Reform Act and the Coupon Election (61 MPs, 22% of the vote). Henderson's organisational and policy work in 1917-18 could be seen as important in overtaking collapsing radical Liberals and in the fielding of 400 candidates in 1918 (there had been only 80 in Dec. 1910). Better candidates might stress how much of this fed into Trade Union issues anyway. How else could a new working class electorate be managed?

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

Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918-1939

10(a) 'The impact of the General Strike (1926) was greater on politics than on the economy'. How far do you agree with this view of the period 1926–29?

Focus: Assessment of the impact of the General Strike.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most candidates are likely to agree. Economically the strike confirmed existing wage and hour levels in the 1920s – lower or static wages, longer hours with dismissal or victimisation for strikers. Facing new fuels and severe foreign competition the coal industry preferred to continue to squeeze labour costs rather than amalgamate or modernise, although the latter was encouraged in the Mond-Turner talks of 1928-29 which sought joint employer and TUC talks on industrial efficiency. The main 'victims' were the miners themselves and striking railwaymen were driven back through starvation or dismissal. In hindsight they would have gained more by accepting Samuel and maintaining hours. Politically this impact was greater – the discrediting of Syndicalism (large scale direct action) with a fall in strikes and lockouts. Union leaders were aware of the dangers of a showdown with a well organised and prepared state. It enabled the Conservative right to hinder the Labour Party by changing the political levy to a 'contracting in' basis reducing Labour income by one third and to hamper Trades Unions by making sympathy strikes illegal. Baldwin's position as Conservative leader was reinforced, as was the government hold over the media. Only in the long term did it help Labour – the bitter memories, the class solidarity evoked and the mine workers determination to nationalise.

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

(b) Assess the claim that economic problems were more important than political ones in undermining the Labour governments of 1924 and 1929-31.

Focus: Assessment of the importance of the problems that undermined governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates are likely to argue that political problems were more important than economic ones in 1924 but that the reverse was true in 1929-31. Doubts over Labour's ability to run the economy and finances were prevalent in both governments but the Chancellor, Snowden, acted in an impeccably traditional manner on both occasions. There was no major crisis in 1924 but in 1931 the Depression threatened sterling and to save the City Snowden and MacDonald were prepared to head a National Coalition which forced through cuts at the expense of the labour rank and file. Economic problems had ended a Labour government. Yet political problems were of much greater importance in ending the 1924 government and candidates could well stress that, politically, both governments were minorities, dependent on Liberal support to defend Free Trade. Some might point out that the decision over 'cuts' in 1931 was just as much a political decision than an economic one. However, in 1924 it was a series of mishandled political issues that led to its fall – the undermining of all previous attempts to appear moderate by negotiating treaties and a loan with the Soviets, by mishandling the Campbell Case, and during the election, to be the victim of secret service smears tactics using the Zinoviev Letter. In 1931, for those arguing for the importance of political issues, the failure to resolve the relationship with the Trades Unions was very serious. Those, like Henderson, who owed their position to the Unions would not accept the level of cuts proposed and no one told the Labour government that going 'off gold' was anything other than disastrous. 1931 was as much a political split between the wings of the party as were disputes over economic policy.

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

Foreign Policy 1939–1963**11(a) To what extent did British policy towards the USSR change during the period from 1939 to 1945?**

Focus: Evaluation of the extent of change in Britain's policy towards the USSR.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can stress either change or continuity in British policy towards the USSR. On one level British remained hostile and suspicious throughout. The USSR had long been seen as an enemy and becoming a wartime bedfellow did not change this. On the other hand Britain was slowly coming around to the prospect of an alliance in 1939 before the Nazis beat her to it. To 1939, Britain had appeased Germany, in part to build up an anti-Communist barrier in central Europe. The Nazi-Soviet Pact horrified Britain, especially as its implications became real in Sept. 1939 with the joint attack on Poland and the later Soviet attack on Finland. From then until 1941, Britain remained opposed to the USSR, attempting only to persuade her of her vulnerable position, further conforming to the view that Britain wished only for Russia to take the strain of Nazi military power, ignoring Churchill's warnings about Hitler's military build up. From 1941, Stalin became a key ally, but Britain remained worried about the price to be paid in any future peace settlement, hence the percentages agreement in Moscow in 1944. In turn, the USSR remained suspicious of the West's delay in reopening a Western Front. Despite the supplies sent via the Arctic convoys, Stalin felt there was no equality of sacrifice and British policy was for the USSR to bear the brunt of the land war against Hitler. By 1944-45, British post-war aims would be in conflict with those of the USSR, over both the future of Germany and especially of Poland, the independence of which Britain had gone to war to defend in 1939. Britain also feared US-USSR co-operation at the expense of British imperial power at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. At Yalta, Churchill sought to divide Eastern and Southern Europe into respective Soviet and British spheres of influence behind Roosevelt's back. He feared Stalin and Roosevelt meeting without reference to Britain. Military co-operation had already broken down as both sides rushed to occupy Germany. Anglo-Soviet hostility had resumed by 1945 at the latest.

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

(b) Assess the claim that political factors were the most important reason why Britain's attitude to Europe changed during the period from 1945 to 1963.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for change of attitude to Europe.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to group the factors into appropriate areas – economic, political, military and strategic and then compare their relative importance to establish a priority. Political factors would include the growing importance of the Council of Europe and the Hague Congress from 1948, a feeling that the 'bus had been missed' especially Britain's non attendance at the Messina Conference, more involvement in the Western European Union and a heightened sense of imperial decline after Suez in 1956. The new direction under Eden was clearly vital. Relations with France and the US were difficult to balance effectively. 'Winds of change' in the Empire were clearly important for Macmillan. Economically there may have been no need for Britain to establish closer European ties in the late 1940s and 1950s, especially given her commitment to Free Trade, the US and Northern Europe (EFTA as a rival to the EEC). But with declining world markets the European core proved attractive. The European Coal and Steel Community, then the EEC, were largely trading organisations. There is much to suggest that Macmillan's decision to apply for membership was an economic rather than a political one. European recovery was obvious by the 1950s. In defence and strategic terms, candidates may down-play these as a factor in change. If anything, they dictated that Britain stay aloof, Bevin rejecting 'Third Force Europe' in 1949 and then embracing NATO and the US after 1949. Britain was hostile to the European Defence Community and the Pleven Plan, but then so was France. A different approach might use the attitudes of the political parties in this period to assess the main reasons for policy and its change with a particular focus on why Macmillan decided to apply for membership in 1961 and the French veto of this in 1963 (political or economic?).

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

12(a) How far did economic problems limit the domestic achievement of the Labour governments from 1945 to 1951? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the domestic achievements of Labour governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to assess the domestic achievements of Labour in this period, especially nationalisation and the introduction of the welfare state. The focus needs to be on the extent to which economic circumstances, especially post 1947, limited these reforms in relation to other factors – the extent of change originally intended, the restriction improved by the perceived need to maintain great power status and political division within the government, particularly in Attlee's brief second government with its small majority of 6. Candidates are likely to stress the severe economic problems verging on bankruptcy, the dependency on US loans, the balance of payments crisis, import controls and devaluation in 1949, all of which limited social spending and perpetuated rationing. Nonetheless Labour simply spent less on industrial recovery, preferring nationalisation and administrative re-organisation to investment, although when it came to the Cold War (Korea) they were prepared to break the 'free' aspects of the NHS (prescription charges). Against such pressures candidates could stress the considerable achievements in health, housing and education (the limiting factor here arguably lay more with the socially conservative views on education which accepted tripartite division). Health reform provides a good example for candidates – the economy forced prescription charges on an expanding budget but limitations can be seen in the opinion of doctors (who gained special provision re salaries) and in the political division it caused in 1950-51. In welfare provisions, despite the economic circumstances, universality and increases were achieved. Housing is a good example of economic constrictions given Bevin's ambitions, not least in raw material shortage but better candidates could point to ideological problems on being of equal importance to economic ones. Nationalisation is another fruitful area for candidates on the issue of the limitations, arguably more ideological and bureaucratic on the part of government than economic. The economy itself, despite or because of wartime experience was seen as less successful and could be blamed on a variety of factors, especially lack of planning.

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

(b) 'Conservative failings were the most important reasons why Labour won the 1964 general election.' How far do you agree?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons why Labour won the 1964 election.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The focus needs to be on whether the Conservatives lost the 1964 election or whether Labour won it. The electoral statistics suggest the parties were reasonably evenly divided so candidates can agree either way. Those who emphasise Conservative failings will stress the ineffective campaign run by the new, but very traditional and aristocratic Conservative leader, Sir Alec Douglas-Home in comparison to the more modern, technological one of Harold Wilson. In the longer term, the Conservatives had been in power for 13 years and the economy was no longer the electoral asset it had once been. The economy was now sluggish and the Conservative Chancellor, Selwyn Lloyd, imported unpopular deflationary policies in 1961. Decolonisation (including the outrages of British rule in Kenya) and immigration all dented the traditional Conservative image held by the middle classes – as seen in the 1962 Orpington by-election. To that disenchantment was then added the Profumo scandal (1963) whilst the 'New Approach' in economics was undermined by De Gaulle's veto of Britain's EEC entry that same year. Macmillan had left a legacy of ministerial distrust after his 'Night of the Long Knives' - far from the new Conservative image he had hoped to create. The Conservatives were unlikely to win many votes amongst the working classes given the heavily class-based politics of the time. Given this, candidates may stress that Conservative failings were the most important reason, but they need to be balanced by the decline in Labour's ideological division (Gaitskell v Bevan), the effective new leadership of Harold Wilson with his scientific managerialism and the new technology cleverly suited to the 1960s ('white heat of technology'). These all helped to make Labour seem 'relevant' and 'up-to-date' but the Conservatives 'out-dated'. The Social Democracy of Gaitskell (now dead) and Crosland appealed to large parts of the electorate.

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

**Mark Scheme 2585
June 2006**

Europe 1046-1250**The Reform of the Church 1046-1122****1(a) How far had the powers of the papacy strengthened during the period from 1046 to the election of Gregory VII in 1073?**

Focus: Evaluation of change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need a good focus upon 'How far ...', inviting as it does some argument. There is no set conclusion; as ever, the quality of argument is what matters. The date is significant, marking the advent of Gregory VII as Pope. Answers must not stray beyond 1073 but stay focused upon the period 1046-73. The key is an assessment of the extent and nature of changes in Papal powers. Focus will be upon Popes Leo IX, Nicholas II and Alexander II and their impact. Expected areas of coverage may include: nature, extent and interpretation of papal 'powers' (including relations with secular rulers and aspects of investiture); the journeys of Leo north of the Alps; increased use of councils; the effects of the Synod of 1046 and the important decree of 1059; legates and decretals to buttress and promulgate papal powers and reform ideas; leadership of church reforms; alliances (and feudal relations) with secular rulers and the advantages of such; the relationship with Henry III and possible gains; attacks on a range of clerical abuses; the development of an ideology or rights (primacy, non-lay interference), even if only partial.

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

(b) Assess the reasons for the growth of the Cistercians to 1122.

Focus: Evaluation of causation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to convey a good sense of 'Assess' and a range of reasons, prioritising wherever possible. Cistercian popularity might be measured by the growth in the number of houses as in personnel and in the scale of landed endowments and gifts. This is not an overt comparison with the Cluniacs, though references are likely. Such a comparison, even well done, may not do enough to merit more than **Band III** unless there is very good focus upon the Cistercian dimension. Answers do need to convey a sense of growth (in appeal, in support, in benefactions, in houses set up), even though by 1122 Cistercianism was only in its infancy. That said, it was clear that growth was under way. The wider religious-spiritual context of salvation, prayers, piety, good works and the application of the Benedictine rule will be a factor in evaluation; so, too, such areas and issues as attitudes to austerity and asceticism, to landholding and use, to episcopal and Papal authority, community ideas, the location of sites, connections with powerful local families, levels of lay involvement. Answers are likely to focus upon Cistercian determination to practise 'pure' Benedictinism, their austerity and sense of militancy (encapsulated in Bernard of Clairvaux), their opposition to any sense of a 'comfortable' monastic life, their determination to remove to remote sites, their willingness to accept poor quality lands and the high reputation of their leaders. Some brief references beyond 1122 (e.g. to continued and major expansion) would be acceptable but are not necessary and answers must stay firmly within the time period to 1122.

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

France and the Empire 1152-1250**2(a) How successful a ruler of Germany was Frederick Barbarossa? Explain your answer.**Focus: Assessment of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to focus well upon 'How successful ...' and will need to establish some criteria by which to adjudicate upon success and the degrees of success, long- or short-term. No set conclusion is expected. They must focus upon Germany with references to Italy kept to a bare minimum and likely to be linked to the effects of Frederick Barbarossa's frequent absences on campaign. Candidates are likely to examine areas such as: the impact of frequent absences upon the conduct of government in an era of personal rulership; the state of the royal domain lands; the conduct of government and administration; his use of his own Hohenstaufen lands; the independence of the nobles and its extent; the struggle with Henry the Lion and the eventual outcome in the breaking of Welf power; the lack of unity within the German lands; their extension by military action; unrest levels (e.g. the revolt of Mainz); the relationship with the German Church, strained by disputes with the Papacy; provision for the succession. It is possible to argue that Frederick attempted to re-shape German politics with a focus upon settling conflicts with Bavaria and Saxony and upon reasserting royal claims without necessarily regaining territories. The crown accepted feudal tenure of lands wrested from its control, though nominal and residual rights remained. It is possible to argue that, in his later years, when focused much more on Germany, Frederick was successful and left a strong legacy.

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

(b) To what extent were the failures of Frederick II in Italy and Sicily the result of over-ambition?

Focus: Evaluation of consequences.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A good focus upon 'To what extent ...' is required and argument is invited, though no set conclusion is expected. They will need to identify the failures experienced by Frederick II in time, nature and scale as well as consider whether these were the result of bad luck, over-ambition, a lack of realism or a conjunction of factors. They may query failures, though it is unlikely that they will argue too much against the basic notion here. Clearly, Frederick thought on a grand scale and had a powerful ideological determination. He sought a dominant position in Italy and Sicily and this embroiled him in further conflict with the Papacy as well as aristocracy and town Communes. At times, he appeared close to success; in the end, he experienced failures. Answers will need to define likely ambitions in context and to evaluate the reasons for failure; personality; ideology; lack of realism; over-extension; mishandling of situations. Evidently, Frederick was determined to re-impose his (imperial) authority and build up a powerful resources base; he had clear views about the place and role of the Papacy and was infused with ideological and political vigour. This meant regular and repeated conflicts with the Papacy, Church and Italian Lombard League as well as Sicilian vested interests. Mention might be made of the effects of the independence, power and wealth of the Communes linked to their (and Papal) resistance to ideas of an imperial Italy; the traditional Papal concerns over encirclement; Frederick's dealings with Innocent III and their consequences as with Gregory IX; his independent policy over crusading; his excommunication in 1227; the Papal invasion of Sicily and the subsequent Treaty of San Germano and Frederick's relations with Gregory IX; military successes, Sardinia; a further excommunication in 1239; the capture of the Papal legates; the council of Lyons in 1245 and the attitude of Innocent IV; Papal engineering of an anti-king. Frederick's last years merit some assessment in the light of the question.

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

Crusading and the Crusader States 1095-1192

3(a) To what extent were Crusader military tactics the main reason for the success of the First Crusade?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need good focus upon 'To what extent ...', inviting as it does argument. No set conclusion is expected. They will need to assess military tactics (and strategy) against several other factors to reach the higher Bands. Answers exclusively focused upon military areas **cannot go beyond Band III**. Military tactics and strategy will embrace the uses of cavalry as well as infantry, archers, defensive operations, siege warfare techniques and skirmishes as well as the occasional but important set piece battle. Examples will be needed. Leadership will impinge here and can be considered as a military factor, though it had political connotations as well. Examples of good and inspirational leadership might be cited, though candidates may well query the efficacy given dissensions and rivalries. Other factors to be assessed would include the place and role of religious zeal (both in the inception and especially the conduct of the Crusade), limited Byzantine help, popular and populist fervour (important in 1098 and 1099 in impelling leaders to action) and the divisions of Muslim opponents.

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

(b) 'Internal discord was the most serious problem facing the Crusader States from 1147 to 1185.' How far do you agree?

Focus: Evaluation of problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need a good sense of 'Internal discord...' and need to set that factor against other important factors, prioritising as much as possible. Answers need to set the factor highlighted against other factors to reach the higher Bands. No set conclusion is expected; the quality of argument is the determinant. Likely areas of consideration are: the disunity within and between the Crusader states; the internal rivalries of the aristocracy, specifically within the Kingdom of Jerusalem (the best known example) but also elsewhere; the factionalism and feuding, prevalent after the late 1140s and intensifying in the 1160s and 1170s; ambitions of various families. Other factors that might be assessed: numerical inferiority of colonists and settlers; the absence of significant new settlers from the West; the insufficiency of knights and landholding peasants, no matter appeals to the West; geographical vulnerability; weak connections with the West and uneven relations with Byzantium; underdeveloped resources, including revenue levels; the need to remain on the defensive and the consequences of misplaced aggressive actions; the growing strengths of Muslim opponents in leadership, unity and strategy, factors often absent before.

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

Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century.

4(a) How important were the educational changes of the twelfth century? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of significance.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to focus well upon 'How important ...' and will argue as they see fit, there being no set conclusion. A sense of context will help here as will a sense of impact and outcomes. They are likely to interpret 'educational changes' quite broadly, embracing features of the twelfth century Renaissance, the developing schools and scholarly pursuits as well as the growing needs for improved educational standards, not least amongst sections of the laity. The educational, political and social context will be important. Candidates may focus upon such areas as the development of learning centres; the role of great teachers; the rise of lay literacy and education; the importance of theology, the classics and law; the requirements of both ecclesiastical and lay administration; the revival of classical learning and ideas; the developments in Paris (and Montpellier) and Bologna (and Salerno).

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

(b) Assess the reasons for the growth of heresy during the twelfth century.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need a good sense of 'Assess ...' and need a range of reasons, prioritising wherever possible. No set conclusion is expected here. Heresy needs to be defined and contextualised. There may be much concentration upon the Cathars/Albigensian dimension and this is acceptable, though a broader perspective would be welcome. A sense of contemporary society as of religion will be helpful in establishing why heresy did grow, more so later in the century. Areas of discontent with the Church and its teachings that might be embraced are: theologians wanting to break away from mainstream teaching and questioning established beliefs and practices; an expanding, urbanised, more educated 'middle class' in search of more personalised spirituality; rural and urban, personal and communal expectations and needs, not met within the established Church; theological disputes not contained by the Church; forms of class conflict; heresy as a means to attack the established order; the growth of universities; possible Balkan connections; the spread of ideas amongst ordinary people and the interpretation (or misinterpretation) of those ideas; misplaced enthusiasms for religion; economic and social brotherhoods; the effects of economic and social changes; reactions to ecclesiastical corruption and perceived worldliness; the defence of traditional practices and customs seen to be under attack from the Church.

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

Europe 1450-1530**The Italian Renaissance 1450-1530****5(a) Assess the reasons why Florence played a leading role in the Renaissance during the period 1450-1530.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may give consideration to the economic and financial situation of Florence such as the wealth brought from the cloth and woollen industries (cultural ideas also spread along trade routes e.g. Istanbul - preservation of classical documents and texts) and the involvement of the trade guilds in sponsoring artistic developments. Financial issues are likely to focus on the development of banking and the pre-eminence of the Medici in this field. This lends itself to links with the political situation and the attempts of the Medici to establish themselves as rulers not least through their patronage of the arts. There may be some discussion of the Baron thesis (though not necessary at this level) i.e. the inspiration of the Renaissance arising from the liberty of Florence. However, this is not now generally accepted and political factors might focus more on the idea of social mobility in government and the exclusion of the nobles. Social/political/cultural issues might examine the impact of individuals in government such as Salutati, the owner of the largest library of ancient manuscripts who became the first Chancellor of the city in 1375, as well as looking at the influence of the humanists in general. The emphasis should be firmly on Florence itself and some might consider the issue of 'Why Florence and not elsewhere'.

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

(b) To what extent were the works of Renaissance artists and architects during the period 1450-1530 merely imitations of classical examples?

Focus: .Evaluation of influences/sources.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should look at both classical features and innovative ones found in the works of Renaissance artists and architects. Candidates are likely to argue that Renaissance artists and architects owed a great debt to the classical world around them; Brunelleschi, Bramante and Palladio all studied and measured proportions of buildings in Rome before going on to build structures of classical proportions such as Brunelleschi's churches of San Lorenzo and San Spirito in Florence and Bramante's San Pietro in Rome which turned away from the medieval cruciform structure to the circular plan of a Roman temple. Candidates may refer to a variety of classical features used by Renaissance architects such as columns, pediments, pilasters, arches and not least domes e.g. Brunelleschi's in Florence. Classical subject matter was also used e.g. Michelangelo's Bacchus, Botticelli's 'Calumny' based on the work of the painter Appelles described by Lucian, a Greek writer. However, candidates should point out that these were not merely slavish imitations but are often combined with the ideals and interest of the Christian and innovative world in which they lived. Thus the development of Brunelleschi's dome, although based on Rome's Pantheon, has its own innovations of structure. Other examples might include: Michelangelo's 'David' i.e. classical form with religious subject matter and Bramante's Tempietto a domed and circular building reminiscent not only of pagan temples but also early Christian sites where martyrs were buried. Innovation might focus on the development of perspective and oil painting.

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

Spain 1469-1520**6(a) How far do you agree with the view that Spain was a unified country by 1516?**

Focus: Evaluation of unity.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many answers may see more to be said against the thesis than for it. In favour of this view candidates might argue that, Charles I was heir to both Castile and Aragon and as such unified the country through his own person. A gold coin, the *excelente*, had been produced with the heads of both Ferdinand and Isabella. However the strength of the unity might be questioned by referring to the situation only 12 years earlier at Isabella's death in 1504 and the reluctance to allow Ferdinand's rule in Castile. Other factors in support might include the Inquisition, shared aims such as the taming of the aristocracy, foreign policy – the kingdoms were united in their conquest of the New World and the war against France and the use of both provinces resources in the conquest of Granada. On the other hand, the Inquisition was the only common institution and Aragon rejected institutions such as the *corregidores* and ultimately the *Hermandades*. Both provinces retained their own separate governments with very different constitutions (Aragon itself sub-divided into three) and with differing powers for the monarchs. Customs barriers remained between the different kingdoms and different coinages were in operation. Granada and the new world possessions were only given to Castilians. Differences in religious attitudes might also be mentioned e.g. the greater tolerance for Muslims in Aragon though it could be argued that this was more due to the individual religious inclinations of Ferdinand and Isabella. Candidates will need to reach a conclusion based on this information in line with the demands of the question.

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

(b) 'Charles I's position in 1520 suggests that Ferdinand and Isabella had left many unsolved problems.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

Focus: Evaluation of a situation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may take the view that Charles' problems with the Comuneros were largely specific to him through his actions and inheritance (the fear that the interests of Spain would be lost to the greater interest of Empire) and refer to the demands of the insurgents as evidence e.g. get rid of foreign advisers (such as Adrian of Utrecht), learn Spanish, give Spanish offices only to Spaniards, respect Spanish laws etc. However, given the nature of the question candidates should also show an awareness of some issues relating to Ferdinand and Isabella such as dislike of corregidores – the revolts started with their expulsion. Reference might also be made to their failure to completely curb noble power – the revolts are sometimes seen as a response to the failure of the crown to protect towns from the attacks of great aristocratic families. In return for support of the nobles, Ferdinand and Isabella had often turned a 'blind eye' when aristocrats had seized town lands and impeded merchants. They may however consider these issues of less importance given that their regime is generally considered to have been a successful one. Some reference should also be made to revolt of the Germania, although candidates may conclude that this is simply an opportunistic revolt (crown weakness due to change of monarch) and/or related to specific issues of unemployment. They might also link to Ferdinand and Isabella's failure to completely solve the issues of the Moors. Candidates should give some relative importance of different factors.

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

The Ottoman Empire 1451–1529

7(a) Assess the reasons for the expansion of the Ottoman Empire during the period from 1451 to 1529.

Focus: Assessment of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates are likely to consider issues concerning military might, administration, the capture of Constantinople the qualities of its leaders and the weakness of its enemies. Issues of military might are likely to include the Janissaries (generally thought to be the best fighting force in Europe at this time in spite of occasional revolts), who provided a large standing army increased to 10,000 by Mehmet II and the feudal sipahis who provided a fully equipped cavalry when required up to 40,000 strong. The Timar system which made this possible might also be considered since it was specifically designed to meet the military needs of the state unlike other systems in Europe. Constantinople could be considered important in providing a strong base strategically – commanding the routes between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, economically –providing extensive dockyards, arsenals and acting as a trade centre, and psychologically – Mehmet II believed that he had inherited the legacy of Rome and proclaimed himself heir to the Romans. Qualities of individual leaders and their absolute authority might be considered as well as the impact of religion as Ghazi rulers – i.e. war as a way of life and necessary for good government. Political and religious divisions amongst their enemies might also be considered e.g. French support for Turks against the Habsburg enemy and/or religious division between Habsburg princes preventing full support for war against Turks.

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

(b) How important were the immediate effects of the fall of Constantinople (1453) on the Ottoman Empire and on Western Europe? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of consequences.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Issues likely to be raised in most answers may be strategic, economic and psychological ones as the basis of the Empire's growing supremacy. Strategically, the Ottomans now commanded the Black Sea and had a springboard for the invasion of Europe. Economically, they now controlled extensive dockyards, arsenals and naval supplies and were able to challenge the trading supremacy of Venice. Psychologically, the Ottomans now considered themselves a great conquering dynasty, and the inheritors of the legacy of Rome. Effects on Western Europe are may concentrate on issues such as: the consequent decline of Venice as a naval power and the increased threat to Christendom. Venice was forced to pay tribute for the right to trade in the Black Sea and a series of long wars ensued in 1463-79, the Venetian trading base of Negroponte being captured in 1470 as well as Serbia, Athens and the Morea by 1460. Answers do not need to be balanced 50:50 between the two parts of the question.

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

Exploration and Discovery 1450–1530

8(a) To what extent were economic motives the main factors behind Portuguese exploration during the period 1450-1530?

Focus: Evaluation of motives.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to give some consideration to economic issues; there was a need for a cheaper and more reliable method of gaining spices essential for preserving meat throughout the winter which encouraged voyages along the coast of Africa and into the Indian Ocean. Gold was a great attraction since Portugal had none of its own necessary to mint coins – this prompted voyages down the west coast of Africa after the capture of Ceuta in 1415 had suggested likely sources. Shortage of labour was a problem for Portugal with a population of only 1 million. Recruitment of slaves from Africa was a ‘pull’ factor these making up 10% population of Lisbon by the end of the 15th century as well as workers for the sugar plantations in Madeira and the Canaries. However, other issues should be examined particularly the religious motive of, both searching for, and extending Christian communities; desire for the latter led to the capture of Ceuta on the West African coast in 1415, desire for the former was expressed by da Gama who claimed to be searching for ‘christians and spices’ in Calicut and in the search for the legendary kingdom of Prester John in Africa. Other issues (though not strictly speaking motives) might be considered as ‘push’ factors, such as: royal patronage, technological and geographical advantages.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why Portugal and Spain took the leading role in overseas exploration and empire-building during the period 1450-1530.

Focus: Assessment of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to look at features which are specific to Portugal and Spain. Geographical features are a consideration with the Iberian peninsular on the 'street corner of Europe' and the favourable North east trade winds directing ships out into the Atlantic. Politically the stability of Portugal was an important factor in helping to pursue outside interests and later rivalry between Spain and Portugal would also help particularly with the Pope's intervention by the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494 that defined specific areas of exploration. Royal patronage was important in both Portugal and Spain with the involvement of Henry the Navigator and King John II in Portugal and sponsorship of individuals such as Columbus by Ferdinand and Isabella in Spain. Technical developments by the Iberians of the caravel redonda and the carrack could also be mentioned as well as developments such as dead reckoning worked out by the Portuguese. Emphasis should be firmly on leading roles and should weigh factors against each other providing linkage where possible.

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

Europe 1498-1560**The Holy Roman Empire 1517-1559**

9(a) How far were Charles V's frequent absences from Germany the main reason for the spread of Protestantism in Germany?

Focus: Assessment of a significant problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to assess the importance of Charles' absences, alongside other factors, in the spread of Protestantism within the Holy Roman Empire. An answer that concentrates solely on the impact of Charles' absences may not go beyond Band III. Similarly, an answer which dismisses his absence in a brief comment and argues that other factors were important should have a **ceiling of Band IV**. Candidates should weigh up the impact of Charles' absences against other factors and may mention some of the following: the role of the princes, the role of cities, the weakness of Imperial power, state of the church within Germany and anti-papal feeling. No set answer is expected and candidates are not expected to cover all the factors, it is the quality of argument that is important.

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

(b) How successful was the foreign policy of Charles V as Holy Roman Emperor? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is an evaluative question in which candidates are invited to measure the degree of success of Charles' foreign policy as Holy Roman Emperor (i.e. not as ruler of his various Spanish kingdoms). Candidates can use a variety of criteria against which to judge the success of his policy. These might, for example, include: his aims, success in different areas (e.g. the Empire's eastern borders against the Turks, the Empire's western borders against Valois France, the Empire's southern borders in Italy – especially Milan - against Valois France.) or at different times, short-term or long-term, his legacy. Some may draw a distinction between what Charles did as Emperor and what he did as a dynastic Habsburg ruler. Reward candidates who deal with 'How successful'. A description of his foreign policy will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

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

Spain 1504-1556

10(a) 'Charles I faced problems in the years 1516-21 because he was not a Spaniard.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

Focus: Assessment of a significant development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question requires candidates to weigh up a variety of reasons for the problems faced by Charles in his early years as ruler of Spain. It seeks to weigh up the problem of Charles being a foreigner against a range of other factors and reach a balanced conclusion. A simple description of the problems faced by Charles will merit no more than Band IV. Although no set answer is being looked for, candidates might consider some of the following issues: the legacy of Ferdinand and Isabella, his absence from Spain, the Comuneros revolt and its causes (fears of the towns and nobility), the use of foreigners in government, Charles' position as Emperor, failure to make a progress through Castile, demands for a subsidy.

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

(b) 'Charles I was more successful in his wars in Italy than in North Africa.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question requires candidates to consider the strengths and weaknesses of a statement and evaluate it. There is a great deal of overlap and better answers may well refer to how these issues influenced each other. Many may argue that he was more successful against France than against the Turks. Candidates will probably consider some of the following, in relation to France: Milan, Pavia and diplomacy. In terms of the Turks candidates may mention the nature of the attacks, there may be some mention of his brother dealing with attacks in Europe, although the question does not require it, Tunis, Tripoli and the links between the Turks and the French.

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

France 1498-1560**11(a) Assess the strengths of the French monarchy during the reign of Francis I.**

Focus: Assessment of royal strengths.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to assess the strength of the monarchy during the reign of Francis I. There may be mention in many answers of the historical debate over absolutism, but this is not essential to gain Band I. There is a great deal of material that could be used and therefore reward candidates who use a suitable range of material to argue a case. Reward according to the quality of the argument. Do not expect candidates to cover all areas. Candidates might mention some of the following: territorial unity, centralised government, administrative reform, the problems caused by war, finance, the question of the nobility, the regions.

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

(b) Assess the view that Henry II's foreign policy was more successful than that of Francis I.

Focus: Assessment of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question requires to candidates to look at a range of factors assess whether the foreign policy of Henry II was more successful than Francis I. Candidates may agree or disagree with the statement, no set answer is expected. The assessment may be done through a comparative approach, but it is not essential for a top band. Some candidates might challenge the assumption that it was more successful, reward according to the depth of analysis. They may argue that the Peace of 1559 was a disaster for France and showed that Henry had failed. However, this was largely the legacy of Francis. It is not expected that there will be a 50/50 balance between the two monarchs, but candidates should be expected to achieve a reasonable balance. Candidates that simply describe the foreign policies of both monarchs will have a **ceiling of Band IV**. Factors that might be considered are the cautiousness of Henry II when compared with Francis, Henry's use of diplomacy because of the royal finances, the strategy of the two monarchs, the vanity of Francis and state of the French army.

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

Warfare 1499-1560

12(a) Assess the reasons for the increased importance of infantry during the period 1499-1560.

Focus: Assessment of a military development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to assess a variety of reasons for the development of infantry in the period. Answers that simply describe the development without commenting on the reasons will have a **ceiling of Band IV**. Better answers will assess the relative importance of the factors and may also make reference to the rate of the change. Candidates may cover some of the following: the decline in the role of the cavalry, the increased cost of warfare, the speed and mobility of the troops, the use of firearms. These developments should be linked to examples from battles of the period. At the top levels candidates should weigh up the relative importance of the reasons.

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

(b) Assess the reasons for the growth in the size of armies during the period 1499-1560.

Focus: Assessment of a military development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question raises an important historical debate about the growth in the size of armies during the period. Although historiography is not an AS assessment objective, candidates who are aware of the debate and use this knowledge to answer and challenge the statement are to be rewarded. Candidates who simply describe the growth, or otherwise, in the size of armies, without explaining the reasons will get no higher than Band IV. Better answers will assess the relative importance of reasons. Factors that might be considered include: the defensive developments, siege warfare and blockades, the attraction of army life and pay, growing importance of the artillery, use of garrisons. However some answers might point to the exaggeration in numbers due to disease, desertion, fraudulent senior officers. Candidates should support their answer with specific examples.

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

Europe 1545-1610**The Counter Reformation 1545-c.1600**

13(a) 'The reform of the papacy played the key role in bringing about the Counter Reformation.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to make a substantial assessment of the part played by the reforming popes in the Counter Reformation, and some evaluation of the idea of 'key role' perhaps suggesting that leadership had to come from the 'top'. Candidates are likely to examine the roles of reforming Popes and stress the greater spirituality of their lives. Reforming measures considered might include: the calling of the Council of Trent, support for the Jesuits and recommendations for Bishops' residency by Paul III, introduction of the Index and renewed action against simony by Paul IV, etc. The question however, does require an examination of other factors, and reference might be made to such issues as the Jesuits, the Tridentine decrees, the Inquisition and the Index and there are obvious opportunities for linkage here. The role of the Jesuits is likely to focus on their missionary work such as that of Peter Canisius in Germany, as royal advisers and in education with the establishment of many colleges particularly in Spain. A consideration of the Tridentine decrees might mention reforms introduced such as imposed residency on Bishops but would need to consider their implementation in order to assess their role. The Inquisition and Index could feature as less important issues.

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

(b) Assess the view that the Counter Reformation was merely a reaction to the Protestant Reformation.

Focus: Assessment of causes and motives.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The actual timing of reform is crucial to the question. Candidates could cite evidence to show that some reform was taking place in the Catholic church before the advent of Protestantism e.g. new orders such as the Oratory of Divine Love, the Theatines and the Ursulines, as well as the work of Erasmus and other humanists in drawing attention to the shortcomings of the church. Better candidates might draw a comparison between Erasmus and Luther – it not being immediately obvious that they were travelling in different directions viz. ‘Erasmus laid the egg which Luther hatched’. However, they are likely to stress that the pace quickens with the advent of Protestantism and Charles V repeated call for a general council of the church. It could be pointed out that the Council of Trent deals specifically with issues that Luther and others had raised e.g. papal authority, transubstantiation etc. Other aspects of the Counter Reformation - such as Jesuits - could be used either for or against the thesis.

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

The Reign of Henry IV 1589–1610**14(a) Assess the problems facing Henry IV from 1589 to 1598.**

Focus: Assessment of problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may see some relationship between Henry's problems and civil war. Issues discussed are likely to include decline of the authority of the crown with a corresponding rise in the power of the nobles and princes of the blood, a weak financial position, economic stagnation, religious problems and war with Spain. Some linkage of factors may be shown by better candidates. Weakness of authority of the crown had developed over a number of years due to prolonged civil wars, minority government and the unpopular regency of Catherine de Medici – a woman, a foreigner and lower class (merchant)! This was paralleled by the rise of factions and individuals such as the Catholic League and Duke of Guise. A weak financial position is directly related to war and weakened royal authority creating difficulties in collecting taxes, but in addition the fiscal system was unwieldy and in chaos. Economic stagnation arose from a number of factors such as war, increasing population and inflation and these had social implications in a number of popular risings, the most serious being that of the Croquants in Western France in 1593. Religious issues were central with bitter feelings between Catholics and Huguenots which had repercussions in relations with Spain. However it could be argued that by 1598, Henry IV was well on his way to dealing with these problems by achieving military success against the Spanish and Catholic league, becoming a Catholic himself in 1593, placating the Huguenots with the Edict of Nantes in 1598 and negotiating the Peace of Vervins with Spain.

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

(b) How successfully did Henry IV deal with opposition during his reign? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to look at examples of opposition, such as: the Biron and Bouillon conspiracies, the Croquants rising of 1593, the tardiness of the parlements of Paris and Rouen in ratifying the Edict of Nantes, ways in which Henry dealt with claims to the throne by princes of the blood. Religious opposition might be considered from both Catholics and Huguenots and the associated problems with Spain and Henry's success assessed, by reference to his military successes, conversion to Catholicism in 1593 and the Edict of Nantes in 1598. More general points might be made about the ways in which Henry attempted to prevent problems through generous pensions, careful management of provincial governorships and a balance of firmness and clemency in dealing with opposition. Ideas should be supported by examples and a conclusion reached in line with the demands of the question. Whilst candidates could argue that the many plots against him and his eventual assassination suggest lack of success, they might equally suggest that a lack of renewal of civil war both during his own reign and at the accession of Louis XIII indicate both short and long-term success.

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

The Dutch Revolt 1563-1609**15(a) Assess the importance of regionalism in the outbreak and development of the Dutch Revolt to the early 1580s.**

Focus: Assessment of contributing factors.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There is a good deal to be said on the issue of regionalism and it could merely be assessed within its own terms. Candidates must address both the outbreak and later phases of the revolt. Issues concerning the outbreak are likely to focus on the imposition of anti-heresy laws on the more traditionally liberal approach of the Dutch provinces, as well as ignoring the states general and the particular interests of the provinces. In terms of continuation of the revolt candidates might examine such issues as 1/10 penny tax and its imposition without the permission of the States General. The effects of regionalism on the Dutch side might also be examined in the problems suffered by William of Orange in creating an opposition to Spain as well as its advantages in providing structures of administration needed for the successful government of a new state. An alternative approach might be to weigh regionalism against other factors to assess its importance. Issues likely to feature are religious, economic and social issues, and policies and ambitions of individuals such as Philip II in the early stages and William of Orange and the Duke of Alva in later developments. A discussion of religion is likely to focus on Philip II's unpopular religious policies, such as the re-organisation of the bishoprics, the introduction of the Jesuits and the prohibition of Calvinism. Such issues have clear links with regionalism. Economic issues are likely to focus on unemployment, the closure of the Baltic and poor harvests, particularly that of 1565 which provided a volatile situation which the hedge preachers exploited. Duke of Alva's/Philip's repressive policies could be cited as helping to continue the revolt with events such as the Council of Blood and the execution of Egmont and Hoorn.

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

(b) To what extent was William of Orange responsible for Dutch success in the war against Spain?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to evaluate the role of William of Orange in gaining independence for the northern provinces, or by setting it against other issues that could be considered to have contributed. Candidates may play down his role by pointing out that he was dead by 1584, that his successes were very limited before 1576 and that although he was a strong advocate of the need for foreign support this was not successfully achieved until after his death. The four-pronged simultaneous attack planned for 1572 went disastrously wrong. William of Orange's main attack from Germany failed to gain the promised support from French Huguenots after the St. Bartholomew's day massacre, allowing Alva to recapture Mons, move northwards and force William to retreat to Holland. However there is a good case to be made for his considerable contribution as a good diplomat and soldier. In 1573, he embraced Protestantism as a means of harnessing the Sea Beggars and cultivating English and Huguenot support; the former was to be a key factor in controlling the sea and therefore keeping control of Holland and Zeeland as well as decisively destroying the fleet of the Brussels government. By his diplomatic skills William of Orange was able to overcome the particularism of individual states, gain the position of Stadtholder of Holland Zeeland and Utrecht and continue the fight against Alva and Spain, Dutch opposition reaching its high point in the Pacification of Ghent in 1576. Although occurring after his death, English involvement with the Treaty of Nonsuch in 1585 (which was to sidetrack Spain and ultimately contribute to Dutch success) was largely due to the vision and negotiations of William of Orange. Other issues which may be considered include the geographical advantages of the north e.g. the ability to retreat behind a defence network of dykes and marshes, economic issues such as the industrial growth of Amsterdam, military superiority of the North under Maurice of Nassau as well as Spanish failures e.g. Alva's repressive policies, the Spanish Fury etc. Candidates should give due consideration to the idea of 'To what extent ...'

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

Spain as a Great Power 1556-1598**16 (a) How far did Philip II's personal style of government contribute to his problems in ruling Spain?**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many may focus on Philip's notorious tardiness in dealing with issues and the problems this caused. They might link this to his conscientiousness arising from both his religious background and lack of trust in others. He followed his father's exhortation to 'depend on no-one but yourself'. By 1571, he was dealing with 40 memoranda a day. In addition Philip consulted a wide range of opinion (even if he eventually ignored it) leading to great vacillation and delay, a problem made worse by 16th century communication problems with letters taking 10 days between Madrid and Brussels. However, this should be set against other issues such as the conciliar system whose procedures might be seen as compounding the problem. Councils were amateur with little or no administrative machinery, their interests sometimes conflicted, their function was only advisory and often ignored. On the other hand it could be argued that this was to some extent offset by the Juntas and secretaries of state such as Perez and Vazquez. Problems with factions may also be seen as an issue, as too the still divided nature of Spain. The Revolt of Aragon could be seen as an event which links both these issues. Problems with the Alva and Eboli factions dominated the early years of the reign with much jockeying for positions. The revolt of Aragon in 1590 might be seen as the culmination of this conflict, with Gonzalo Perez (Eboli faction) as the central figure. There is opportunity here for linkage with other issues, since centralisation, (with Philip ruling from Madrid and never visiting the provinces,) is also a consideration. Finance and the economy might also be considered problematic; Philip inherited a debt of 36 million ducats and an annual deficit of 1 million, a debt that was to be greatly increased by foreign commitments against the Turks, English and French and was to lead to a declaration of bankruptcy on three separate occasions. The economy also continued to suffer with little investment due to massive taxation and the excessive privileges of the Mesta. Candidates should give weighting to the different factors in order to address the idea of 'How far ...', and although they might dismiss the given issue as of little importance, they should nevertheless have given substantial consideration to it.

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

(b) How serious were the problems faced by Philip III on his accession to the Spanish throne in 1598? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of problems in an inherited situation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers may focus on foreign policy, finance and the economy. The problems with finance might be considered fairly obvious with high taxation (e.g. the millions from 1590), escalating costs of war against the English, Dutch and French and the last declaration of bankruptcy in 1596. Whilst on the one hand they might point out the amount of bullion coming in from the New World and the apparent prosperity of Seville to offset the above problems, they should also be aware that this wealth was largely illusory with much of the income committed in advance to Spain's creditors. Stagnation and decline of the economy is also likely to be seen as a considerable problem; the silk industry of Granada had been crippled by taxes and fighting in the revolt of the Moriscos. Commerce had suffered from an increase in taxes and agriculture had failed to develop because of the excessive privileges of the Mesta. Spain was forced to import much of her grain. Some distinctions are likely to be drawn between the foreign powers, peace having been negotiated with France through the Treaty of Vervins, whilst war still continued with England and the Netherlands. On the positive side, it might be pointed out that there were few religious problems, (apart from the Moriscos) Protestantism never really spreading to Spain and that the problem of the Turks had also declined with their defeat at Lepanto in 1571.

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

Europe 1598 - 1661**17 Richelieu and Mazarin 1622-1661**

(a) 'Richelieu's most important domestic policy success was his handling of the Huguenot problem.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of domestic policy success with particular emphasis on the Huguenots.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Richelieu dealt successfully with the Huguenots using a combination of ruthlessness and conciliation - a mixture characterising his policies in a number of areas e.g. provincial parlements and royal plotters. He destroyed the Huguenots' political and military independence but granted them religious rights. One indication of success here may be measured by Huguenot support for/participation in French action in the Thirty Years' War. Other successes might include Richelieu's survival of plots against him, the unswerving drive to increase royal authority at the expense of the Paris Parlement and the nobles. There is no requirement to examine failures although brief references to finance, the economy and regionalism could be considered.

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

(b) Assess the extent to which Mazarin continued Richelieu's foreign policy.

Focus: Evaluation of continuity in foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There was considerable continuity by Mazarin but he was not always able to give foreign policy his fullest attention. In particular, he was distracted by the Frondes. He continued an implacable opposition to the Hapsburgs including the weakening of Spain through territorial gains on common borders and the weakening of Spanish power in Italy. The Treaty of Westphalia is clear evidence of the success of these policies, albeit limited in some respects. However, Mazarin did more than Richelieu to seek alliances with the United Provinces and England (e.g. English support against Spain in 1658). References might be made to the Treaty of the Pyrenees 1659. The basis of Richelieu's policies, especially the extension of French influence and boundaries and the ending of the threat of Habsburg encirclement, remained unaltered by Mazarin.

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

The Problems of Spain 1598-1659**18 (a) Assess the reasons for failures in Spain's foreign policy from 1598 to 1659.**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for failures in foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The period was not one of unremitting failure but, by its end, Spain had clearly failed to maintain its dominance. Candidates who write only about Europe can access any mark band. Major reasons relate to Spain's enduring economic weaknesses, including a poor infrastructure and lack of interest in economic expansion and investment. These formed the basis of continued difficulty in raising revenues to support foreign policy. The tendency of Spanish foreign policy to be aggressive when caution might have been the better option and the Dutch refusal to compromise exacerbated the problem. Spain went to war too often when it could not afford to do so. The bullion from the overseas empire masked the chronic state of Spain's finances for some time. The Truce of Antwerp (1609) was a de-facto recognition of Dutch independence and the renewal of war in 1621 was senseless. Another major error was support for the Habsburgs during the Thirty Years' War, as was the continuation of war with France after Westphalia in 1648. Some might offer mitigating evidence of the degree of choice that Spain had when entering the Thirty Years' War but this is not necessary; the focus should be on failure and the need to rank reasons.

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

(b) Assess the reasons for Spain's economic and financial problems from 1598 to 1659.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for economic and financial problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The period was not one of unremitting failure but, by its end, Spain had clearly failed to maintain its dominance. Candidates who write only about Europe can access any mark band. Major reasons might relate to Spain's enduring economic weaknesses such as a poor infrastructure and lack of interest in economic expansion and investment. Olivares experienced major difficulties in confronting regional interests. There were continual difficulties in raising revenues to support foreign policies. The tendency of Spanish foreign policy to be aggressive when caution might have been the better option refusal to compromise over the Dutch issue exacerbated the problem. The Truce of Antwerp (1609) was a de-facto recognition of Dutch independence but the renewal of war in 1621 was senseless. Another major error was support for the Hapsburgs during the Thirty Years' War, as was the continuation of war with France after Westphalia in 1648. Spain went to war too often when it could not afford to. The use of bullion from the overseas empire to support wars masked the chronic state of Spain's finances for some time. Some might offer some mitigating evidence, for example of Spain's decision to enter the thirty years' War, but this is not necessary. The focus should be on failure and its reasons.

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

The Thirty Years' War 1618-1648**19(a) Assess the reasons why the Thirty Years' War continued after the Edict of Restitution (1629).**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for the prolongation of war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

From the beginning, the war had more than one cause and more than one state was bent on enhancing its own interests. The Hapsburgs were conspicuously successful to 1630 and the Edict of Restitution represented that success. The war could have ended at that point but, such was the scale of Habsburg domination, some of its own supporters found the Edict too much to stomach, representing as it did not just religious victory but also the furtherance of Imperial authority generally. Outside the Empire, other powers took exception to Habsburg success, notably Sweden under King Gustavus Adolphus. Aided by French subsidies and under the flag of Protestantism (in some ways a flag of convenience), Sweden entered the war in 1630 and rapidly turned the tide against the Habsburgs. The war might have ended with Gustavus's early death but France took up the baton against the Habsburgs in 1635. The war continued, often in desultory fashion, for the next ten years, largely because neither side could find the energy and resources to gain outright victory and neither side was weak enough to seek compromise and peace until 1645-48, when Bohemia suffered a string of defeats and Prague was besieged. This persuaded the Hapsburgs to end the war at Westphalia.

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

(b) Compared with 1618, how far did the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) represent an important change in the European balance of power?

Focus: Assessment of change in the balance of power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Comparison is important here, whether straightforward as a contrast between the situations in 1618 and 1648 or in a more sophisticated approach. There is no requirement to look beyond 1648 to demonstrate how the balance of power worked out. In 1618, the Habsburgs in Austria and Spain were stronger than any of England (*see below), France, Sweden and the United Provinces, especially as there was no unity of interest or action among these states. As a result of the war and Westphalia, there was a significant change. The Habsburg axis was broken although the Holy Roman Empire/Austria and Spain remained as significant powers in their own right. The Empire was forced to look south-east for advance; the rise of France and Sweden blocked the north-westerly avenues. Sweden's pre-eminence in the Baltic and influence in north Germany, which were not significant in 1618, were formally recognised in 1648. France, still a struggling power in 1618, emerged at Westphalia as a secure and consolidated state on the cusp of European dominance. The United Provinces had finally thrown off the Spanish yoke. (*England, apart from its navy, was still a military lightweight in European affairs and candidates are not expected to deal with England.)

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

Social Issues in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century

20(a) Assess the reasons why economic development in France was limited in the first half of the seventeenth century.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for limited economic development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is not an invitation to discuss the issue of whether or not economic development was limited, but requires an explanation of reasons for limited economic development. However, as always, examiners should read carefully answers that take an alternative approach. France offered alternatives in this period. It had the greatest economic potential of any continual state with a large land mass, much of which could be farmed, coherence within most of its boundaries, the largest population in western Europe and the potential to trade by land and by sea through the Mediterranean and the western seas. Yet France made only limited progress. Successive governments became involved with war through much of the period. Huge revenues were required as subsidies even when France took no direct action. This added to an inequitable tax burden which encouraged economic stagnation. The general lack of investment in the economy and infrastructure was also partly the result of the lack of a significant social class that was motivated by economic change. Titles and offices were more attractive. The wealth of the land was constantly siphoned off by both governments and nobility. This left a small middle class involved in enterprise and a hugely disaffected and lethargic peasantry. Some may make brief comparisons with England and/or the United Provinces to enhance the focus on France – that is fine and should be rewarded, but it is not required.

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

(b) How far were scientific developments in the first half of the seventeenth century limited to astronomy?

Focus: Assessment of scientific developments, especially in astronomy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question should lead to a discussion of scientific developments but astronomy cannot be dismissed totally in favour of other arguments even when candidates offer an alternative explanation. Astronomy in this period was dominated by two giants: Kepler & Galileo (& the on-going influence of Brahe) and by technical developments and new equipment (e.g. telescope) as well as by discoveries. It would be valid to argue that scientific progress was limited, but there were advances outside the narrow field of astronomy. Mathematics and physics were interwoven with astronomy – and developments were in part driven by the on-going needs of maritime empires. Medicine saw significant discoveries (e.g. Harvey). ‘Fashion’ attracted more noblemen and gentlemen to scientific pursuits. However, there was no explosion of ideas, as with Newton later, although some might discuss the importance of Galileo. There were the first stirrings of scientific theories unencumbered by religious dogma. The reaction of some powerful religious authorities was still hostile (e.g. Galileo). Candidates who focus only on Galileo or only on astronomy will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Some may refer to strong on-going interest in astrology and so question ‘scientific’ development.

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

Europe 1660-1718**Sweden and the Baltic 1660-1718**

21(a) To what extent were Charles XI's reforms successful in improving the domestic condition of Sweden during the period to 1697?

Focus: Assessment of a ruler's domestic reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is not solely about absolutism and responses that focus only on the status of the monarchy might find it difficult to get beyond Band III. Charles XI made little distinction between his power and that of the state. His main aim of strengthening his own authority also led to the strengthening of the state. The legacy of Charles X had been tainted by the regency during Charles XI's minority but successive rulers had allowed the crown's domain to shrink and that of the nobles to increase. On achieving his majority, Charles XI began by punishing the regents for abuses of power and began the process of restoring crown lands, the Reduktion. There is no doubt that Charles's reforms in this respect brought an alliance with the clergy, peasants and townsfolk: a major improvement via 'popular absolutism'. He overhauled the administration with the implementation of the collegiate system, resulting in more efficient government. He made moderate reforms in the size and resourcing of the army and the navy but there was a downside here for Sweden; the costs were a great burden for a largely under-resourced economy and a small population. Mercantilist policies stifled the very trade that Sweden relied on and allowed the Dutch greater prominence in the Baltic *entrepôt* trade.

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

(b) How far was the rise of Russia the main reason for Sweden's loss of its Baltic power?

Focus: Assessment of reasons for the loss of Sweden's Baltic empire.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Russia under Peter the Great posed the major threat to Sweden's Baltic interests. It can be argued that it was only a matter of time before Russia occasioned Sweden's collapse. The Swedish empire had, in large part, been created only because of Russia's weakness before Peter. The very nature of the empire made it difficult for Sweden to maintain in the long run even without a Russian threat. It was too scattered at a time when competition for the lucrative Baltic trade was emerging swiftly from England and the United Provinces. The small Swedish population was insufficient to provide manpower and revenue over a long period. Its economy was not as robust by the 1680's with copper resources severely diminished. The jealousies over Sweden's success from the 1630's had become deep-seated in Denmark, northern Germany and Poland, making them natural allies in anti-Swedish coalitions before Peter the Great and decisively so with him in the reign of Charles XII. Sweden's empire might well have been lost without the emergence of Peter the Great but undoubtedly in the reality of events Russia proved to be Sweden's nemesis. Examiner should note that this question is within the topic of Sweden and the Baltic. Candidates are not expected to have a detailed knowledge of the rise of Russia.

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

France and Europe 1661-1715**22(a) To what extent was the European balance of power in 1661 favourable to France?**

Focus: Evaluation of the international balance of power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The key issue here is the focus on 1661 (i.e. the effective start to Louis XIV's initial foreign policy aims). The outcome of Mazarin's foreign policy would make a useful template for an effective response, but responses will need to be firmly focused on 1661 and based on an evaluation of the condition/ relations of each major power, notably the reduced threats from Spain and the Habsburgs – many may stress the relative weakness of Spain. Holland, on the other hand, was likely to be an opponent. (England need not be considered, but credit is to be given if any answers do bring England into their evaluation). Some responses may argue that although the balance may be seen to have been favourable to France, it was not yet the power it was to become during Louis's long reign – such a longer term contextual evaluation is absolutely valid.

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

(b) To what extent was Louis XIV's foreign policy mainly defensive from 1661 to 1715?

Focus: Assessment of the nature of Louis XIV's foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some candidates might argue that Louis XIV was initially defending French interests against a hostile Europe: attack was the best form of defence. This proposition might be acceptable for the early years but is less tenable thereafter. The question might be worth posing as to how many times Louis XIV was attacked first and without provocation. Later the description of 'defensive' might be viewed as unrealistic. Candidates might confront this as part of their responses. Some might argue that his provocations and aggressions produced coalitions against France, but again the quality of the argument will be paramount. The more standard argument might be one that offers 'defensive' over the wars to extend and strengthen French boundaries; the French had long been subjected to the perceived threat of Habsburg encirclement. The label 'aggressive' can be applied to the rest of his reign with appropriate examples. The specified period is long and candidates cannot be expected to refer to all of the stages of foreign policy. However, answers in Bands I and II might be expected to show an awareness of policy at both the beginning and end of the reign.

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

The Development of Brandenburg-Prussia 1660-1713

23(a) Assess the claim that Frederick William, the Great Elector, achieved only limited success in strengthening his power within Brandenburg-Prussia.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a ruler's success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There is no disputing the fact that Frederick William did strengthen his power within Brandenburg-Prussia and candidates might be expected to demonstrate their understanding with reference to the Junkers, the army and administration, particularly revenue collection. However, there were limits, not least that much of his success depended on the sheer force of his personality (a weakness which his son's reign was to demonstrate, although this point is not needed because it is outside the specific terms of the question). Although further territories were added, increasing his prestige, the state was still widely scattered at the time of his death. There was over-reliance on the army for internal policy, including the collection of revenues and law and order. The economy had improved enhancing his power. Frederick William undeniably left his power in Brandenburg-Prussia in a stronger position than he had inherited it but the kingship, perhaps one of his greatest ambitions, was not to be fully realised unto the next century.

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

(b) To what extent were there differences between the domestic policies of Frederick I and those of Frederick William the Great Elector?

Focus: Assessment of the differences between the domestic policies of two rulers.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There were contrasts, largely borne out of differences of personality. However, the contrasts were perhaps fundamental only in one area: the promotion of and spending on cultural pursuits by Frederick I. For a time, the perception that Frederick I was weak highlighted one of the limitations of his father's legacy, that it was too centred on the Great Elector's personality. The result was a period of bureaucratic corruption unthinkable in his father's reign. Nevertheless, the cultural impetus that Frederick I gave to Brandenburg-Prussia was not superficial and was used as a political tool for increasing the ruler's prestige. In major ways, Frederick I continued his father's policies, for example in his commitment to develop the army. He pursued the Great Elector's ambition for kingship and was recognised by the Holy Roman Empire as 'king in Prussia'.

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

Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century**24(a) Assess the success of attempts to promote economic change in France during the reign of Louis XIV.**

Focus: Evaluation of the attempts to promote economic change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many answers might centre on the work of Colbert and this approach can access all mark bands. His economic ideas were based on mercantilism: wealth was finite and prosperity would be obtained primarily through foreign trade at the expense of others. Hence his great emphasis on improving France's foreign trade and increasing colonies as sources of raw materials and markets. Trading companies were established to trade with the East and West Indies, northern Europe and the Levant. However, they were largely unsuccessful. Domestic commerce was expanded through an improved infrastructure and an attempt at tariff reform, particularly affecting the movement of goods between the regions. Complete elimination of tariffs was not possible in view of the strength of vested interests. Industrial development had the goal of self-sufficiency through subsidies, monopolies and favourable loans. Industry was stimulated to some extent but became more regulated under Colbert's influence, with new guild regulations, standardisation and inspection. Here, as in other areas, his ambitions outran his ability to achieve success. The result was too often an over-reliance on luxury goods production and the stifling of enterprise and innovation. Vested guild interests, insufficient inspectors and local resistance to centralised planning combined to thwart Colbert. Agriculture was subjected to the same bombardment of regulations and control but to little effect. Reference might be made to the role of Louis XIV, who was less interested in economic change than in the constant supply of money to supply their needs. His minority and its Frondes impeded economic change whilst the period after Colbert's death (1683) to the end of the century saw the economy suffer because of the costs of war as well as the personal expenses of the King.

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

(b) To what extent was there religious toleration in Europe during the second half of the seventeenth century?

(Refer to any two of Brandenburg-Prussia, France, the United Provinces.)

Focus: Assessment of levels of religious toleration in two countries in a specified period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

France could be used to illustrate intolerance whilst either of the other two could be used to make a case for tolerance. Louis XIV was intolerant not just with the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes which ended the relative calm with the Huguenots. He also treated Catholic *dévots* harshly because he saw them as a threat to the unity of the state and his own position. The rulers of Brandenburg-Prussia and the United Provinces were largely tolerant of other faiths, adopting positive immigration policies to religious refugees. Their motives were not always altruistic, particularly in the case of the Great Elector; these refugees were often economically active and talented people who brought great benefits to the welcoming state. This was especially ironic for France when Louis XIV began driving out the Huguenots whose importance to the French economy was transferred to his enemies. Jews were well-treated in the United Provinces where they were neither 'ghettoised' nor marginalized. They were welcomed in Brandenburg-Prussia, although rather more cautiously.

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

**Mark Scheme 2586
June 2006**

Europe 1789-1849**The French Revolution 1789-1795****1(a) To what extent do economic problems explain the course of events in France from 1789 to 1792?**

Focus: Evaluation of causes of events.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Even if candidates wish to argue that other factors were more important in explaining the course of events, they must deal with the impact of economic problems effectively to score in the higher Bands. Candidates may well point to the economic problems of 1789 in bringing about the events of July and August 1789 and, also, their impact in the October Days. Many may consider the renewal of economic problems in 1792 in playing a role in the eventual overthrow of the monarchy. Some may point to financial problems faced by the new government and the decision to seize church lands. Such developments may be balanced against other factors, such as: the attitude of the King and Court, the development of factions, the onset of war and religious division.

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

(b) 'The costs of the Reign of Terror outweighed any benefit.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of a government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Among the (arguable) benefits that candidates may discuss are: defeat of foreign invasion, federal revolt and internal counter-revolution; the maximum; expansion of Revolution abroad. Among the costs (arguable) considered are: violence, bloodshed; radicalisation of Revolution; de-Christianisation; loss of foreign sympathy and moderate support; long term war. Some may interpret the Terror as a necessary evil – at least in the short term – to enable France's revolution to survive. Whilst many may argue in agreement with the quotation, there must be some attempt to deal with benefits as well as costs to score in the higher Bands.

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

Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815**2(a) To what extent did French people benefit from Napoleon's reforms during the Consulate (1799-1804)?**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Among the benefits (arguable), candidates may refer to, for example: stabilisation of Revolution, order, stability, victory and peace, law, education, effective government, healing of religious divisions/problems (Concordat). Discussion of the former may be balanced against negative aspects (arguable), such as: dictatorship, censorship, police state, loss of revolutionary gains (popular sovereignty), renewal of war/foreign hostility (murder of Enghien). Candidates may seek to identify different groups and assess the relative benefits for them (e.g. notables, workers, peasants, women). Answers need to evaluate critically the degree of benefit to score in the higher Bands.

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

(b) To what extent was Napoleon's generalship the main reason for his military success in Europe to 1807.

Focus: Evaluation of the factors explaining success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with Napoleon's generalship even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to his generalship, candidates may discuss issues such as: motivation of men, officers, planning, strategy and tactics. Other reasons considered might include: developments of the pre-revolutionary and post revolutionary periods (1790s) to explain that in 1799 Napoleon inherited a veteran, organised, honed and mass army, pointing to such aspects as developments in artillery, tactics (mixed order), organisation (divisions), mass army (e.g. *levee en masse*, *amalgame*, living off the land). Such discussion may be balanced against the 'weaknesses' of enemies (e.g. poor leaders, divided leadership, loose coalitions, still using 18th century styles of warfare).

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

France 1814-1848**3(a) To what extent should Louis XVIII's reign be considered a failure?**

Focus: Evaluation of a reign.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to evaluate critically the issue of failure to score in the higher Bands. They may do this by balancing evidence of 'failure' with evidence of 'success'. In relation to the former, candidates may refer to, for example: liberal criticism, rise of Ultras, Charles Artois, shortness of the reign (too short to establish stability, success), failure to win popular support, change after 1821 (murder of Berry). This discussion may be balanced against 'successes', such as: no revolution after 1815, foreign success, economic stability, advantage of war-weariness/desire for stability, peaceful succession.

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

(b) How successful were Louis Philippe's domestic policies? Explain your answer

Focus: Evaluation of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to discuss a range of policies, but do not need to be comprehensive to access the higher Bands. Candidates may examine a variety of social and political policies and assess, for example: the repression of early years, the use of censorship, the limited electorate, the apparent lack of policy, the policies of Thiers and Guizot, the demand for change and so forth. Candidates may point to 1848 as evidence of failure, the lack of timely concessions, the failure to lance the revolutionary heritage. This is not, however, a question focusing on the causes of 1848 – candidates must focus on relative success or failure of the whole reign.

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

Revolution and Repression in Europe 1815-49

4(a) How far do you agree that Metternich's repressive policies were the main reason for his success in containing revolutionary forces in the Austrian Empire before 1848?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to examine Metternich's repressive policies, even if they wish to argue that other factors were more significant in explaining the containment of revolutionary forces. In relation to the former, candidates may discuss issues such as: repression of potential revolution, censorship of mail, restrictions on free speech – also 'divide and rule' and billeting of troops from different areas. They may balance their discussion of the above against other factors, such as: the weakness and disunity of the opposition, and revolutionary/liberal/nationalist movements.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why revolutions broke out in the German Confederation in 1848.

Focus: Evaluation of causes.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should discuss a range of factors and seek to come to a judgement which weighs them up ('Assess ...'). Among the causes, answers may discuss, for example: the impact of the French/Italian example, the collapse of power in Vienna, the paralysis and fear of monarchs, the extent of liberal/nationalist agitation, the effects of economic crisis, popular unrest. Candidates will need to show how these different factors 'caused' revolutions and may assess by arguing relative important/significance and/or by explaining the linkages between different factors.

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

Europe 1825-1890**Italy 1830-1870****5(a) Assess the reasons for the failure of the revolutions in Italy during 1848 and 1849.**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may answer about the revolutions generally or may deal with the revolutions in different states separately. In the case of the former, the use of examples will be important to support reasons given and we might expect in the latter case some explanation of how the fate of revolutions in different states was interconnected with that in others. Reasons candidates may discuss might include: divisions and disunity, lack of sufficient and effective armed force, lack of popular support, Radetsky and the Austrian army, lack of foreign support, attitude of France. Assessment requires some weighing of the different reasons, such as analysis of links or relative importance.

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

(b) 'Cavour's diplomacy was the main reason for the creation of the Kingdom of Italy by 1861.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Whatever the candidate wishes to argue as the main reason, Cavour's diplomacy needs adequate treatment for the candidate to score in the higher Bands. Answers may discuss, for example: Crimea/Paris, Plombières and after, the annexation of the central duchies, the handling of Garibaldi and the issues surrounding Garibaldi's actions and aims in Sicily and Naples. Discussion of Cavour's diplomacy needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: balance against longer term nationalism, the attitude of Victor Emmanuel, the role of Garibaldi, foreign support (particularly Napoleon III) and war.

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

Germany c.1862-1890

6(a) How far do you agree that Bismarck's diplomacy was the main reason Germany was unified in the period to 1871?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Whether the candidate agrees or disagrees with that Bismarck's diplomacy was the main reasons, this issue must be given adequate treatment for answers to score in the higher Bands. In discussing the role of the Bismarck's diplomacy, candidates may assess Bismarck's diplomacy from the background to the Danish War through the Austro-Prussian War to creation of North German Confederation, alliance with south German states, the use of Italy, and Bismarck's role in 1870 in provoking war (the Hohenzollern succession/the Ems Telegram) and the creation of Empire. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: the role of war and strength of Prussian army, the isolation of Austria, the weakness of France, the lack of effective foreign intervention, the impact of German nationalism, the balance between Prussian economic strength and relative Austrian weakness.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why Bismarck pursued anti-Catholic and anti-socialist policies in the period from 1871 to 1890.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may choose to deal with the two areas of policy separately, but many may see some common elements in explaining them. Many may discuss the concept of *Reichsfeinde* and the desire to consolidate control and Prussian dominance, to unify Germany, and to deal with potential internal threats to unity and German Empire. Answers may also refer to the fear of internationalist connotations of Catholicism and socialism and, in relation to the latter, the threat of social upheaval and revolution.

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

France 1848-1875**7(a) Assess the reasons for the overthrow of the July Monarchy in 1848.**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

We can expect candidates to discuss a range of reasons, although the coverage need not be comprehensive to score well – what is key is the quality of understanding and the analysis of reasons. Candidates may discuss the role of some of the following: accident, short and long term social, economic and political causes – economic crises, reform banquets, failures in domestic and foreign policy, revolutionary heritage, lack of nerve. The key to accessing the higher Bands is the degree to which the candidate moves beyond explanation of individual reasons to the weighing of them and/or the linkages between them.

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

(b) How successful was Napoleon III's foreign policy? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The key to accessing the higher Bands is the degree to which the candidate has assessed relative success – this may be done in terms of aims, outcomes or against context. Candidates may discuss successes (arguable), such as (in the 1850s) the Crimea, Paris Conference, Italy. These may be contrasted with the failures (arguable) in the 1860s, e.g.: Mexico, Germany, war with Prussia. Aims discussed as criteria may include: restoration of French power and influence, the Napoleonic heritage, support for nationalism, territorial expansion. Outcomes discussed as criteria may include: victory in Crimea, the Paris Peace Conference, the acquisition of Nice and Savoy, compared to isolation in Mexico, failure to arbitrate over Germany (or win 'compensation'), withdrawal from Italian war.

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

Russia 1825-1881**8(a) Assess the reasons for the growth of opposition to Tsarist rule from 1825 to 1881.**Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The essay covers quite a long period and whilst we would expect reasonable coverage to access the higher Bands, what matters most is the quality of analysis and understanding. Factors candidates discuss may include: the role of Polish nationalism, radical ideas/ideology, westernisers, the failure to reform (especially Nicholas I), the failure of reforms to satisfy key groups, repression, the flipside of autocracy, orthodoxy and nationality, long term problems in Russia (e.g. serfdom, poverty). The key to accessing the higher Bands is the degree to which the candidate moves beyond explanation of individual reasons to the weighing of them and/or the linkages between them.

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

(b) How successful were Alexander II's domestic reforms to 1881? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must cover more than the emancipation of the serfs to score in the higher Bands, but coverage need not be comprehensive to score in these Bands. What matters is the quality of understanding and evaluation. Success may be judged against aims, outcomes or context. Answers may discuss reform issues, such as: serfdom, local government, education, the military, legal. Candidates may suggest some general ideas, such as that although autocracy maintained, opposition grew and that the reforms generally pleased few (either hopeful beneficiaries or opponents).

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

America 1846-1919

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

The American Civil War 1861-1865

9(a) To what extent were the North’s superior resources the main reason for the defeat of the South in the Civil War?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There needs to be significant discussion of the role of resources even if the candidate wishes to argue that other factors were more important. Resources can be seen as a long term reason for victory but on their own they cannot explain victory – the North needed the military and political strategy to make resources count and the political will and support to use them effectively. Candidates may discuss the impact of Grant’s 1864-65 strategy in the Wilderness campaign and Sherman’s March through Georgia. They may balance discussion of resources and campaigns against other factors, such as: the South’s failure to win foreign support, South’s chances of victory early on, Lincoln’s leadership, importance of morale.

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

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

(b) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Lincoln’s political leadership of the North during the Civil War.

Focus: Evaluation of political leadership

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to discuss both strengths and weaknesses, although there is no requirement for absolute balance. Discussion of strength and/or weakness may focus on some of the following areas: appointments (military and political), aims and purpose of war, marshalling of resources and maintenance of morale, the Emancipation decree, finding Grant, the handling of Congress, diplomacy, nerve. The key to accessing the higher Bands is the degree to which the candidate moves beyond explanation of individual factors to the weighing of them and/or the linkages between them.

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

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

Politics and Reform 1877-1919

10(a) To what extent was civil service reform the main issue facing US presidents in the period from 1877 to 1896?

Focus: Assessment of issues.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The issue of civil service reform needs adequate discussion even if candidates wish to argue other issues were more important. Candidates may properly argue that different issues came to the fore at different times although the issue of civil service reform and many other issues (such as: tariffs, trusts, gold and silver, agriculture and corruption) were more or less prominent throughout the period.

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

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

(b) How progressive was President Wilson’s domestic policy from 1913 to 1919? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of domestic policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to have an explicit or implicit definition of progressive as a test for assessment of policies. We can expect candidates to discuss policy in relation to progressivism. Candidates may consider in this context, for example: the legislation to help farmers (Smith-Lever Act, Federal Farm Loan Act) and workers (Adamson Act, Keating-Owen Act, Seaman’s Act), anti-trust legislation, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Reserve Act, tariff reduction. How progressive were these policies? How far did they extend and develop the ‘progressive’ policies of Roosevelt and Taft?

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

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

Western Expansion 1846-1900

11(a) Assess the impact of mining and cattle farming on the West in the period from 1846 to 1900.

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of two developments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is not strictly a comparison question, but valid comparisons between the two developments are to be rewarded positively. Many candidates may well discuss the impact of these two developments in relation to various issues, such as: the opening up of the West, their impact on Native Americans, types of expansion/settlement, problems of law and order, the development of railways, changing landscapes, problems they caused.

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

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

(b) How important were railways in opening up the West?

Focus: Evaluation of significance.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to do more than list the ways in which railways were important. There needs to be explanation of the importance and some argued assessment of the degree of important to score in the higher Bands. Candidates may discuss the importance of railways in relation to factors such as: communication, telegraph, cheap transport, railheads for cattle, mining, opening up of land. Candidates may explore the inter-linkage with other factors – mining, farming, cattle, pressure for expansion, railway towns. Reference may well be made to key railways, especially transcontinental routes and linkage of cities, towns and also to other means of transport/communication – trails, stagecoaches, steamboats.

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

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

Race Relations in the South 1863-1912

12(a) Assess the reasons why, despite Reconstruction, the position of Blacks had improved so little by 1877?

Focus: Assessment of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may legitimately contrast the hopes raised by Reconstruction with the reality as the backdrop to their analysis of the reasons for relatively limited progress. Whilst the blacks appeared to win major formal rights – the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the US constitution, participation in politics, the Freedmen’s Bureau, land acquisitions – in reality real gains for Blacks were limited. Candidates may discuss basic social and economic factors, such as: the relative poverty and lack of education of Blacks, discrimination, the Black Codes, violence, the KKK and other white racist organisations, the role of politics (local and Federal) and the situation in 1877.

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

[NB The option heading printed at the top of p.4 of the QP says “Europe” instead of “America” - the dates given are, however correct; so too is option’s listing on the front cover of the QP. A Notice to Centres has been issued correcting this. Refer any sign of candidate confusion to your Team Leader]

(b) To what extent were the rights gained by Blacks during Reconstruction eroded by 1912?

Focus: Evaluation of a development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may well set out the formal position in 1877 and better answers may suggest that the erosion of rights had begun before 1877 (such as the ‘Slaughterhouse’ cases of 1873 and the US v Cruikshank case of 1875) and that erosion of rights was a progressive development in the last quarter of the century. Candidates may point to key Supreme Court decisions, such as Plessy v Ferguson, Williams v. Mississippi, Cumming v the Board of Education, and the various Jim Crow laws passed by different states in the late 1880s and later grandfather clauses which eroded the right to vote. Candidates may argue that by 1912 (even by 1900), Blacks had in practice lost any rights that, in theory, they held under the 14th and 15th Amendments and the Civil Rights Act of 1875. Candidates are to be rewarded for any information pre-1877 that is used relevantly.

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

Europe 1890-1945**Russia 1894-1917**

13(a) How serious were the problems facing Tsar Nicholas II in the period from 1894 to 1914? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the seriousness of problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The emphasis in many answers may be on political problems and the threats to autocracy (growth of opposition – and events like the 1905 Revolution). However, candidates may also consider other issues, such as: the problems of agricultural and industrial development, urbanisation, poverty, education, the Russo-Japanese War. Seriousness may be assessed by reference to, for example: the intractable nature of some problems, the degree of threat posed, the seriousness with which the government dealt with such problems.

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

(b) Assess the reasons for the February Revolution in 1917.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The emphasis of the question is on reasons and better answers may consider both longer-term and shorter-term reasons to explain the overthrow of the Tsar and the creation of a Provisional Government. Candidates may discuss various issues, such as: the impact of war from 1914 to early 1917 on Russia (casualties, hardships, defeat, inflation, shortages; the war's role in exposing weaknesses of autocracy and the personal association of the Tsar with defeat), political, Marxist, liberal opposition (longer and shorter-term); the role of Rasputin; the events of February 1917; the legacy of long-term stresses and strains in the Russian state and society. Candidates should do more than simply explain individual reasons. The key to accessing the higher Bands is the degree to which the candidate moves beyond explanation of individual reasons to the weighing of them and/or the linkages between them.

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

The Causes and Impact of the First World War c.1890-1920**14(a) Assess the economic impact of the First World War on Britain and Germany to 1920.**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is not strictly a comparison question. However, candidates should be rewarded for analytical use of a comparative approach. Equally, the impacts on Britain and Germany may legitimately be dealt with separately - as long as in each case there is assessment. Answers may refer to, for example: the mobilisation of economies for war, the impact of loss of manpower (e.g. on agricultural production), the nature of industrial production. Answers may also discuss the impact of enemy action on domestic situations – e.g. blockades, U-boat campaigns, rationing, the role of women, inflation. As the period goes to 1920, answers should offer some discussion of the immediate aftermath of the war, e.g. unemployment, dislocation, inflation.

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

(b) 'Revenge on Germany was the sole motive in the making of the Treaty of Versailles (1919).' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of motives.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may well disagree with the judgement offered in the question. They may argue that revenge was certainly the main motive of France and certainly informed Britain's position, but it is hard to argue that Wilson was motivated by revenge; consideration of Lloyd George could go in either direction. Expect many candidates to explain other motives, such as: justice/fairness, prevention of future war, protection for France, the specific interests of different allies, the role of self-determination. Some answers may test such points against actual terms of the Treaty itself.

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

Italy 1919-1945

15(a) To what extent can the rise of Mussolini to power in 1922 be explained by his own talents and abilities?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to discuss the role of Mussolini's talents and abilities even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. Discussion of Mussolini's talents and abilities may refer to: his opportunism, skills of oratory and propaganda, charisma and leadership. Discussion of these needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: the impact of World War I, nationalism, discontent with governments, fear of socialism/communism, the connivance of the establishment, the events of 1922. Many may argue that Mussolini's talents and abilities were a necessary but in themselves not a sufficient reason to explain his rise.

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

(b) How far did Mussolini succeed in establishing a full dictatorship in Italy in the period from 1922 to 1928?

Focus: Evaluation of a key development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Better candidates will pick up on the adjective 'full', but all need to deal with the question of establishing a dictatorship. Some candidates may test developments in Italy against some definition of the characteristics of a full dictatorship. Answers may refer, for example, to: the dismantling of parliamentary government, the establishment of '*Il Duce*', elements of a police state, censorship, proscription and propaganda, education, the Rocco Law, the Fascist Grand Council, Mussolini's personality cult. On the negative side, answers may discuss issues such as: relations with the Church, the position of the monarchy, the limits of Mussolini's power in the country as well as over his party.

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

Germany 1919-1945

16(a) How far was the impact of the Depression the main reason for the rise of Hitler to power by January 1933?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal adequately with the impact of the Depression even if they wish to argue other reasons were more significant. A common line of argument may be that the Depression provided necessary conditions in which Nazism and other forms of extremism could thrive but on its own cannot explain Hitler's rise. In discussing the impact of the Depression, answers may discuss issues such as: social and economic crisis, exposure of the weaknesses of Weimar Democracy, the break-up of the Grand Coalition, rule by decree, and the rise of extremism (left and right). This needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: fear of communism, the failure of democratic and socialist parties to see or unite against the threat, the appeal of Nazism, the skills of Hitler, Goebbels and the Nazi party machine, the backstairs intrigue of 1932-33.

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

(b) How successful was Hitler's economic policy in the period from 1933 to 1939? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may assess the New Plan and the Four Year Plan or they may deal generally with different areas. Aims, results and context can be used as the test of success. Answers may discuss policy and its impact in relation to areas/ideas such as: unemployment, public works, industrial and agricultural policy, heavy industry and autarky, foreign trade agreements, consumer goods v war materials (guns v butter). There may be discussion of the appearance of success and of underlying criticisms (e.g. unemployment), weaknesses and the time taken to change things.

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

Europe and the World 1919-1989**International Relations 1919-1941****17(a) Assess the reasons why there were no major international conflicts in the 1920s.**

Focus: evaluation of the international situation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to discuss a range of factors which resulted in there being no major conflicts in the 1920s. Areas that might be covered could include: the legacy of the Great War and the various Peace Settlements; the objectives of Britain, France and the USA; the role of the new League of Nations; conferences like Locarno. Answers may consider what would constitute a 'major international conflict', as opposed to 'minor skirmishes' – of which there were rather a lot around the world in the 1920s.

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

(b) How far was British foreign policy to blame for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939?

Focus: Evaluation of causes.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Evaluation of the impact of British foreign policy will form the focal point of an effective answer. Answers could consider, for example: the development of post-World War I planning (including disarmament), focus on imperial rather than continental concerns, the Ten-Year Rule, attitudes to the USSR, appeasement (under Chamberlain, perhaps set in the longer context of British policy from 1919 and the feeling that Germany had legitimate demands after Versailles). The balance of discussion between the rise of aggressive nationalism in Germany and Italy, and Britain's response to them would provide effective context for the assessment.

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

The USSR 1924-53**18(a) To what extent was Stalin's position secure by the early 1930s?**

Focus: Evaluation of strength of Stalin's position.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers might focus around analysis of Stalin's manoeuvrings during the later 1920s. Power struggles with Trotsky and others could form useful evidence, as would evaluation of Stalin's later successes with the Purges. The given date 'the early 1930s' gives latitude to each candidate to decide where to end - some may end with the death of Kirov and the start of the purges; that would be fine. Answers that go further will be fine if their focus is on using later evidence to assess Stalin's security by the early 1930s.

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

(b) How effectively did the USSR control Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1953? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the strength of the USSR's control over E. Europe.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Soviet control of Eastern Europe must be the focus. Evaluation of the effectiveness of various constraints (e.g. economic, political and social) would enable candidates to illustrate and develop good answers. In particular, the planning of Stalin to divide and rule the states 'liberated' from Nazi control and the imposition of Moscow's 'brand' of Communism could be explored. Consideration of perspectives from 1945 across the years to 1953 would enable evaluation of Stalin's success in building dependent satellites. The dates allow for the opportunity to weigh up the opportunities and ambitions of the USSR not just from the end of the war in Europe, but from before Germany's surrender.

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

The Cold War in Europe 1945-89**19(a) To what extent was mutual distrust between the wartime Allies shown in the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of 1945?**

Focus: Evaluation of tensions.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The opportunity to evaluate the build up to and the effects of these two conferences would provide a good basis for an answer – so answers may legitimately range into the years either side of 1945 as long as their focus is on assessing mutual distrust as revealed at the Conferences. Candidates will find much to explore in the contrasts and similarities between the two conferences - for example, by considering issues such as: the main personalities (Truman rather than Roosevelt, Attlee rather than Churchill), the state of hostilities in Europe at each point (references to the Far East are not required, but any validly made are to be credited), the developing nature of agreements reached. Levels of co-operation and mistrust may also be considered. Answers may explore elements of the debate about who was to 'blame' for starting the Cold War [the USA or the USSR] – that will be fine, as long as the focus is kept on using such evidence to understand mistrust in 1945.

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

(b) How important were the Warsaw Pact (1955) and building of the Berlin Wall (1961) in strengthening Soviet control in Eastern Europe in the 1950s and 1960s? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of causes of growing Soviet control.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Both of these key events needs to be considered in the light of its significance in strengthening Soviet control in Eastern Europe. The Warsaw Pact might be evaluated more for its symbolic role in tying in satellite states as a belated response to NATO's creation in 1949. However, in the context of the crushing of the Hungarian Uprising in 1956, it could be argued that it demonstrated how effective the Soviet Union's military control was in backing its political imperatives. On the other hand, the building of the Berlin Wall was an admission of problems for the regime, yet its success in following through such a divisive policy and confronting the West in Berlin once again, demonstrated a degree of effectiveness. Some may propose another factor as having been more significant in strengthening the USSR's position, such as the crushing of the Prague Spring (1968).

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

The Cold War in Asia and the Americas 1949-74**20(a) To what extent was the United Nations successful in the Korean War from 1950 to 1953?**

Focus: Evaluation of UN success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Criteria to evaluate 'success' need to be to be deployed for effective answers: e.g. economic, military, political in Cold War terms (locally in Korea &/or in the region &/or globally). Issues evaluated in answers may include: the development of Russian and American influence in North and South Korea respectively, the influence of the USA over the Security Council, the Sino-Soviet split, the changing fortunes of UN forces during the war, the problems of McArthur's leadership. Some may point out that 'the UN' in Korea really meant the USA. Answers may go beyond 1953 to provide a longer-term perspective from which to evaluate success in the war – that will be fine, as long as the focus is in assessing success during 1950-53.

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

(b) Assess the reasons why the USA failed to prevent a communist victory in Vietnam.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons why US efforts failed.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to evaluate a variety of reasons. Many may focus on the particular appeal of Communism to the rural peasantry and the failure of 'conventional' US military intervention. Consideration of different phases in the USA's campaigns would enable a broad perspective to be produced. Some may point to the fact that the US was propping up unpopular and corrupt regimes in South Vietnam, and never won the battle for the 'hearts and minds' of the Vietnamese. Some may point to inspirational leadership and generalship in the North. US domestic social and political issues may also be brought in to provide balanced discussions. The key to accessing the higher Bands is the degree to which the candidate moves beyond explanation of individual reasons to the weighing of them and/or the linkages between them.

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

**Mark Scheme 2587
June 2006**

Charlemagne

1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C about the importance Charlemagne attached to the imperial coronation of 800. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** indicate that, to an extent, the Coronation brought no real power to Charlemagne. It was quickly dissolved in Passage **B** and led to little change in **C**.

Differences: Passage **B** says the Coronation was not important whereas Passage **C** thinks it was. **B** says it was a mirage which dissolved when in contact with realities whereas **C** says it was not an empty distinction. **B** says the Annals do not refer to the 802 Assemblies and they were transient and unimportant, but **C** gives details of the Assemblies and reforms resulting from the Coronation, arguing that it was important to Charlemagne.

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 imperial coronation inspired in Charlemagne ‘an intensification of the reforming theme already evident in the pre-imperial years.’ (Passage C, lines 19-20) [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.

In Passage **B**, Ganshof has a somewhat sceptical and dismissive view of Charlemagne’s government and this is supported to a degree by Collins (**D**). In this Passage (**D**) Collins draws attention to the provisions of the division of the empire drawn up by Charlemagne in 806, though never implemented. These ignored the issue of succession to the empire and simply divided up all Charlemagne’s lands between his sons in the traditional Frankish manner. This suggests that Charlemagne regarded the empire as less important than obedience to Frankish law which demanded that all sons should benefit from the death of the father, or even that he saw the imperial title as unimportant. Passage **A**, Charlemagne’s letter to Michael I confirms the peace by which he was recognised by the Byzantines and shows he placed some value on the title. Furthermore, as **D** says, Charlemagne passed on the title to his only surviving son, Louis the Pious in 813. Passage **C** introduces into the discussion evidence that Charlemagne had a real reforming drive and suggests that there is evidence that this had been manifested even before 800. This could be further explained.

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 Assess the reasons why Charlemagne ceased to seek large-scale conquest after 800. [45]

Debate: reasons for the end of Carolingian conquest.

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.

It has been suggested by historians that Charlemagne's relative inaction was simply due to the emperor's age, but he did employ his sons and other leaders to manage the wars of this period. Some historians have also suggested that he deliberately called a halt in order to deal with other priorities such as church reform and spreading true Christianity. Yet others have championed the idea that the empire had run into the buffers - there was nowhere to go in Central Europe, while the Muslims of Spain and the Byzantines of South Italy were too strong to conquer. The development of trade led to an economic boom so plunder was less necessary to Charlemagne.

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 factors which induced Charlemagne to promote culture and learning. [45]

Debate: Charlemagne's motives in promoting culture and learning.

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.

Charlemagne was deeply concerned with the organisation of the Church in all his land, and candidates can point to a number of manifestations of this such as the *Admonitio Generalis*. Learning, texts and writing were vital to the business and mission of the Church and Charlemagne wanted to achieve correct versions of the texts. Moreover, the Church was a great political asset, disposing as it did of wealth, lands and troops, and providing a vital element in the administration of the Carolingian lands. Improving this literacy and extending it to the laity would thus facilitate the government of the empire. Charlemagne could secure loyalty and legitimise his rule as a Christian Emperor through the promotion of a common culture. He could impress his nobles and maintain their loyalty. Following what he had seen in Rome and using his great wealth notably from conquering the Avars, Charlemagne was able to build and embellish Aachen. Thus a variety of factors bore upon Charlemagne amongst which personal interest and curiosity may have figured.

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 A and D about the problems John experienced in the British Isles while attempting to recover his continental lands. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages refer to John's financial problems in trying to recover his lands. **A** says he collected money from all sides and was resisted by the Cistercians while **D** mentions the general rise in prices which caused the demands described in **A**.

Differences: Passage **A** refers to a string of problems which John faced in Ireland, Wales and in England, which makes the financial emphasis in Passage **D** seem less problematic. **A** suggests John overcame some problems, he pacified Ireland, the Welsh dispersed and William de Braose went into exile. **D** implies that the price rises made it very difficult for John to overcome his problems.

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 John faced overwhelming difficulties in attempting to recover his continental lands in the years after 1204. [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.

These Passages show that John did face considerable problems, but it is a matter of judgement whether they were overwhelming. Passage **D** makes it clear that rising prices increased his need for money and the likelihood of resistance. The Barnwell Chronicler (Passage **A**) shows that in the years of preparation for the continental expedition John was pressing on his subjects for money, but also that he had many diversions – troubles with the Church, Ireland, Wales, untrustworthy barons. Holt (Passage **B**) suggests that in his anxiety to forward his continental ambitions John pressed very hard on the barons, and the problems this created were made worse by the way he dealt with them. But Baldwin (Passage **C**) shows that there were real weaknesses in the French position and real possibilities of finding friends and allies. Candidates can adduce other factors such as John's inheritance and his character.

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 Assess the main reasons for John's loss of most of the Angevin lands in France in 1204. [45]

Debate: why the Angevin lands were lost in 1204.

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.

Historians have discussed a wide variety of reasons to account for the loss of the Angevin lands in France. In older works John's supposed laziness and incompetence were often adduced, but modern historians have pointed to his victory at Mirebeau as evidence of his military capacity and there is a general acceptance that he was administratively highly competent. In recent years historians have pointed to John's difficulties in raising money and his problems with inflation. Some have argued that in Philip he confronted an immensely richer enemy, but others have said that this was not the case. The context of John's early reign and his relationship with King Philip established by the Treaty of Le Goulet can also be discussed. John's actions, especially in the matter of the Lusignan marriage have been blamed by some and the policies of Philip Augustus may also be assessed.

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 can John's surrender of England to Innocent III be considered a humiliation? [45]

Debate: what John's surrender to papal demands represented.

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 well use the terms of the 'capitulation' as a factor in their discussion. The debate rests on how far John was adversely affected by his surrender, described as 'contemptible' by Stubbs, and the cause of the loss of baronial support, and how far Pope Innocent III's support benefited King John. It has been argued that the surrender, far from being humiliating, was a diplomatic master-stroke as John had papal backing, even against Archbishop Stephen Langton - of particular value in his dispute with his barons. The focus of the question is on the outcome of the dispute with the pope, not its causes.

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 2006

Philip II

1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D on the possibility of Philip II solving his financial problems. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages refer to several reasons why Philip could not solve his financial problems. **B** has the expense of the Armada, and **D** mentions the enormous costs of war. **D** says Philip was extravagant in building the Escorial and **B** mentions artists and architects.

Differences: The Passages disagree about whether a solution could be found. **D** offers the solution of peace but **B** argues that even in peacetime the system was flawed. **D** feels the system could be reformed since Philip had trebled his income but **B** says it cannot be fixed. **B** argues that war is inevitable because of defence commitments but **D** thinks a prolonged period of peace would provide a solution.

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, how far do you agree with the view that Philip II himself was to blame for causing Spain's financial problems. [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 personal financial ineptitude; 'grandiose schemes'; Grand Strategy, war and defence costs; and the inherited financial and economic systems have, in turn, been emphasised and debated. Philip II's self-confessed lack of understanding of finances is illustrated by **A**, written at the time of his fourth bankruptcy; **B** and **D** refer to grandiose schemes: the Armada, the Escorial; **all the Passages** have references to the inherited financial system, **D** to the economy; **C** implies the hardship of Spain which led a truculent Cortes to demand 'redress before supply', undermining royal control. Further factors discussed might include: an explanation of the system, weaknesses of the economy, inflation, failure to collect taxes, defensive or aggressive foreign strategies.

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 How effectively did the Spanish Inquisition fulfil its role in mainland Spain during the reign of Philip II? Explain your answer. [45]

Debate: the role of the Inquisition within Spain.

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 the role of the Inquisition, whether religious, political, social, educative or cultural. Its effectiveness in Christianising the Spanish semi-pagan people is also debated. The reputation of the Inquisition has been revised since the Black Legend portrayed it as a 'terror machine', but its effectiveness in inspiring fear is still hotly debated. Debate also focuses on its cultural impact, by censorship through the Indices, and in persecuting Conversos and Moriscos. Discussion might include: the cases of Carranza and Perez, in developing the debate on whether the Inquisition was a 'political tool'; the role of the Inquisition in provoking the Moriscos and Aragonese Revolts; examples of its use in enforcing the Tridentine decrees to strengthen orthodoxy; in educating semi-pagan communities to a new level of Christian orthodoxy, thereby eroding local traditional religion; in using fear as a method of social and moral control; in culturally shaping literary taste, perhaps reinforcing Spain's position as a cultural backwater. Reference to the Netherlands or the Empire beyond Spain is not relevant.

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 how far Philip II's foreign policy followed a consistent strategy. [45]

Debate: the consistency 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 here on Philip's foreign policy is about whether he pursued a co-ordinated set of strategies, with clear priorities, driven by messianic vision, or whether he reacted in a confused manner to events ad hoc. The debate draws together many elements of this strategy: defence, imperialism, dynastic ambition, consolidation, religion, prestige, personal and national interest. Discussion used might include: the Mediterranean war against the Turks; Portugal; relations with England, relations with France, relations with the Papacy. The Netherlands are not relevant except insofar as foreign policy issues were concerned.

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 B and D on the role of the Privy Council. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: There is a clear **measure of agreement between** the Passages regarding the importance of the Privy Council, although **B** only recognises it implicitly while **D** states that it was the focus of government.

Differences: The differences are largely of emphasis. **Both** Passages believe the Privy Council had a role in giving advice. However, **D** stresses that the advisory role belonged to individual Councillors rather than to the Council as a body, a point that **B** does not mention. **D** also adds that Elizabeth did not feel obliged to act on the advice she received and suggests that decisions were the Queen's own. However, **B** emphasises the difference between the stated duty of the Councillor and the way in which Councillors used their position in an attempt to manipulate the Queen, preventing her from making decisions with which they disagreed. **B** refers to the Councillors' duty to give advice regardless of whether it coincided with Elizabeth's views, but **D** suggests that advice that did not correspond with Elizabeth's wishes was unwelcome even if it was unanimous. **B** also refers to the executive functions of the Council, which **D** does not mention explicitly, although it may be inferred from the first line.

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, how far do you agree with the view that Elizabeth was in full control of her Council? [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.

Passages **A**, **C** and **D** are in basic agreement that Elizabeth made her own decisions, taking the advice of her Councillors when she saw fit. In contrast, **B**'s interpretation is that the Councillors became adept at manipulating the Queen. Candidates might explain how this was done: by withholding information or pressurising the Queen through parliament. Candidates could use the examples provided in the Passages, such as the proposed meeting with Mary, Queen of Scots, and Mary's fate, developing them by using their own knowledge, and/or answers might use other examples, such as marriage/succession issues, to demonstrate the means by which the Queen controlled her Councillors or by which they manipulated her.

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 far was there a serious Puritan threat to the Church of England in the reign of Elizabeth I? [45]

Debate: the nature and extent of Puritanism as a challenge to the Church of England.

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 would do well to define 'Puritan' before embarking on their answer. The doctrinal aspects as well as the organisation of the Church are both relevant. Candidates might consider the vestiarian controversy, the Cartwright lectures, challenges to the Church Settlement in parliament, prophesying and the classical movement. They may also consider the success of the authorities in dealing with the Puritans, and the extent to which the Puritan threat increased because the authorities were indecisive until after Grindal's suspension. There were also unifying factors among English Protestants. It has been argued that bishops and Puritans shared a common concern to advance the gospel. Candidates may discuss whether predestination was central to Church of England doctrine, or whether the Edwardian legacy was more influential. However, popery was seen as a common enemy by all Protestants and this tended to unite them, and allowed English divines to argue that many issues of conflict were adiaphora. The defence of the episcopalian structure of the Church by Elizabethan divines appeared by the end of the reign. Candidates may also refer to the anti-Puritan image that was a feature of Elizabethan culture.

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 did England cease to be a nation of Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth I? [45]Debate: the extent of Catholic survivalism in the reign of Elizabeth I.

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 discuss the extent to which England was a Catholic country in 1558, but should not spend too much time on this aspect of the debate. Valid lines of approach include assessment of the extent to which the Church of England retained or permitted Catholic practices and beliefs, as well as the extent of religious conformity. The difficulty faced by historians in assessing the religious beliefs of individuals might be addressed in evaluating different arguments. Church papistry as well as recusancy might be discussed and candidates are likely to address the extent to which missionary priests were successful in maintaining a Catholic community. Local studies show that in the 1560s there was a large Catholic population, but little recusant problem. Church papists are seen as fulfilling their social duty to worship where their ancestors were buried. Other arguments suggest that church papistry remained within the Church of England, and a life-cycle pattern has been identified whereby Catholics became recusant when they had (economically) less to lose. There was a minority Catholic community at the end of the reign, although there is disagreement about its nature and extent.

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 when Cromwell became committed to removing Charles I from power. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages agree that the exact moment of Cromwell's decision is hard to define and that the taking of the decision was a fairly length process.

Differences: The main area of difference between these Passages concerns the timing of Cromwell's decision concerning the execution of the king. **B** implies Cromwell's reluctance to commit to the purging of parliament but refers to his 'impulsive and decisive support' for the trial of Charles in December 1648, thus suggesting that Cromwell only became committed to the trial and execution after Pride's Purge. However, **D** believes Cromwell decided that it was impossible to work with Charles by the time of the Putney Debates in October/November 1647. While **B** argues that Cromwell perhaps still hoped to achieve a settlement with Charles at the time of Pride's Purge, **D** argues that Cromwell was by then convinced that Charles should be removed from power, but was uncertain when and how the deed should be done. **D**, however, does not put an exact time on Cromwell's decision, merely arguing that he became increasingly convinced, in the 15 months after the Putney Debates, that this is what must happen. **D** argues that Cromwell was reluctant to support Pride's Purge because it meant, effectively, that the Army rather than Parliament decided Charles' fate.

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 a reluctant regicide. [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 contain a range of views about Cromwell's attitude to Charles I. **A** argues that by the autumn of 1648 Cromwell believed that the purging of Parliament was justified, hence implying that he saw the execution of the king as the right course of action and would go to any lengths to achieve this. In contrast **B** suggests that Cromwell was still reluctant to commit regicide in November 1648, although once convinced that there was no hope of negotiating a settlement he became convinced of the necessity of trying Charles. **C** and **D** similarly show Cromwell unsure about the role of the army in bringing the king to account. Like **B**, **C** suggests that Cromwell was not initially convinced of the need to kill the king, even if he was a 'murderer'. However, it does acknowledge that Cromwell's argument may imply that a legitimate authority could punish him. **D** is far more secure of its argument that Cromwell believed the king had to be punished. The Passages contain references to the evidence interpreted by historians in an effort to establish Cromwell's views - his speeches at Putney and in parliament as well as his correspondence. Accounts of the events, often by hostile contemporaries or those who, after 1660, sought to exonerate themselves from blame over the regicide may also be used to evaluate the various interpretations.

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 'Cromwell's contribution was greater off the battlefield than on it.' How far do you agree with this view of Cromwell's role in the First Civil War (1642-46)? [45]

Debate: the role played by the First Civil War in Cromwell's rise to power.

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 enter into debate candidates will need to establish criteria for judging the importance of Cromwell's contributions. There is relatively little debate over Cromwell's major military successes (e.g. at Marston Moor and Naseby), although some historians claim that he never faced a superior force on the battlefield and certainly the engagements in which he was involved by the end of 1643 were of relatively minor significance for the outcome of the war. Comparatively speaking, however, Cromwell was a successful officer by this stage in the war. There are other criteria by which to judge his contribution, such as the way in which Cromwell motivated his men, caring for their physical and spiritual needs, the extent to which Cromwell was a team-player, or the extent to which he was self-seekingly ambitious. All these aspects of Cromwell's military career are open to debate, having been criticised and praised both at the time and since. Away from the battlefield, candidates might consider Cromwell's methods of recruitment, his dealings with the county committees and his attack on the leadership of Manchester and Essex. The wider implications of these aspects of his role and their importance should be set against the importance of military successes in reaching a judgement.

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 To what extent did Cromwell as Lord Protector dominate government from 1653 to 1658? [45]

Debate: the balance in government between Protector and other individuals and institutions 1653-58.

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.

Most contemporaries assumed that Cromwell wielded great powers, despite apparent constitutional constraints on him, and very many historians have accepted their accounts. According to recent research on the workings of the Council this is a flawed interpretation, since neither in theory nor in practice did Cromwell exercise absolute power. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that with the army at his command, Cromwell had the potential to exercise such power. Candidates might draw on evidence regarding the details of the constitutions, apparent manipulation of parliaments, the Major-Generals experiment and the role of the Council. Cromwell was persuaded to call the second Protectorate Parliament and prevented from legalising the return of Jews to England by his Council. However, he and the Council were able to legislate without parliament until September 1654 and in 1657 he gained the right to name his successor and nominate members of the 'Other House'.

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 C and D of Peter's character. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages agree that Peter could be brutal and high-handed. In Passage **C** he enforced high taxes and conscription and in Passage **D** he executed rebels ruthlessly.

Differences: Passage **C** is largely critical of Peter while Passage **D** sees some redeeming features. The second half of Passage **C** relates the violent, even abnormal, characteristics of Peter the Great. Passage **D** notes different qualities. The Passages look at very different aspects. Passage **C** is more concerned with the very personal side of Peter and stresses how hard he worked whilst Passage **D** mostly takes a broader view.

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 how far Peter's character helped or hindered his achievements as tsar. [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 are not expected to have knowledge of the historians who have written the Passages and the information about Vernadsky (Passage **A**) is given only to deter them from the assumption that a Russian historian 'must' be a Marxist. Passages **A**, **B** and **D** mostly agree that Peter's character contributed to his achievements as tsar. Passages **A** and **B** link his character with his achievements very directly and Passage **A** notes his concern for Russia. Passage **C** agrees to some extent but the agreement is limited by the description of Peter's cruelty which might have limited his achievements, especially if it was 'a mild form of mental illness' or 'abnormal'. Some candidates might question the claim about Peter's tolerance of criticism that is mentioned in Passage **B**. Passage **D** is a more sophisticated argument about the use of cruelty. Candidates might come to different conclusions about the relevance of his kindness to animals. Other knowledge used might refer to other examples of Peter's violence and savage repression and/or his dedication to Russia and hard work, but the focus is on his character.

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 whether Peter the Great's aims in foreign policy were more defensive than aggressive. [45]

Debate: the aims of Peter'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 broad areas of debate are whether Peter the Great's motives were more aggressive or defensive and evidence can be found to support both propositions. The Specification mentions Turkey, Persia and Sweden but candidates are not expected to give equal attention to each. There is likely to be more on Sweden than on the others even in answers that are worth the highest marks. However, answers in **Band I** should normally be expected to deal confidently with all three [NB detail on Persia might always be more lightweight by comparison with the other two and Sweden may receive greater consideration than Turkey – that is fine]. Answers in **Band II** should be able to discuss at least two. The threat from Sweden under Charles XII would point to a defensive stance by Peter. On the other hand, the war continued after the decisive victory at Poltava (1709) and did not end until Nystadt (1721). The Tsar sought to open a way into the Black Sea and Mediterranean and to end the dominance of Turkey in that region, which might be seen as either aggressive or defensive. His policies were often not thought out carefully. For example, there was confusion in policy towards Persia.

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 How convincing is the claim that Peter the Great had carried out revolutionary changes within Russia by 1725? Explain your answer. [45]

Debate: the extent of change achieved.

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 area of debate is the extent and significance of the changes introduced by Peter the Great and the key word is 'revolutionary'. This does not require a long discussion of revolutions but a focus on the extent of change; nobody would claim that there were no changes during the reign of the Tsar. Some would claim that Peter developed changes that were already in hand but examiners will note that candidates are not expected to have specific knowledge of Russia before 1696. Others might argue against the claim because his reforms existed mostly on paper and many were not implemented. On the other hand, the 'revolutionary' case would be that he addressed virtually every aspect of Russian life and that the changes were more extensive than anyone could have envisaged at his accession. The Specification mentions 'Domestic reforms: administration, economic reforms ... religious policy, westernisation, St. Petersburg'. It also mentions military and naval reforms but these should be treated carefully because the question asks about changes within Russia. These aspects can be made relevant if it is claimed that the demands of war drove internal reforms but the wars themselves are outside the question. The situation in 1725 can be assessed but candidates are not expected to have knowledge of later periods to assess the long-term 'revolutionary' effects of Peter's policies.

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 2006**

Napoleon I

1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and B on support for Napoleon during the Hundred Days. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages agree that there was much popular support, based on a revival of revolutionary ideas and fears about a return to the *Ancien Régime*, rather than support rooted in support for Napoleon *per se*. The ideas are more developed in Passage **B**, explaining that support was found not just among peasants, but also among the small-town bourgeoisie.

Differences: Passage **A** comments that popular enthusiasm waned, and that Napoleon failed to win over notables whilst Passage **B** notes support from the army and old officials. In Passage **A**, the notables feared a *new despotism* while in Passage **B** the peasants hoped for an end to *repression* with fewer taxes.

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, without the support of the notables, Napoleon's hold on power in 1815 was bound to be shortlived. [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.

Passages **A** and **B** point to the potential for support if Napoleon capitalised on the nature of popular support (i.e. the revolutionary heritage). This Napoleon was unwilling to do (Passage **A**) and preferred to woo notables – this attempt failed (Passage **A**) despite attempts to revise the constitution to meet notable aspirations (Passages **C** and **D**). Napoleon was unwilling to capitalise on Jacobin support (Passages **A**, **D**) or make sufficient concessions to notables (Passage **D**). There was much opposition in any case, especially from royalist/catholic areas (Passages **D**, **C**). Notables believed Napoleon had not changed (Passage **C**). In addition, candidates may refer to other factors, such as: war-weariness, indifference (abstentions – Passages **C**, **D**), the overall narrowness of support especially after 1812 and especially in the west of France, the attitude of Allies and the formation of a resilient Quadruple Alliance, defeat at Waterloo – many answers may especially link these last two together to help explain why Napoleon's resurgence was brief. Some may also make valuable use of the reasons for his first overthrow and show that these were still very pertinent (perhaps even more so) in 1815.

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 Assess the claim that, as First Consul, Napoleon was the ‘heir to the French Revolution’. [45]

Debate: Napoleon as heir to the 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.

Candidates may address some of the following ideas:

Heir to Revolution – some answers may point to arguments used by defenders of Napoleon referring to Napoleonic statements about the new regime, the defence of property, religious toleration, equality before the law, meritocracy, education and so forth. **Not Heir to the Revolution** - Candidates should balance this by assessment of the critics by consideration of the alternative, for example: elements of a police state (Fouché, censorship, propaganda, police), restrictions on liberty (e.g. of the press, of movement), sham popular sovereignty (Constitutions), the tendency to dictatorship over time and so forth. **Other ideas:** Some may point to the argument that Napoleon can be seen as ‘heir to revolution’ because he was a product of the revolutionary 1790s and the increasing involvement of the military in civil affairs, especially under the Directory – he was, in Robespierre’s phrase, a ‘Messiah in army boots’.

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 'Napoleon was not a military genius.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Debate: Napoleon's genius as a commander.

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 examine the claims to military genius – victories, campaigns (e.g. Marengo, Ulm-Austerlitz, Jena-Auerstadt, Friedland, Wagram), plus motivation of men, supposed strategic and tactical brilliance (envelopment, central position, tactics and adaptability in battle), organisation and planning (corps system, *bataillon carré*), personal bravery and so on. These need to be balanced against criticisms/counter-claims – Napoleon's ability needs to be seen in context of power of French state, the strengths of the French army he inherited (tactics: e.g. mixed order, skirmishers, artillery, divisions, *amalgame*, *levée en masse*, living off the land), weakness of enemies (trapped in 18th century warfare, lower quality officer corps, poorly motivated troops, divided coalitions), supposed decline of Napoleon after the heady days of 1805-07. Candidates may also use subtler arguments: yes he was a great general, but he was no genius – a blunderer often dependent on the abilities of others, e.g. Desaix, Davout, Murat.

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 D about how far Disraeli's attitude and policies were responsible for the disasters in Afghanistan and South Africa. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both Passages blame Disraeli's subordinates - in B for *extravagant deeds* and in D for *headstrong behaviour*, and behind them was Disraeli so he is to blame through his *flamboyant speeches* in B and his *bad judgement* in appointing them in D. Passage D offers up excuses for Disraeli and B does accept that he was not to blame for what actually happened.

Differences: B blames Disraeli because of his views of *national prestige and honour*, his underlying attitude of *expansionism* and his obsessive *fear of Russia* and desire to *protect India*. D is less condemning and says there is no evidence Disraeli *wanted a forward policy*, he had *bad luck*, Lytton *miscalculated* while the *India Office favoured a defensive position* and Frere ignored *orders to proceed with caution*.

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 how far Gladstone's criticisms of Disraeli's Imperial policy were justified. [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.

Gladstone in **A** directly and in **C** indirectly condemns Disraeli for his rash policy with its costs, both human and financial as immoral and expensive adventures. He asserts that safeguarding the road to India is far from justifying this evil behaviour in **A** and in **C** goes further and claims Disraeli was using Imperialism to set up an oriental despotism as evidenced by making Victoria Empress of India. Candidates might well indicate that the circumstances of Gladstone's attacks could mean some exaggeration for his own political ends, but equally could refer to his well known moral stance over foreign affairs. Passage **B** claims Disraeli did not give detailed support to campaigns in Afghanistan and South Africa and the Zulu war was not his fault and **D** supports this. But **B** argues that Disraeli's general outlook and ideas of national prestige and honour mean Gladstone was justified to an extent. The real defence of Disraeli comes in Passage **D** with the failure of ministers and the 'men on the spot' to work within the policies they were given. Candidates could add that Disraeli had some responsibility for appointments, notably Lytton, and some historians argue this strongly. **C** does also defend Disraeli to an extent indicating Gladstone's charges were unreal and a lurid interpretation which Disraeli's alleged beliefs and conversation about the monarchy had made just about credible. Some historians take this latter view while others consider the threats from Russia justified moves in Afghanistan where they argue that traditional British policy was being followed. Several of Disraeli's biographers defend his actions as the Passages show.

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 far was Disraeli's rise to become leader of the Conservative Party by 1868 the result of luck? [45]

Debate: the role of the various factors in Disraeli's rise such as luck, his own abilities and the Second Reform Act.

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.

Disraeli had some luck, although given his age when he became Tory leader he might not have agreed. The break up of the Tories after 1846 moved him to the front bench, albeit in opposition. Gladstone, who would have been a rival eventually, became a Liberal. But more major factors are likely to be argued by many candidates as having been of crucial importance, such as: Disraeli's oratorical powers, his ability to adapt (over Protectionism for example), his refusal to be cowed (over his 1852 budget). Disraeli never gave up. The Reform Act may be seen by many answers as his main triumph. Candidates could indicate that, even in 1872, his leadership was not that secure.

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 radical were the reforms at home and in Ireland in Gladstone's first ministry (1868-74)? [45]

Debate: how radical Gladstone's first ministry was.

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.

There is much debate as to how radical Gladstone was and how much influence radicals had in the Liberal party. Radical measures included the civil service and army reforms, supported by Gladstone as measures to improve national efficiency. The secret ballot was less palatable to Gladstone, but was pressed for by the radical Bright. The Education Act and Trade Union reforms were not seen as radical enough and Gladstone certainly defended Church Schools. With regard to Ireland, it has been argued that Gladstone's commitment has been overdone and that Disestablishment of the Church was largely a ploy to keep the Liberals united. Gladstone was renowned for choosing the best political moment to act. But radicals also welcomed the Act as an attack on privilege. The Land Act and the Irish Universities Bill have been seen as conservative measures responding to specific problems and, in the case of the Land Act especially, not going far enough. Candidates need not assess all of these reforms, but they should include discussion of both domestic and Irish reforms to have **access to Bands II and I**.

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 in Passages A and D about why Bismarck promoted the Hohenzollern Candidature. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages refer to Bismarck's own claims in his memoirs/recollections that war was inevitable. **Both** see the importance of the candidature – **D** says that it did start a war and **A** says that he needed a war and the candidature was promoted to this end.

Differences: Passage **A** accepts the memoirs; **D** rejects them. The essential difference is that for **A** it is part of a plan and for **D** only an 'iron in the fire' to be used if necessary. For **A**, Bismarck was aware that complete unification needed a war with France, hence the promotion of Leopold of Hohenzollern's claim; in direct contradiction, **D** sees it as implausible that Bismarck planned to use the Spanish claim. **D** sees it as impossible to predict that France would react in the way it did; **A** sees the candidature as part of a long term plan.

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 Bismarck's planned to unify Germany through war with France. [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 debate is on whether there was a long-term plan or at least an intention on Bismarck's part to complete unification by eradicating the threat from France, or whether Bismarck did not see war as inevitable or the inclusion of the southern states as being likely for some time. There is also debate about blame for the war: unscrupulous exploitation by Bismarck or the hysterical reaction by an unstable French regime. **A**, an older view influenced by Bismarck's memoirs, sees strong intentionality. France was not necessarily hostile and Bismarck continued military preparations and promoted a war as the only way to get reluctant German princes into the Empire. This may be confirmed by knowledge of the development of Krupp artillery and military growth after 1867 and the hostility to Prussia reflected in elections in South German states. However, it can be countered by knowledge of Bismarck's attitude towards more unification. **B** sees developments within Germany leading towards war. With a growing population, a large army and Russian support, Bismarck had the tools available for war against France. This could support the view then that the war followed from his policies, or could support an argument that war came about because of the logic of Prussian growth. The idea of inevitable victory can be challenged – there had been no certainty of Prussia victory in 1866 and there was none in 1870. France was still a great power and, even with the guns and railways, war was still a risk. Both campaigns depended heavily on mistakes by Prussia's opponents. **C** has Bismarck's famous quotation about ripe fruit. It was true there was anti-Prussian feeling in the South; that could cut both ways. Bismarck had nothing to gain from annexing hostile catholic populations but, alternatively, an alignment between France and the independent German states was a danger. The Passage indicate he considered war inevitable. Promotion of the Candidature could be set against this view that he was still uncertain and open-minded by 1869. Some may consider **D** rather far-fetched, with Napoleon put out by Luxembourg in 1867 and having to see the balance of power altered, with his regime resting on prestige and show to some extent, is it likely that the Hohenzollern candidate would not have been seen by all concerned as likely to provoke? There is a case for a sort of 'strategy of alternatives' here, but the Passage could be criticised.

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 Assess the view that the growth of Prussia from 1862 to 1871 was only possible because Bismarck took advantage of the weakness of other European states. [45]

Debate: whether external factors were necessary for Prussian growth.

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 is whether Prussian growth was determined by factors such as economic growth, military development, German national feeling or Bismarck's skills or whether the crucial factor was the European environment. This argument looks at the failures in 1848 and again at the failure of the Erfurt Union and then argues that the break up of the Crimean Alliance, the failure of Austria in Italy in 1859, the defeat of Russia in the Crimea and its concerns about internal reform and suppression of revolt in Poland, the failure of Denmark, Austria and France respectively to gain allies outside Germany gave Bismarck a uniquely favourable context. Candidates could focus more on Austria and France- the failure to develop military power and communications in a similar war to Prussia could be discussed; economic weaknesses relative to Prussia would be relevant; diplomatic failures could be analyzed. Counter arguments might stress Prussian developments – economic and military growth, strong leadership and diplomatic skill.

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 To what extent were the events of 1866-67 a defeat for German liberalism? [45]

Debate: the effects of war and the North German Confederation on the development of liberalism.

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 is about the implications of the war and the constitution of the North German Confederation. The 'Sonderweg' thesis is that liberalism was fatally compromised by its alliance with Prussian nationalism and military power; that the Liberals were hopelessly subservient to might rather than right after 1866; that by the indemnity bill they accepted illegality and bowed to *realpolitik*; that the North German Confederation was a mixture of Prussian greed (the annexed lands) and a sham parliamentary/federal structure that paved the way for the Reich constitution that somehow made 'Hitlerism' more likely. Against this stands the view that Bismarck's alliance with the National Liberals did lead to many aspects of liberalism in Germany, that the Indemnity Bill can be seen as a concession by Bismarck, that he did not take advantage of the nationalist furore in 1866, that the Constitution did not mean total Prussian domination and that the individual states kept rights. This view argues little continuity between the Germany of the 1860s and subsequent dictatorship.

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 1920-41

10(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C on the impact of the car industry on the US economy in the 1920s. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages provide positive views on the car industry. It employed millions of workers.

Differences: Passage **C** takes a generally positive view of the impact of the automobile industry. 'Fordism' led to mass production across all the industrial sector of the economy. By 1929, some 26 million cars were registered and car manufacture accounted for 13% of all manufactured goods. However, Passage **B** sees the car industry as having had a detrimental effect on the US economy in the 1920s. It led to unemployment in railroad and coal industries. Mass production also led to over-production and under-consumption, this development also being associated with the creation of large corporations which limited competition and price variations.

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 over-production during the economic boom of the 1920s caused economic collapse from 1929.

[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 **B** contains the evidence to suggest that over-production and, with it under-consumption, caused the economic collapse. Passage **A** suggests that share speculation overstretched finances and helped create excessive risk taking. Combined with own knowledge of the effect of Wall Street Crash on US economy, candidates will be able to argue a case where share activity in the boom was directly linked to collapse. Passage **C** suggests that economic boom aided the US consumer, in particular with cheap cars; there is no direct link in Passage **C** to a collapse. Instead, **C** suggests that new techniques created a second industrial revolution in the 1920s. Passage **D** suggests that Federal Government economic and tax policies aided the boom but also led to an uneven distribution of wealth. This, in turn, had an effect on creating the conditions for an economic collapse. Indicative own knowledge might include, for example: the dislocation of the world's trading system following the First World War, political instability around the world from late 1929. President Hoover used this as representing the main cause for economic collapse.

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 How far did national prohibition meet the aims of its supporters in the period 1920 to 1933? [45]

Debate: Evaluation of debate on the success of national 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 could mention that supporters of prohibition wanted to reduce crime against the family and in general across society. They wanted to see grain used generally in food rather than in alcohol production. They also wanted to preserve WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) values against immigrants such as the Irish, Germans and various Eastern Europeans. In the 1920s, crime in most parts of USA did fall in particular those associated with the family and general drunkenness. This was particularly true in rural and small town America, the WASP heartland. Some may argue that prohibition may also be seen as part of a wider WASP backlash against 'foreign influences' which could include limits on immigration, the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan and the religious revival of Protestant America in the 1920s. An alternative view deployed in answers could be that prohibition aided the development of violent crime associated with gangsters and bootleggers. It also led to an increase in political corruption, in particular in large cities with large immigrant communities such as Chicago and New York. The association of prohibition with law breaking forced many, including a large proportion of women to support the abolition of the 18th Amendment by 1930. Also, when the Depression hit the USA, the collapse of the brewing/distilling industry helped make economic matters worse.

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 To what extent have the achievements of the New Deal during the years 1933-41 been exaggerated? [45]

Debate: Evaluation of the New Deals to 1941.

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 favour of the New Deal candidates may mention that the New Deal prevented a complete economic collapse of the United States. In particular, the banking reforms and reform of the stock market prevented a return to the conditions which caused the Wall Street Crash. Acts candidates may mention include: the Emergency Banking Act 1933, the Glass-Steagall Act 1933, the Securities and Exchange Act 1933. They could consider how the New Deal reduced unemployment. The Second New Deal, in particular, introduced far reaching reforms, such as the Wagner Act on trade union rights and the Social Security Act. The Rural Electrification Administration as the Tennessee Valley Authority brought real economic benefits to poor rural areas. Against the New Deal, some may argue that unemployment was higher in 1941 than it had been in late 1929. It took the Second World War to bring about a complete economic recovery. Answers may mention that the New Deal had no clear overall economic plan, that New Deal agencies often duplicated the same functions and that it wasted a considerable amount of money. These were major criticisms of right-wing contemporary opponents and of right-wing historians since. Left-wing historians have criticised FDR for not being more radical: he saved American capitalism rather than fundamentally reforming it.

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 the Bolshevik Revolution 1903-24

13(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C about the strength of the Bolshevik Party in the summer of 1917. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Passage **B** refers to Lenin as a radical and in Passage **C** his radical programme is seen as responsible for Bolshevik growth in strength. Passage **B** says the Central Committee drew up policies and **C** mentions organised strengths. In **B**, mobs were transformed with Bolshevik encouragement and in **C** support for the party among mobs swelled.

Differences: Passage **B** focuses on the disunity in the Bolsheviks with three distinct groups as a weakening factor. Kamenev and Lenin are mentioned as having different views. Passage **C** argues that the Bolsheviks had clear principles and membership rose as a result. There is no hint of disunity. Passage **B** refers to mobs roaming the streets with no direction, but Passage **C** describes meetings and demonstrations which have no suggestion of aimlessness. Passage **B** sums up the Bolsheviks as fragmented and ineffective but Passage **C** says they were growing stronger.

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 Lenin's leadership was the key factor which enabled the Bolsheviks to pose a serious threat to the Provisional Government in 1917. [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 view that Lenin's leadership was crucial is best expressed in Passage **D** which suggests he saw what others missed. The last sentence of Passage **A** backs up this point. Passage **C** shows how hard Lenin worked to win over the peasants to what is described as his programme. Other evidence to illustrate Lenin's role could come from the April Theses or from the events just before the October revolution began. Alternative interpretations are indicated in all the Passages. Passage **C** argues that it was the Party as much as Lenin which won over the masses through its propaganda and its organisation. Candidates might well want to assert that Lenin did play a key part in developing these aspects of the party. Passage **D** concentrates on the role of the Soviet and sees control of this, for which Lenin aimed, as a key factor. Passage **B** argues that the Bolsheviks were too divided to do much but did help to turn the mobs into a more disciplined force which became a major threat to the stability of the government. Passage **A** sees the shortcomings of the Provisional Government after the failure of the Kornilov Coup as an important factor thus indicating an own goal view. It mentions the growing anarchy which Lenin implied was not orchestrated by the Bolsheviks. Candidates could develop this theme at length but only brief references are needed.

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 far do you agree with the view that the Bolshevik party mounted an increasingly effective challenge to Tsarism from 1903 to February 1917? [45]

Debate: the degree to which the Bolsheviks posed a real challenge in this period.

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.

There is some justification for the view that the Bolsheviks were effective resulting from the tight control exercised by Lenin over them as outlined in *What is to be Done?* Lenin's conviction that a second revolution could follow rapidly on from the first as long as the peasants were brought into play was also important. Their influence in the Soviets could be discussed. But there is much evidence against the effectiveness of the Bolsheviks: e.g. in the disunity in the SDs and the 1903 split, the lack of participation in 1905 (even if Lenin did refer to 1905 as a dress rehearsal for 1917), the prevalence of discord among the leaders which confused supporters in Russia. Lenin's emphasis on theory was not universally welcomed or accepted. Members of the Bolshevik party were either arrested or in exile. Other issues arising from the First World War could 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.

15 Assess the view that the Bolsheviks used terror tactics from 1918 to 1921 only because it was necessary to ensure victory in the Civil War. [45]

Debate: How far the use of terror was a natural part of Communist policy or how far it served a specific purpose.

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.

There is much debate as to the reasons behind the introduction of the terror. Some authorities flag up the difference between Marxist theory of the withering away of the state and the greater centralisation introduced by Lenin. The survival of the Bolshevik government was dependent on terror to some extent, given the increasing disillusionment of the proletariat with the new regime and the political challenges to its rule in 1918. Wartime could justifiably be claimed to need extraordinary measures. The activities of the Cheka in eliminating opposition, whether organised or sporadic, could be seen as having a dual function both to strengthen the party by eliminating counter-revolutionaries and to win the war. There is a view that Lenin himself urged violence, especially towards kulaks, and evidence from telegrams and messages he sent may be referred to, although he tried to cultivate a more humane reputation and rarely put his signature to death warrants. His participation aimed to preserve party unity at all costs in the midst of economic and military upheaval, but can be seen as implicit in the regime from the start.

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 B about Britain's policy towards Czechoslovakia in 1938. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages agree that Hitler would have gone to war and that France was weak (in **A**, France had virtually no air force; in **B**, France would not have gone to war) so **both** agree that Chamberlain faced the danger of war and had weak potential allies (**B** also says that Russia would not have been effective) Thus **both** agree on the context in which Chamberlain conducted his policy. **Both** agree that if Chamberlain had gone to war, then Hitler would have won – **A** mentions certain victory and **B** says that Germany would have won after a short campaign.

Differences: **A** sees no betrayal of the Czechs – Chamberlain saved her. Though this partially accords with **B**'s view of a likely Czech defeat, there is a difference – that Chamberlain was wrong to press the Czechs to agree. **A** in contradiction thinks that he gave them a chance of a new life. **B** raises the criticism, not found in **A**, that Chamberlain should have remained isolated from Czech affairs, while **A** sees Chamberlain rightly engaged with a wider European problem of removal of bad feelings.

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 Chamberlain was right to appease Hitler at the 1938 Munich Conference. [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 debate is whether Chamberlain was rightly aware of Britain's limitations and bought time to rearm and also convinced British and world opinion that when war came it was the only option, or whether he threw away the chance of using the Czech army and the Franco-Russian alliance to make a stand against Hitler. Also whether he was guilty of betraying the Czechs or whether he saved them. Though **A** and **B** agree that the chances of French help were low, **B** raises the moral issue of whether Chamberlain had a right to interfere at all. **A** argues that Chamberlain's motives were worthy and that he bought time. Knowledge of the growth of air defences might be deployed here as well as consideration of the alternative of a grand alliance and Czechoslovakia's 35 divisions and defences. **C** refers to the case against, raised by Churchill, and refers not only to moral disaster but to the loss of France's eastern alliance system. It is open to criticism as it was not clear that Eastern European countries, fearful of Russia and with economic links with Germany and some political sympathy with Nazi notions, would have been likely to stand against Hitler. **D** stresses public opinion, refers to anti-Communism and the pro-appeasement attitude of the monarchy and the masses who so openly cheered in 1938. This can be supported by press responses, the cheering crowds at Heston, the fears of another World War I bloodbath. Against this can be set opposing views, both contemporary and since, that Munich merely encouraged aggression and undermined possible alliances that might have deterred Hitler. A wide range of additional knowledge is possible here, so it is important that examiners do not expect any specific material.

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 Assess the view that British policy towards Germany from 1919 to 1932 was based on an unrealistic desire to avoid being involved in European affairs. [45]

Debate: the wisdom of British policy to Germany 1919-32.

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 is between the view that Britain withdrew from its responsibilities, feeling that Versailles was unjust, the French unworthy of support and the League of Nations not worth committing wholeheartedly to. This has been seen as unrealistic as it led to a lowering of defence spending to levels which later constrained action, led to an encouragement of German hopes of treaty revision, left Britain without adequate allies and unprepared for the German resurgence after 1933. Other views see Britain as more involved in international affairs: the post-Versailles conferences, the League, Locarno, the Dawes and the Young Plans. Others question whether in the context of the time it would have been politically realistic to undertake any other policy, given public opinion, increased imperial commitments, a weak economy and unreliable potential allies.

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 How far do you agree that the strengthening of British defences was the main reason why Chamberlain's policy towards Germany changed after March 1939? [45]

Debate: why policy to Germany in 1939 changed after March 1939.

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 argument is put forward that the unprecedented increase in arms expenditure in 1939, the development of RADAR and air defences, the introduction of conscription and the preparation of a BEF allowed more freedom and confidence to confront Hitler after March 1939. These improvements had not been present in September 1938, but they gave the government the confidence to declare war in September 1939 and to take a tougher stance from March 1939 (there is a debate about how far this went, but even if there were elements of appeasement and even if the Polish guarantee did not cover territorial integrity, the general tenor of policy changed). Alternative explanations focus on public opinion, shocked by the occupation of Prague; or a growing feeling among conservatives that Churchill was right; or a shift in cabinet opinion, say by Halifax; or changing opinion in the Dominions. Some argue that the Nazi-Soviet Pact was something of a turning point. The question invites candidates to set different possible explanations against the build up of defences and evaluate explanations.

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 C on the benefits of the Marshall Plan. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: **Both** Passages suggest that there were economic benefits to the USA through the Marshall Plan. The whole thrust of **A** is the ‘extra business’ that US companies will be able to generate in order to keep plants working at full capacity. **C** also concentrates on the domestic economic concerns of the USA: Without financial assistance, Europe would not be able to act as a market for US goods.

Differences: **C** suggests that others also benefited from the Marshall Plan. **C** suggests that Marshall was shocked by the devastation and economic suffering he witnessed in Europe, and recognized that economic support and assistance were desperately needed. In **C**, Churchill describes Marshall Aid as the most unselfish act in history because it provided Europe with much-needed aid. Although in **A** Westinghouse does dress up their business schemes as a Practical Program of Action For World Progress’ there is little else here to refute Molotov’s claim that the Marshall Plan was dollar diplomacy. **C** is much more convincing than **A** in promoting the view that there were other significant beneficiaries of Marshall Aid.

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.

19(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Marshall Plan was an act of selfless generosity by the USA. [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.

In terms of own knowledge, candidates should be able to discuss a variety of interpretations from giving selfless help to needy West Europeans, to preventing the spread of communism (basically, the financial clout behind the Truman Doctrine), to dollar diplomacy (an attempt by the US to implant an informal American Empire in Europe). These interpretations are all referred to in the Passages. Passage **D** describes the Marshall Plan as an act of 'selfless generosity', but explains that this was the view of traditional western historians. In **C**, Churchill (himself a 'cold warrior') is quoted as describing Marshall Aid as 'the most unselfish act in history'. **D** suggests that other western historians have seen the Marshall Plan as the 'economic muscles' behind the Truman Doctrine while Soviet historians saw it as a 'cunning plan' for the US to gain control over the 'global economy'. **B** suggests that the US had a desire to strengthen Europe's 'market economy' in order to lessen the appeal of a communist-style planned economy. **C** also explains that the USA was concerned that an economically weak Europe would be bad for the American economy with the attendant 'danger of economic recession in the USA'. Passage **A** demonstrates a clear contemporary understanding in the US that the Marshall Plan was a golden opportunity for US businesses, whilst also referring to the urgent need in other countries for 'US goods and services'.

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 'Disputes at Yalta and Potsdam were more important than previous war-time disagreements in the collapse of the Grand Alliance in 1945'. How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Debate: why the wartime Grand Alliance broke down in 1945.

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 must consider the key disputes that divided the allies at Yalta and Potsdam. They may display knowledge of arguments about the future of Germany and the increasing unease of Stalin's allies at the Red Army's actions in Eastern Europe, most especially outside Warsaw in 1944. Answers may consider how disagreements about the shape of post-war Germany and Poland became more critical at Yalta and Potsdam. Candidates may evaluate the importance of these disputes to the collapse of the Grand Alliance, setting them against other causes of wartime conflict. Answers may 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 in 1942-44 this was a highly significant disagreement. Candidates may consider the degree to which Roosevelt and Churchill had very different views of the post-war world, for example over the existence of the British Empire. Some may argue that the 'Percentages Agreement' between Churchill and Stalin demonstrates that both saw victory as an opportunity to extend 'spheres of influence' in time-honoured fashion. Answers may highlight ideological differences between the capitalist democracies and the Soviet Union. Deep-seated differences between the west and the USSR could be seen as having united unlikely partners in a stormy relationship that was never likely to survive its original purpose – defeat of the Axis. Roosevelt's death and his replacement by Truman at Potsdam could be seen as making the collapse of the Alliance much more likely because of the strong anti-Soviet stance Truman took. Answers might argue convincingly in favour of the assertion in the question, but many may choose not to.

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 view that Stalin's main foreign policy concern in the period from 1944 to 1949 was the defence and security of the Soviet Union. [45]

Debate: Stalin's foreign policy goals 1944-49.

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 how and why Stalin's take-over of Eastern Europe can **both** be viewed as a response to the need for future Soviet security, **and** as a deliberate expansion of Russia's empire, should be displayed. Knowledge as to how the take-over has been subject to various interpretations, both at the time and by historians will be evident. Candidates may make the point that in 1944 Stalin's main aim was the defeat of Germany and that this led to the Red Army freeing much of Eastern Europe from the Nazis. Answers may consider the consequent significance of the takeover of the 'satellite states' in the wake of Red Army advances - both as an essential defence mechanism (against another invasion by Germany in the future &/or an invasion by the USA/Britain) and/or as an attempt to extend Stalin's 'sphere of influence'. Candidates may display understanding of developments in the satellite states in order to shed light on Stalin's motivation, e.g. considering 'rigged' elections in various states during 1945-47. Some may look at the crisis over Berlin in 1948-49 as revealing Stalin's objectives. The Greek Civil War might be used to argue against Stalin's aggression – Stalin kept his promise not to aid the communist party there. Candidates may look at various developments in/by the West and argue that steps taken by Stalin were defensive reactions (e.g. Comecon following the Marshall Plan). Answers need to consider the relative importance of Stalin's various possible motivations for the take-over of Eastern Europe.

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 2006

England 1066-1228**The Government of England 1066-1216**

1 'The most important change in English central government in the period from 1066 to 1216 was the development of the office of chief justiciar.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

Focus: assessment of the relative importance of the development of the office of chief justiciar compared with other changes in English central government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

From its origins in the role played by Ranulf Flambard in William Rufus' reign, through its explicit development in the time of Henry I, to its full expression under Hubert Walter, the office of chief justiciar was increasingly important. It was part of the mechanism by which English government could function with an absentee king. By the reign of Henry II the justiciar was a great officer in the state having both vicegerent duties and presiding over the Exchequer. However, developments in the Exchequer itself, with the holding of annual accounts and the recording of them in the Pipe Rolls, for example, were essential to the systematic control and exploitation of finance which was so important to effective government in the period. Candidates could also argue that the most important changes were in Henry II's reign with the judicial innovations such as the use of assizes e.g. novel disseisin or mort d'ancestor, and the general eyre. Some candidates may wish to point out that the development of the office of chief justiciar was, like the other major changes, just part of the whole growth of centralisation and bureaucratic government throughout the period.

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 did the role of feudalism in the military organisation of England show continuity throughout the period from 1066 to 1216?

Focus: evaluation of the degree of change in the role of feudalism in the military organisation of England.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Throughout the period feudalism provided some of the answer to England's military needs but was never the only factor in the military organisation of the kingdom. It was always possible to perform military service in person but even William I, who established in England the most feudal state in western Europe, supplemented the host with mercenaries. The reliance on feudal service gradually declined as time went on. William II was using paid knights and this trend continued under Henry I when there was also a decrease in the length of knight service. Stephen paid for more knights, serjeants and foot soldiers, even though he continued to use the feudal cavalry. Examples of commutation of knight service in the form of scutage occur quite early and become more frequent in the Angevin period. Henry II certainly preferred to raise money from his knights to spend on professional soldiers rather than insist on their military contribution and by John's reign feudalism was a system of land holding. In reaching their evaluation, some may question the very idea of feudalism.

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 To what extent was baronial reaction to years of strong government the main cause of poor relations between crown and nobles in the period from 1066 to 1216?

Focus: evaluation of the claim that baronial reaction to years of strong government was the main cause, in comparison with other factors, of poor relations between crown and nobles.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Relations between crown and nobles were at their poorest in times of rebellion and these occur throughout the period e.g. the rebellion of Roger of Hereford in 1075; of Odo of Bayeux in 1088; the rebellion of 1095; the great rebellion of 1173-74; and arguably most serious, the rebellions under Stephen and John. Some candidates may assess the reasons for a number of these and this should gain credit but it is likely that most may concentrate on the reasons for poor relations in the reigns of Stephen and John, perhaps comparing them only briefly with other rebellions. Candidates may argue that reaction to years of strong government was the main cause of poor relations in these reigns: Stephen followed Norman government at its height under William I and Henry I; and John was blamed for 60 years of Angevin strong rule. The great rebellion of Henry II's reign could also be seen as reaction to 20 years of strong government; the fundamental cause of the rebellion of 1095 was probably William I's severe government and even the rebellion of 1075 could be attributed to the expansion of royal control in the Marches. However, a range of other factors needs to be considered too. Candidates may include the personality of the kings involved: Stephen was brave but unreliable, unable to rule men and lacked perseverance. John was not trusted by the barons and was seen as cruel and opportunistic. Neither Stephen nor John kept the support of the church, Henry of Blois, for example, defecting from Stephen. Some candidates may consider the part played by continental possessions in creating tension between kings and nobles: barons in Stephen's reign found difficulty in having different overlords in Normandy and England and this echoes the cause of rebellion in 1088. John's loss of Normandy not only led to demands for money for his unpopular Norman campaigns but also meant that he was present in England for much of the time and so was the subject of hostility which might otherwise have been directed against the justiciar.

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.

Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228**4 ‘Lanfranc did more than other archbishops of Canterbury to strengthen the English Church.’ Assess this claim with reference to the period from 1066 to 1228.**

Focus: evaluation of the work of Lanfranc compared with that of other archbishops in strengthening the English church.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Answers do not need to consider every archbishop of this period in relation to Lanfranc, but they do need to consider a number across the full period. Most likely archbishops for consideration against Lanfranc may be (in chronological order) Anselm, Becket, Langton but this list is not exclusive.

Although Lanfranc (1070-89) was dependent on William I and even the decrees of his synods had no force without royal approval, under Lanfranc’s leadership the English Church gained in power and prestige. It was a vital organ in William’s establishment of Norman rule. Through his reforms Lanfranc was able to bring the English Church into the mainstream of the European Church without entangling it in the investiture contest. His reforming councils gave it a sense of unity and these, and recognition by York of Lanfranc’s personal primacy, gave it structure and order. With William’s agreement a degree of separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction was established which opened the way to further development. However, Lanfranc’s achievements need to be set against those of other archbishops of Canterbury and compared. Some candidates may argue that Becket (1162-70) went further in establishing the independence of the church. His insistence on separate treatment of the clergy in ecclesiastical courts led to more independence of the church courts and clarification of areas of jurisdiction. After his death, Becket’s canonisation and Henry’s doing penance at his shrine helped to strengthen the reputation of the church in the eyes of the laity. On the other hand, candidates may also point out that Becket did things which undermined the church’s strength: his exile did nothing to enhance the power of the English church and his activities also allowed more papal intervention which could be said to be strengthening papal control over the church. Becket’s quarrel with Henry II led Henry to try to bring the bishops under his control.

In his attempt to strengthen the English church in line with papal reform, Anselm (1093-1109) brought the investiture dispute to England, and was also in exile for some of his pontificate, both potentially damaging developments. However, candidates may point to his eventual compromise with Henry I that helped to increase the independence of the church since Henry gave up the right to investiture, and also to his fame as a theologian which lent prestige to the church. By contrast, Langton (1207/13-28) did little to strengthen the church. John would not allow him into England until 1213 and meanwhile confiscated church property. Innocent III’s placing England under an Interdict and excommunicating King John led most English bishops to flee abroad and Langton himself was later suspended by the pope.

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 To what extent did the role of the papacy in English affairs change during the period from 1066 to 1228?

Focus: evaluation of the degree of change in the role of the papacy in English affairs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

With the growth of papal authority, there was arguably more dramatic intervention by the pope as time went on. Lanfranc was able to resist Gregory VII's summons to Rome; by contrast, Innocent III put England under an Interdict and suspended Langton as archbishop of Canterbury. Some candidates may emphasise this change. There was also a variety of ways in which the papacy involved itself in English affairs. Support for the archbishop was an example: Urban II supported Anselm against William II and the pope initially gave his backing to Becket in the quarrel with Henry II but popes also intervened to undermine archbishops' authority, giving support to Henry of Blois as legate or supporting York against Becket. Some popes got involved for political reasons, including threatening an Interdict in order to try to resolve the Becket affair and imposing one in order to bring John to heel. Papal suspension of Langton was also prompted by the English political situation. Encouraging appeals to Rome or giving support to Stephen could be seen as papal attempts to gain greater freedom for the English church. Candidates may argue that, rather than suggesting a change in the role of the papacy during the period, papal interventions demonstrate that the same sort of variety existed throughout. Indeed, candidates may point out that consistency in the papal role is more noticeable than changes in it. It is also arguable that during the whole period the pope's role in English affairs was to strengthen his own position over the church and in relation to the monarch; it was both an expression of papal power and an enhancement of 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); 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 'The most important development in English monasticism was the expansion of the Cistercians in the middle of the twelfth century.' How far do you agree with this judgement in relation to the period from 1066 to 1228?

Focus: evaluation of the importance of the expansion of the Cistercians in the middle of the twelfth century compared with other developments in English monasticism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

In the middle of the twelfth century the Cistercians underwent a period of rapid expansion in England. They were the most radically different of the new Orders offering a highly attractive mix of simplicity, poverty, humility and righteousness which led to converts from the older orders and to the foundation of new houses. They brought new life to English monasticism and tried to avoid the temptations which had beset the older orders. Their success led Cistercian houses to become wealthy and for hundreds of lay brethren as well as monks to be subject to their abbots. However, although they were the most radical they were not the first of the new orders to appear in England. Candidates may argue that developments under Henry I were more significant: the Augustinians, Gilbertines and Savigniacs, for example, helped to contribute to the golden age of English monasticism. All offered a purer life than the increasingly worldly Benedictines and so attracted not only members but also supporters who furthered English monasticism either by founding new monasteries, as in the case of Henry I with his great abbey at Reading, or by their gifts. It is possible that some candidates may argue that the most important development in English monasticism came with the appointment of Lanfranc. He was responsible for bringing English monasticism into the European mainstream and without this it might have been much more difficult for the new orders to gain a foothold. He revolutionised life in English abbeys, e.g. at Canterbury, sweeping away many of the more idiosyncratic English customs. He brought over abbots and monks from Normandy, some of whom made a distinguished contribution to monasticism, e.g. at St. Albans. At the other end of the period some candidates may argue that the most important development was the arrival of the friars in 1221 for they offered a completely new form of monasticism.

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.

England 1485-1603**Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603****7 How important were disputes over the succession to the English throne as a cause of rebellion during this period?**

Focus: evaluation of the succession as a cause of Tudor rebellions.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The issue of the succession was a recurring cause of rebellion – in 1486 (Lovel), 1487 (Simnel), 1497 (Warbeck), 1536 (Pilgrimage in favour of Mary), 1553 (Northumberland in favour of Lady Jane Grey), 1554 (Wyatt in favour of Elizabeth), 1569 (Northern Earls in favour of Mary Stuart), 1601 (Essex). The 1571, 1583 and 1586 Catholic plots in the name of Mary also caused difficulties even if they did not provoke rebellion. Candidates have enough material here to focus entirely on the succession but they should nevertheless set this factor against other causes. They should at least be aware that religious and economic factors played a major role and that, for instance in the 1549 Western and Kett's rebellion), the succession was not in dispute.

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 Explain why Tudor authorities were so concerned about rebellion and disorder throughout this period.

Focus: explanation for authorities' concern over rebellion and disorder.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should seek to explain why central and local authorities were so concerned when a rebellion or disturbance broke out. Social and political stability depended on mutual respect for the law and civil obedience; if these broke down, there was no standing army or police to restore order quickly. Central governments could find their policies threatened, prominent ministers vilified, a régime's legitimacy questioned, and, if disorder persisted or spread, the country could become vulnerable to invasion (as in 1549). County and local authorities were rarely caught up in high politics but they were held responsible for dealing with minor problems, especially social and economic, before they got out of hand. Some candidates may well focus their answer on society's theoretical concerns about disorder and use examples from 'real' revolts by way of illustration.

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 'Not every rebellion was a total failure although every rebellion ended in defeat for the rebels.' Assess this view of Tudor rebellions.

Focus: evaluation of rebels' achievements in the light of their aims and overall failure.

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 appreciate, some rebellions achieved some of their aims. The best examples are the Cornish rebellion and Amicable Grant protests, which saw no further tax impositions; the Pilgrimage of Grace and Northern Earls rebellion, which resulted in reforms to the Council of the North; and the peasant revolts of 1536, which led to Henry VIII recoiling from making more radical religious changes. In general, however, most rebellions failed to achieve their main aims. Examples of 'total failure' are Lovel, Simnel, Warbeck, Western, Kett, Wyatt and Essex, in that none of their main aims was achieved and the ringleaders were executed. However, the greatest number of casualties occurred in 1536 and 1569-70.

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.

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603**10 How far did Spain's impact on English domestic affairs change during the period from 1485 to 1603?**

Focus: assessment of Spain's changing impact on English domestic affairs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Spain was of importance to England throughout the Tudor period in respect of trade, finance, political security, dynastic and religious concerns. At the outset, Henry VII signed a political and economic treaty that served both England and Castile-Aragon, and established matrimonial links that played a more prominent part in Henry VIII's reign. Military alliances against France had a serious impact on royal finances under Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary, and Elizabeth's war against Spain proved equally damaging. Trade with Spain and her dependencies, notably the Netherlands, was another important influence until the 1570s. Political security was of the utmost importance to the Tudors: until 1558 Spain was an ally although not all Englishmen (notably Wyatt) appreciated the link but Philip II's growing support for Mary Stuart after 1568 led to serious repercussions for Elizabeth.

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 Explain why Scotland ceased to be an enemy of England in the course of this period.

Focus: explanation for Scotland's changing relationship with England.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Several factors should be cited. Firstly, the personal attitude of Tudor rulers: Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth pursued non-aggressive policies towards Scotland but Henry VIII and the Duke of Somerset were antagonistic. Secondly, France consistently exploited Scottish politics to weaken England but in 1560 the court faction was expelled from Edinburgh and never again exercised a divisive influence. Thirdly, dynastic links between the Tudors and Stuarts, established by Henry VII but weakened by Henry VIII, indirectly led to James VI's claim to the English throne and his keenness to improve Anglo-Scottish relations.

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 How important were dynastic factors in shaping Tudor foreign policy?

Focus: evaluation of dynastic influences 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 are likely to consider how dynastic factors affected foreign policy-making and to compare them with other factors. Dynastic issues played an important part in the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary but less so under Edward and Elizabeth. Candidates should seek to bring out these differences and discuss their relative influence upon policy-making. Other factors, of course, had an impact too: political, religious, economic and personal influences, for example, and we can expect dynastic issues to be compared with some of them. However, candidates who largely ignore dynastic factors should be **confined to Band III** and below; and those who totally ignore dynastic factors should **not gain a mark above Band IV**.

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.

England 1558-1689**The Development of Limited Monarchy in England 1558-1689****13 To what extent was Charles II's government more effective than other English governments from 1558 to 1689?**

Focus: evaluation of Charles II's administration compared with rulers from 1558.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The effectiveness of government rested on how the ruler managed his/her resources when dealing with particular problems e.g. the maintenance of internal peace and order; management of the country's finances and economy; handling of parliament and political elites in the counties; administration of the Church and religious issues; resolution of social problems; the country's defence and national security. How candidates measure 'effective' may well determine the quality of their answer. Some will vote in favour of Charles II; some may support Elizabeth. Keep an open mind for different approaches and do not expect candidates to cover all aspects of 'effective' in their answer.

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 How far did the personalities of English monarchs determine their relations with parliament from 1558 to 1689?

Focus: Evaluation of personalities and other factors in causing difficulties with parliament.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The personality of the monarch was always an important element in determining how smooth relations with parliament would be. Elizabeth and Charles II had fewer difficulties partly due to their attractive, even appealing, characters; on the other hand, James I, Charles I and James II never gained parliament's trust and support. That said, difficulties between monarchs and their parliaments were also due to unwelcome government policies and ministers, and to parliament's rising constitutional 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.

15 Which religious group presented the greatest challenge to the crown from 1558 to 1689? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of at least one religious group that challenged to the crown.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

What candidates understand by the phrase 'greatest challenge' will have a crucial bearing on their line of argument. Challenging the crown's authority in the Commons and Convocation (Puritan MPs), in the law courts (the Seven Bishops), in the parishes (Anglican ministers), in plotting against the crown (Roman Catholics) and in refusing to conform (Protestant sects and recusants) were all examples of opposition to the crown. Some groups were more organised, popular and threatening than others and came closer to achieving their objectives. This criterion may be viewed as evidence of 'greatest challenge'. Only one religious group need be evaluated although we can expect better answers to compare it with other groups to meet the requirement of 'the greatest challenge'.

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.

Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689**16 How far did the Church of England grow in strength during the period from 1559 to 1689?**

Focus: Evaluation of the Church of England's strength during this period.

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 strength of the Church thematically across the period 1559-1689 but some may produce a chronological account. How candidates assess 'strength' will probably determine the quality of their answer. Better candidates will recognise that the Church changed in character, aims, composition and strength as time passed. Defender of the monarchy, guardian of the Protestant faith, upholder of moral standards, and increasing involvement in high politics could be considered strengths but set against these developments were the continuing low salaries of the lesser clergy, an excessive work load and frequent clashes with the crown, dissenters and House of Commons. Progress was far from uniform. It was certainly stronger in 1689 than in 1559 but it was weak in the period 1642-60 and recovered thereafter. 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 (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 To what extent was the reign of Charles I the main turning-point in the development of attitudes towards English Catholics from 1558 to 1689?

Focus: Assessment of changing attitudes towards English Catholics.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

In 1625 English Catholics were unpopular but tolerated by an overwhelmingly Protestant government; penal laws existed but were rarely enforced, Jesuits roamed the country, and a handful of bishops held views not dissimilar from Catholics. By 1649 English Catholics were prosecuted by the courts, the royal court was deemed to have been tainted by French Catholics, Laud was judged to have been a pseudo-Catholic and parliament was convinced there had been an Irish plot to invade England. Thereafter, Catholics were hounded by parliament, most notably during the years 1678-81, and only protected by Charles II and James II. The Toleration Act however made no allowance for them. An argument, however, can be made that Elizabeth began the persecution after her Excommunication in 1570, and that this continued intermittently under James I. The Gunpowder plot was the nadir of Catholic fortunes but his relaxation of the penal laws enabled them to recover. Expect candidates to compare Charles I's reign with at least one other turning-point.

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 Explain why government policies towards Protestant non-conformists changed during the period from 1558 to 1689.

Focus: Explanation for changing government policies 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 policies 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 because they threatened the unity of the Church and the Queen's authority as head of state. James I was willing to tolerate Puritans but not Presbyterians after his Scottish experiences 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 (1649-60) changed the prospects of non-conformists. They grew in number and ambition but this posed a threat to Cromwell's sense of order and discipline, and the more radical sects were attacked. Thereafter, the later Stuarts could not ignore them although the Restoration Settlement put them on the defensive. Presbyterians, Quakers, Baptists and other minority sects were again persecuted by parliament and the Anglican Church, although Charles II protected select groups. Limited toleration was finally granted to them in 1689 at the insistence of William III and leading Whigs. Cromwell, Charles II and James II had different attitudes from their Parliaments and better candidates may well point out how the executive, advisory and legislative elements of government influenced policy-making.

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 1498-1610**The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610****19 To what extent did the Catholic Church in France assist in the development of the nation state from 1498 to 1610?**

Focus: Evaluation of the Catholic Church 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 should look at how the Catholic Church assisted in the development of the nation state. It was a force for unity and cohesion in France for much of the period, strengthening the crown, many noble families and most of the French people. Yet the church could also be a divisive influence, challenging royal policies, undermining liberal-minded monarchs, fomenting civil disobedience and, in its persecution of heretics, destabilising communities.

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 Assess how far France became a more unified state during the period from 1498 to 1610.

Focus: Evaluation of France's state and society in this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to consider political and geographical unification, central (and possibly local) administration, the crown's relations with *parlements*, social and economic factors tending towards unity, and the role of religion as a unifying/ divisive agent. Some candidates may question the extent that civil war revealed fissures in society and left wounds damaging to the state's unification and unity; and the effects of civil war should be contrasted with developments towards absolutism evident in the first half of the period. There should be a real attempt to compare 1498 with 1610 and to explain significant developments between these years.

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 How far did Henry IV continue the domestic policies of the previous kings of France from 1498?

Focus: Assessment of Henry IV's domestic policies in the context of the 16th century.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Henry brought an end to 30 years of civil war and began the process of restoring and strengthening the crown's authority in respect of the nobility and *parlements*, and so continued the policies of Louis XII, Francis I and Henry II. Unlike Francis I and Henry II, he did not believe in religious persecution but continued the policies of Catherine de Medici, Charles IX (to a degree) and Henry III, in seeking to establish a Catholic Church which tolerated Huguenots. Social and economic policies, directed by Sully, were a strong feature of Henry IV's rule in contrast to the Valois rulers who showed little or no interest in the welfare of peasants, workers and merchants.

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 Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century

22 Assess the contribution of the Jesuits to the Catholic revival in the sixteenth century.

Focus: Assessment of the work and successes/limitations of the Jesuits between 1500 and 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 Jesuits in the 16th century and to examine their achievements by 1600. How they evaluate 'contribution' 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 and envy felt towards the Jesuits may be cited as reasons for their limited success by c.1600. Candidates should also examine other factors relevant to the Catholic revival (e.g. the papacy, Trent and the implementation of its decrees, other religious orders whether reformed or new, secular rulers), and use these as a benchmark to assess the relative importance of the Jesuits' contribution.

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 How far did the rule of Pope Paul III mark a turning-point in the development of the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century?

Focus: Evaluate Paul III's rule and compare it with other argued turning-points in the Catholic Reformation

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Paul III's pontificate saw many changes in the Catholic Church: the establishment of Jesuits, the foundation of the Roman Inquisition and Index, the convening of the Council of Trent, Paul's encouragement for reforming Italian bishops. In the light of the preceding 30 years or so and in the half-century that followed, his rule may well be judged as a turning-point in the development of the Catholic Church. However, candidates should evaluate other events and periods to see the real significance of his rule. For instance, some may argue that Paul continued ideas already in progress or that the Lutheran Reformation was a more important catalyst or that little happened until the publication of the Tridentine Decrees.

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 Which term better describes the development of the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century: 'Catholic Reformation' or 'Counter Reformation'? Explain your answer.

Focus: Comparison of Catholic and Counter Reformation terms.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Historians continue to argue whether the Catholic revival was independent of the Protestant reform movement, and so there was a Catholic Reformation, or whether the Church simply reacted to Protestantism to produce a Counter Reformation. Several developments in the later 16th century Catholic Church originated independently of Luther and Calvin (new orders and Jesuits, for instance) but other features were a result of the Protestant Reformation (e.g. the Council of Trent). Candidates should discuss the arguments for and against the use of these terms by referring to the main influences, both Protestant and Catholic, upon the Church during this period.

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 1598-1715**The Decline of Spain 1598-1700**

25 How far were Philip IV and Olivares able to halt the decline of the Spanish monarchy? Explain your answer with reference to the period from 1598 to 1700.

Focus: Evaluation of the work of Philip IV and Olivares in the context of the 17th century.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Philip IV's reign witnessed the beginning of Spain's decline politically and militarily, and some historians have held the king and Olivares responsible for this change in Spain's condition. Wars against England, France and Portugal, and revolts in Naples, Portugal, Catalonia and Aragon brought military defeats that were not reversed in the second half of the century. Philip IV inherited serious social, economic and financial problems, which were not solved by Olivares or Haro, his successor. Charles II was therefore left with a most inauspicious legacy. Some candidates may argue that advisers to Philip III, especially Lerma, halted any perceived decline after 1609 by improving finances and ending wars, and for a time in the 1620s the condition of the Spanish monarchy looked promising. Charles II and his ministers also tried to improve the country's finances and Maria wisely ended the war with Portugal, but decline was more apparent in respect of royal leadership, military defeats and deepening financial crises. **Band I** answers should focus on Philip IV and Olivares and compare the effects of their work with the reigns of Philip III and Charles II in respect of how far the Spanish monarchy 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 (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 extent of Spain's decline in the seventeenth century has been greatly exaggerated.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

Focus: Assessment of differing views of Spain's condition in the 17th century.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are not required to identify historians who have taken sides in this debate but they are expected to identify the basis of the argument and so decide whether the case for decline has been exaggerated. Kamen has claimed that Spain's economy was already in decline by 1600, a view shared by contemporary *arbitristas*. Indeed, he has asked whether Spain ever really rose? Geoffrey Parker has argued that Spain only began to decline after France emerged as an effective rival and this was not until the reign of Louis XIV. Philip IV retrospectively believed that Spain's entry into the Mantuan War (1628) was the turning-point. Yet his country's fortunes did not consistently decline. Indeed, the 1650s witnessed several upturns, although these coincided with the Fronde. Many candidates may write about financial and economic problems, military and naval defeats, political revolts and government incompetence. They should use these developments to illustrate a case for and against decline.

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 How important were wars against France in causing the decline of Spain during the seventeenth century? Explain your answer

Focus: Assessment of impact of wars against France in the 17th century decline of Spain.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Expect candidates to discuss domestic problems (especially financial/economic), rebellions (particularly in Catalonia and Portugal), military defeats (e.g. Rocroi and Lens), the loss of political influence (in Italy) and lands (Alsace and Dutch towns), and encouragement given to the United Provinces and England, resulting from wars with France (1628-31, and 1635-59). Defeat in three further wars – 1667-68, 1672-79 and 1689-97 – confirmed France's supremacy over Spain. Some candidates may assess the impact of war and/or compare its impact with other factors (or wars). A comparison is required to access the higher Bands.

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 Ascendancy of France 1610-1715**28 Assess the importance of Versailles in the development of French absolutism from 1610 to 1715.**

Focus: Evaluation of Versailles in the context of 17th century French absolutism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Versailles was more than a symbol of French absolutism: it enabled Louis XIV to exert control over 5000 nobles, to be the focal point of his administration and the centre of French culture. Its baroque structure housed a wealth of talent second to none in Europe and its life-style elevated Louis to the status of 'sun king'. Expect candidates to set the role and importance of Versailles in the context of the development of French absolutism in this period. Some may consider Versailles in comparison/ conjunction with other factors e.g. Louis' relationship with the French Church and Papacy, the expansion of the civil administration and armed forces. Either approach is acceptable. Some consideration may also be given to the limitations of French absolutism during this and earlier periods (from 1610), especially in terms of finance, *parlements* and the papacy.

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 'The French economy hindered rather than helped France rise to greatness during the years from 1610 to 1715.' Assess this view.

Focus: Evaluation of the French economy in the development of 17th century France.

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 assessing the importance of the economy in the wider context of rising French power and to assess its strengths and weaknesses during this period. Essays supporting the premise will point to the generally poor financial condition until Colbert's administration, the reaction to high taxation shouldered by the bourgeoisie and peasantry, inadequate agricultural produce to feed a growing population, insufficient ships to rival Dutch and British maritime traders. Essays should link economic developments directly to the rising power of France. Arguments refuting the premise will suggest that France's military successes, commercial prosperity, growth in royal power, wealth and patronage, as exemplified by Versailles in Louis XIV's reign, were all assisted by its economic strength. Some candidates may refer to other factors to explain France's ascendancy. This is fine provided that economic factors are given substantial treatment.

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 How far did French kings and ministers achieve their European aims during the period from 1610 to 1715?

Focus: Assessment of French kings and ministers in achieving their European aims.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main European aims of French kings in this period were: to break or limit Habsburg power and influence in Western Europe – in Spain, the Netherlands, Holy Roman Empire, in Italy; to defend the nation's frontiers from traditional enemies of England and Spain; to curtail the trading power of the United Provinces; to expand France to its natural borders; to spread the Catholic faith in the face of Calvinism. Most of these aims were accomplished, although not until Louis XIV's reign. By the end of this period, however, France had over-reached itself and failures mainly replaced its earlier achievements.

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 1661-1796**Key Theme: From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661-1796****31 How far did political ideas depend on Reason during the period from 1661 to 1789?**

Focus: assessment of a claim about political thought 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 identifies three thinkers of the Age of Reason that candidates should therefore know about: Diderot, Rousseau, Voltaire. Some may mention others, e.g. Montesquieu (his '*De L'Esprit des Lois*' is on the Insert), but no such additional specific references are required. The question offers candidates the opportunity to discuss change and continuity because Reason was not an important element of political thought during the time of Louis XIV. Religion and tradition were, then, the basic grounds for justifying political structures and authority. For example Bishop Bossuet (with his belief in Divine Right) can be considered a significant political thinker during the reign of Louis XIV (as can the King himself). During the eighteenth century, however, the grounds of argument changed for some political thinkers. Answers can explain what is meant by Reason and why it became more attractive as the 18th century developed (e.g. the French nobility were strongly influenced). However, not all of the *philosophes* drew their inspiration from Reason (e.g. Rousseau) so some candidates may discuss political ideas that derived from other sources. The reliance on Reason may be agreed with or rejected - no set conclusions are expected - but many answers are likely to agree in respect of the eighteenth century – although answers that consider Russia will argue about the relative weakness of such ideas there. If answers concentrate on France, that is fine (especially since the thinkers identified in the specification were all French). Equally, they may range more broadly, looking the other states in the specification (Austria-Hungary and/or Russia) or even more widely in Europe. The question asks 'How far ...?' and answers in **Band I** should consider alternative explanations.

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.

32 How far do you agree that the power of the French monarchy was characterised more by continuity than change during the period from 1661 to 1789?

Focus: assessment of change and continuity in the power of the French monarchy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The question asks 'How far ...?' and answers in **Band I** should normally be expected to consider alternative explanations. The question is based on the second paragraph of Content in the Specification: 'France: the changing nature of absolutism under Louis XIV, Louis XV and Louis XVI'. It raises directly the idea of change and continuity and examiners should look for an awareness of both. However, answers are not required to give equal attention to each characteristic because the tilt of the balance will depend on the arguments that are proposed by each candidate. Continuity was reflected in the adherence to absolutism as an ideal; there was no effective challenge to it during this period, but answers may have one focus on the years leading to 1789 and opposition to/criticism of Louis XVI. The '*ancien régime*' did not change substantially to bring about basic reforms to the monarchy. However, change can be detected. Candidates are not expected to show knowledge and understanding of the period after 1789, but the crisis of that year was greater than any that had occurred during the earlier part of the relevant period. There were some changes because alternatives were being discussed more openly in the reign of Louis XVI than the reign of Louis XIV – some answers may look, for example, at the impact of Enlightenment thinking on the nobility. The financial problems of the crown had a greater impact. There were changes in the personal strengths of the monarchs. Louis XV and Louis XVI did not manage to emulate the comparatively untroubled monarchical style of their predecessor. The qualities of ministers varied and some may explore with profit the impact of e.g. Colbert, Fleury and Turgot on the power of the French monarchy from 1661 to 1789. Some may think about a gradual weakening across this period – 'the decline of France'.

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.

33 How similar were the causes of opposition to absolute monarchy in Austria under Maria Theresa and Joseph II and in Russia under Peter the Great and Catherine the Great? Explain your answer.

Focus: assessment of the opposition to Austrian and Russian monarchies 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 is based on the third paragraph of Content in the Specification: ‘the changing nature of Absolutism in Austria and Russia (specifically Maria Theresa and Joseph II, Peter the Great and Catherine the Great) ... opposition to absolutism’. Credit will be given when candidates distinguish between different types of opposition and it can be claimed that there was no effective opposition to absolute monarchy as such but there was opposition to particular policies that rulers tried to enforce. This can be a valid argument. Peter faced the resistance of traditional forces in many classes and groups, including the Church. Many of the nobility were unwilling to embrace the Tsar’s new policies. The *streitsi* were a threat at the beginning of his reign. Catherine the Great faced the potential threat of the nobility and the actual problem of the Pugachev Rising (1773-74). Maria Theresa tempered opposition by mostly working within the existing situation in Austria whilst Joseph II confronted head-on what he perceived to be problems and reactionary forces, arousing more obvious opposition. It can be argued that the causes (and extent) of opposition to Joseph II were more widespread than for any of the other monarchs specified in this question. Some answers might tackle the question in two parts, for example Russia first then Austria. These might give slight consideration to comparisons between countries. This approach might take answers into **Band I**, but it difficult to see such answers reaching the top of this Band. The question does not require candidates to assess the rulers’ success in dealing with opposition. This might be included as an optional extra in a conclusion, but it should not be part of the main argument.

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 2591
June 2006

Britain and Ireland 1798–1921**1 How far would you agree that Catholic Emancipation in 1829 was the most damaging factor in the decline of the Protestant ascendancy during the period 1798-1921?**

Focus: evaluation of the relative importance of Roman Catholic Emancipation in explaining the decline of the Protestant ascendancy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Emancipation was only one damaging factor for the Ascendancy and answers need to compare its importance with others. However, it cannot be ignored and candidates need to assess its role in decline, especially its link to land-holding, control of office and as a symbol for the Ascendancy. O'Connell certainly saw it as leading to their eventual destruction, a 'bloodless revolution' that paved the way for catholic office holding from the 1830s through to the end of their grip on local office in the 1880s and 1890s. It set the precedent for mass mobilisation and for using the system against itself (Freeholder rebellion in the Clare election) to be repeated later. It ensured, despite O'Connell's intentions, the triumph of sectarian nationalism, a dangerous development for the Ascendancy. It led to British governments doing deals over their heads (with O'Connell in the 1830s, Parnell in the 1880s and Redmond in the 1910s). It signalled the rise of its successor group, the Catholic tenant farmers. MPs slowly became nationalists rather than Conservatives or Liberals. The 'stab in the back' came from the centre (Peel and Wellington). Nonetheless, better candidates might point out that the barrier to catholic landowning had already gone and a propertied catholic electorate could already vote. It was their hold on MPs, RMs and Town Councils that would be threatened. Other factors need to be put alongside emancipation and these might include, for example: the blow of the Union itself (loss of their own Parliament) and the impact of the Famine and the agricultural depression post 1879 on their land (selling up) underscored by the burning of their houses in the Anglo-Irish War. Parliamentary Reforms also undermined their control in 1850, 1884 and 1918 (and the Secret Ballot of 1872), whilst other political reforms undermined them in the 1880s and 1890s. Ulster Unionism displaced their leadership after 1886 whilst the Great War destroyed their sons. Set against emancipation, these might demonstrate its relative damage one way or the other. Certainly, British governments seemed content to abandon them from the beginning (1800).

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 ‘British governments were persuaded more by constitutional nationalism than by revolutionary nationalism to change their policies on Ireland’. How far do you agree with this view of the period 1798-1921?

Focus: comparison of the effectiveness of two approaches to nationalism in persuading British governments to change.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

They will need to compare throughout whilst remaining aware that constitutional nationalism preferred co-operation and revolutionary nationalism, violence and terror. Some may seek to address the question in this way and it is an appropriate one. Others could choose to argue that at various moments constitutional nationalism proved more effective e.g. in the 1830s via the Lichfield House Compact which delivered on the Tithe problem, Municipal Reform and the opening of offices to Catholics. Yet the Irish Tenant League in the 1850s and 1860s proved a failure. Butt and especially Parnell secured via the Kilmainham Gaol ‘treaty’, new deals on land and a Rent Arrears Act, culminating in a Home Rule Bill in 1886. Redmond continued the tactic with much less success in 1893–1918. Clearly constitutional nationalism could only go so far, especially when its results could be questioned. It explains why support for constitutional nationalism was losing its strength post 1886. Candidates are likely, when comparing the two, to stress the negativity of revolutionary nationalism’s violence and terror with references to the rebellions of 1798–1916, all of which were suppressed with relative ease. Traditional and endemic violence (‘Defenderism’) was clearly counter-productive to the 1880s (arguably the Plan of Campaign was to curb it). However, some may point to gains for revolutionary nationalism – the creation of a ‘heroic movement’ marked by sacrifice for a polarised and simplified Irish cause (e.g. Tone; Emmett; Young Ireland in 1848; Fenians). Violence could work in persuading governments – some historians think Gladstone was bombed into his ‘mission’ post 1868. Fear of it certainly led to negotiation in Kilmainham Gaol in 1881-82 and to an unfortunate over-reaction by Britain in 1916. Yet the Phoenix Park Murders led to a dead end. Revolutionary nationalism’s political violence and terror were very effective post-1916, making it difficult for the government to put down unrest without alienating moderate Irish opinion. Both sides could see the point of negotiation in 1921, despite the costs. Better candidates may seek to examine the interconnection of nationalists methods, the implied threat of violence allied to legitimate protest in the 1820s and 1840s, Parnell’s skilful handling of Irish agrarian unrest (as President of the Land League) 1879–82 and again 1886–93. It gave co-operation a ‘bite’. Sinn Fein and the IRA did the same after 1918, as did Ulster Unionists in 1886 and 1912–21. Such methods seemed to be more successful in changing British policy when used together.

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 How far was the success of Irish nationalism dependent on popular support within Ireland during the period 1798–1921?

Focus: evaluation of the role of popular support in Irish Nationalism's success.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers need to address the issue of success and the relative importance of popular support in it. It is quite possible to argue that nationalism failed to achieve its aims (a united, possibly republican, Ireland), but that a version of it occurred in 1916–21. This would suggest popular support was mobilised only in the latter period, or at least voiced its support through elections. Clearly popular electoral support was vital to Sinn Fein, first locally, then nationally. 1918 was more important here than 1916 and the actions of British governments could contribute to this – the unwise decision to extend conscription to Ireland in 1918 and to use the Black and Tans during the Anglo-Irish War. Earlier extensions of the vote were important for empowering constitutional nationalism – the 1850 Act (the vote to Catholic tenant farmers), 1872 Secret Ballot Act, 1884 Reform Act, and universal male suffrage 1918. In the 1885 Election, Gladstone was sufficiently impressed by support for the Home Rule party to consider Ireland ‘a nation struggling to be free’ and so worthy of Home Rule. Its importance in deciding Parnell's fate is obvious. Candidates could also examine popular support in earlier periods, especially the 1820s and 1840s. Although such numbers were not legitimised through the vote, they did provoke a response, negative in Wolfe Tone's 1798 Rising (largest rising of the period by far) and the 1840s but positive in 1823–29 (emancipation). No wonder Peel removed the 40 shilling freeholders from the franchise in 1829. The later power of Parnell's party was dependant on mobilisation and control of popular support (through the party, the Land League and the Plan of Campaign). The non-popular route, a revolutionary seizure of power, was very difficult, as various risings, including 1916, show. Existing underground and not tapping into popularising activities as the Gaelic League did, doomed such nationalism to failure. Candidates should also measure popular support against other factors, e.g. quality of leadership, government reaction and the role of the Catholic Church in opposing or supporting the cause.

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 How far do you agree that the Crimean War was the major turning-point in creating a changed approach to waging war during the period 1793-1918?**

Focus: evaluation of the relative role of the Crimean War in creating different approaches to War.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

They can focus on the army although most are likely to refer to both army and navy in their comments. They will need to expand upon approaches to war (e.g. strategies, taxation, purpose, administration, recruitment and abstention) to assess change and whether the major turning point was the Crimean War. It is perfectly possible to posit other 'points' of change – likely points could be the Napoleonic Wars, Colonial Scares in the 1870s, 1880s and 1890s (especially the 2nd Boer War) and perhaps most importantly the 1st World War. However, candidates will need to address fully the Crimean War. Those who conclude it was the major turning point could stress, for example: the long overdue exposure of aristocratic amateurism (Roebuck's motion), a realisation of the implications of technology, the need to rationalise overlapping jurisdictions, recruitment issues, disease and soldier care. This applied to both army and navy. However, candidates could just as easily demonstrate that Russell's despatches were lost in the euphoria of victory in 1856. The extremely slow response of government is highlighted by the lateness of reform 14 years later (Cardwell), itself triggered more by concerns for cost, efficiency and the lessons of the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian wars. Gradual developments in an industrialising society were possibly of more importance in effecting slow change than something immediate as the Crimean War. Disaster continued to happen in the 1870s and 1880s, especially in the Navy but also, as the Zulu Wars demonstrate, in the army. The second Boer War produced a quicker reaction to the lessons of how to fight (some unfortunate – the prevailing interest in cavalry) and how to organise this (a General Staff, which Britain had failed to create post Crimea). Similarly the Navy tended to react to 'scares' – the French naval building programme in the late 1850s and the German one after 1899. Candidates who consider whether a changed approach characterised the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars are unlikely to find any - except in terms of scale after 1807. The French Wars saw an intensification of traditional approaches – e.g. bounties, patronage, empressment for the Navy. There was no supreme commander and Wellington found it difficult to get his senior officers to obey him. Changes here come in the decade before the Crimean War and continued up to Cardwell's reforms. They were patchy and piecemeal. Clearly the First World War demanded a changed approach, requiring more organisation, the effective working with Allies (a useful comparison here with the Crimea), co-ordination of various groups, artillery precision, conscript armies and the adaptations (slow but effective) to different types of warfare. Spectacularly the Navy failed to co-ordinate with the Army at Gallipoli, as in the failed Walcheren expedition in the 1790s. Candidates can thus argue the merits of various turning-points or reject all in preference to slow 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 (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 successfully did British military and naval strategy adapt to deal with the threats to British interests during the period 1793-1918? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of naval and military strategy's success in dealing with threats to British interests.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The balance between military and naval strategy can err to either, provided there is some consideration of both. Failure to consider one will limit the answer to Band III at best. Some consideration will need to be given to 'threats' (e.g. invasion; blockades; vulnerable strategic routes like the Straits, South China seas, the Mediterranean; key garrisons) and how those changed or resurfaced during the period together with changing technology and the type of power an opponent could wield (e.g. ironclads; large conscript armies; dreadnoughts; U-boats; railways) On the military side, armies successfully adapted but were always slow to do so. Cost, economy and public perception of the army always hampered change. However the British Army could afford slow adaptations given Britain's nature (an Island) and power (global reach). The navy was always the fallback position. In the French wars of 1793–1815 the army was slow to develop a continental reach before 1807 after which it was a force to be reckoned with in the Peninsula and ultimately in Northern France and Belgium. It largely stuck to its 18th century 'line' standards. After 1815, it failed to adapt and, during the Crimea War its incompetence was only disguised by an even worse performance by the Russians. Lessons here took a long time to learn. It was better prepared for Colonial Wars, despite disasters and scandals and by 1914 the B.E.F. was a small but very professional force. Nonetheless, it acted in a secondary capacity to the French in 1914-15. Only after 1916 did it adapt to take the strain alone. Its ability to change led to victory (e.g. a much more effective approach to offensives, co-ordinating tanks and soldiers, very effective use of artillery). The navy was much more prone to sudden change because of technology. Nonetheless, it too disliked change and cost always hindered its adaptability. It remained effective as part of a 'Bluewater strategy' that could compel obedience from coastline enemies but combined operations remained a weakness throughout the period, from Walcheren, through the Crimea to Gallipoli. At times the demands on it were too great. During the Crimea War a strategy that required a Mediterranean, Black Sea and Baltic presence overstretched the Navy. It remained excellent at blockade, both in the French Wars and the First World War but was slow to react to German U-boat threats to shipping lanes. Convoys were only accepted with reluctance, although the technology was there (e.g. aerial reconnaissance, depth charges, radio intercepts). When France, Russia and finally Germany built new navies, public clamour ensured a British naval supremacy that was not effectively threatened between 1805 and 1918 (even if at least some in Britain thought that it was).

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 To what extent did public opinion on war issues change during the period 1793-1918?

Focus: evaluation of how far public opinion on war changed.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

They will need to unwrap the concept of public opinion in the period (educated and Radical opinion, Nonconformist views, MPs, the growth of a Press that both followed and led and the expression of opinion in demonstrations and elections). As to war issues, these could be whether it should be fought, how it should be fought and the nature of the peace, together with traditional attitudes to the armed services. Clearly the 'fact' of public opinion grew enormously in the period with the growth of literacy and a cheap press. Yet some candidates may argue that public opinion changed little – most opinions were fixed, Britain's enemies were to be circumscribed whether they be France, Russia or Germany. Despite Gladstone, the fate of tribal peoples did not disturb an opinion that was mainly conservative and patriotic, from Church and King mobs in the French Wars, to the naming of streets and pubs after Crimean battles, to the Colonial Wars (romanticised in fiction) and patriotic elections (1857 on China; the Khaki Election 1900). The First World War saw an excess of this, although a private and silent response from soldiers stood out as well. Governments were only too keen to sponsor this throughout the period. Candidates could also point to exceptions. In the early revolutionary wars, some Whig opinion (Fox) condemned it, as did Radicals. Once the French Empire was proclaimed, such opposition was much less effective. Even the mutinies at Spithead and the Nore were more to do with conditions than support for a revolutionary enemy. The sailors stressed their patriotism. For the rest of the century radical groups did gain more support from the middle classes by stressing diplomacy and peace as a preferred policy. Here the rise of Nonconformity was crucial and its fusing with middle class Cobdenite radicals with a vision of the Pax Britannica. The growth of a popular press from the 1860s helped this alternative view, as did Gladstone's duels with Palmerston over the Crimean War, China, Don Pacifico, involvement in the American Civil War. Later, Gladstone's Bulgarian and Midlothian campaigns, 1876 and 1879, clearly rallied those who opposed a patriotic and imperial forward policy. This continued with the liberal 'pro-Boers' who scored well in the aftermath of this war ('Methods of Barbarism'). Yet it was still unable to stop a Liberal government going to war in 1914, despite Morley's resignation from the Cabinet. More successful were the tight-knit Nonconformist towns of the North who often successfully resisted conscription post-1916 and supported Conscientious Objectors. Arguably, the First World War did see a 'slow burn' of opposition to the scale of its demands and the sacrifices made (inter-war pacifism). For most of the period, critical public opinion had to rely on a sudden surge of the popular mood, e.g.: reaction to disease in the Crimea, Roebuck's Motion, various naval disasters, dreadnought fever, the siege and relief of Mafeking (the latter an outburst that confirmed the patriotic trend). On these occasions, the public demanded its pound of flesh and a righting of the perceived inefficiency. It often didn't get 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); 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.

Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**7 To what extent were concerns about financial cost the main influence on the treatment of the poor by governments from 1834 to 1948?**

Focus: assessment of the influences on government policies to help the poor.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Economic concerns were important throughout these years. During the early part of the period, rate payers complained about rising local costs, which was one reason for the reform of 1834 and subsequent amendments. Generally, the need to keep the cost of administration and the upkeep of the poor to low levels was a constant concern. Better answers might also consider how the prevalence of poverty (and not just pauperism) was a hidden economic cost (e.g. links with crime, ill health) although this was not always understood by governments. The question invites candidates to measure economic concerns against other factors, which might include the rise of the labour movement, a changing electorate, the work of social investigators (e.g. Booth), changing expectations, wars (e.g. the scare about the fitness of the nation generated by the Second Boer War, repeated with conscript armies in 1916-18), foreign example (usually Germany and often linked to the military capability of the nation).

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 To what extent was the 1919 Housing and Town Planning Act the most important turning-point in the provision of quality housing in the period from 1834 to 1948?

Focus: assessment of the significance of Addison's housing policies.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might well argue before 1918 there was little attempt by governments to intervene in the housing market to provide quality housing, simply due to a lack of political will. The housing stock was largely in the hands of private enterprise. Most people rented property and quality was dependent on the relationship between demand and supply – although some might point to the Building Acts which from the 1840s gradually stopped large numbers of people living in cellars and introduced regulations bringing ever more improvements to the quality of newly-built property, such as: connection to the new public sewers being constructed, fire-prevention measures, minimum thicknesses for party walls. The First World War seemed to mark a significant change in direction with c.170,000 new, high-quality council houses being built by 1922. Subsequent policies seemed to be based on Addison principles and by 1948 the standard of housing was generally far superior to that of fifty years earlier. However, this view can be countered on the one hand by pointing to developments before 1914 (e.g. industrial housing, slum clearance in Birmingham in the 1870s, the 1885 Housing of the Working Classes Act), and on the other by issues that remained after 1922 (e.g. the spiralling cost of public housing, the abandoning of the 1919 Act in 1923, the lack of good standard housing for the poorest members of society, the years of the Depression when spending by most councils was at least severely cut). Much local authority building only began in 1946 and some answers may point to the major improvement in the specification for the design of local authority housing that came only with Bevan.

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 Assess the reasons why it took so long for a Welfare State to be established during the period 1834 to 1948.

Focus: assessment of the reasons for the evolution of the Welfare 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 consider a series of reasons holding back such a development: e.g. the prevalence of laissez-faire individualism, pressure from vested interests, lack of political will (perhaps including the struggle between different wings of the Liberal party on the social responsibility of government, weakness of the Labour party before 1945, economic concerns (especially c.1870-90 and 1918-39), limited pressure from 'below', the prevalence of charitable provision, social norms and values (e.g. innate conservatism). Stronger answers may argue that there was a gradual change towards a Welfare State across the period and not a sudden revolution from 1942 to 1948. Useful material to support this might be the evidence of the later nineteenth century social investigators that prompted government action, the Liberal Welfare Reforms of 1906-11 (and Lloyd George made clear that these changes were but first steps), the end of the Poor Law in 1929, the continued development of policies to help the unemployed in the 1920s and 1930s. A listing of factors approach is **unlikely to produce a response that can gain Band 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 (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 were political, rather than social or economic issues, the main reason for reform of the franchise during the period from 1868 to 1992?

Focus: assessment of the reasons for franchise reform.

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 argue that political factors were very important. There might be discussion over Disraeli's motives in 1867 (did he 'dish Gladstone' or was he swayed by external pressures for reform?), the consolidatory nature of the Third Reform Act 1884, the bowing to pressure group activity in 1918 and 1928 and the removal in 1948 of 'bias' in a voting system that had seemed to favour the Conservatives. Stronger answers will make some attempt to assess the use of 'main' in the question. It could be argued that franchise reform was generally a reflection of social change, making reference e.g. to: class based politics, the role of women in society, developments in education and the influence of the media. It is also possible to push a case for economic factors being the most significant, particularly when related to social class (as in 1867 and 1884) and war (as in 1918 and 1948). Stronger answers may take a broad view and show how political, social and economic factors were 'linked'.

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 How far was the quality of party leadership the main reason for the changing fortunes of the Liberal party during the period 1868-1992?

Focus: assessment of the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Liberal party.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many candidates are likely to argue a case for the assertion in the question, and stronger answers will be critical of the use of the word 'main' in the question. There should also be some attempt to define and measure 'the quality of party leadership'. One obvious line of argument to adopt is that when leaders were strong (e.g. Gladstone, Grimmond, Ashdown), then so was the Liberal party. Conversely, weak and divided leadership led to a decline in Liberal fortunes (e.g. Rosebury, the Lloyd George-Asquith split, Thorpe). However, the question invites a balanced response and there is likely, therefore, to be discussion in many answers of the relationship between the Liberals and the other political parties (The Conservatives as well as the growth of Labour). Better candidates should be able to set the developments in inter- and intra- party politics in the changing political, economic and social context for the period. Some may point to the first-past-the-post electoral system in keeping the Liberals small after 1923. Other possible factors having an impact on Liberal position that may be considered in answers might include: the relationship with the union movement and the rise of class-based politics, the move to universal suffrage (the propensity of women to vote Conservative as well as the enfranchisement of the remaining sections of the male working class), divisions within the Liberal party itself during the Gladstone period (Whigs v Peelites v Radicals) and in the 1930s (three-way splits over the National Governments between Lloyd George, Samuel and Simon). Was it ever more than an uncomfortable coalition? Are parties of the Left more prone to schism than parties of the Right?

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 To what extent were reforms to the education system the main reason for the development of democracy during the period from 1868 to 1992?

Focus: assessment of the influence of educational reform on democracy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Educational reforms were obviously important, but some candidates may well argue that they were not necessarily the main reason for the development of democracy in Britain during this period. Candidates are likely to pinpoint key education reforms, as either just preceding or going hand in hand with major political change, (e.g. the Acts of 1870, 1902, 1918, 1944). A simple line-of argument might be that a more educated population deserved and/or demanded a more democratic political system. Sharper candidates will point out that on occasion democratic reforms preceded those in education as a result of the idea that 'we should educate our masters'. Equally, answers may argue that educational reform was very slow in Britain, and often undertaken with reluctance, so it was unlikely to have been a driving force in democratic development. There is also scope for distinctions to be made between official and non-official educational change. Sectors of the population became more 'educated', especially politically, through means not directly associated with a schools based system (e.g. 'self help' methods, Mechanics Institutes, the church, the media, trades unions). A balanced assessment is also called for and hence, there needs to be mention of other political, economic and social factors that influenced democratic change, e.g. reform of the franchise, reform of parliament, growing national prosperity, the development of trades unions.

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 successfully did the printed media rise to the challenge of radio and television during the period from 1922 to 1996? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of the role of the press in the age of television; the growth of radio and television broadcasting.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many answers may offer a range of criteria against which to measure success (for example circulation; number and range of publications; skilful adoption of the agenda of radio and television; the carving of a distinct role). Another approach could be to identify the characteristics or roles of the press and assess the impact on and response to the other media in each of these. Candidates may be able to make some useful distinctions between the response to radio and that to television. It would be a valid (but not essential) approach to include some discussion of whether changes detectable in the character of the printed media may actually be attributable to factors other than the competition with the broadcast media, such as: technological factors, social factors, economic factors.

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 Assess the impact of the mass media on popular culture in Britain during the century from 1896.

Focus: evaluation of the impact of the new mass media on popular culture

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may be expected to demonstrate a good understanding of what is meant by 'popular culture', and strong answers may show an awareness of how hard it is to distinguish the particular impact of the mass media from other possible causes of change (NB it is not intended that candidates should put forward more than brief suggestions of other causes of change). Some candidates may wish to compare the influence of the three distinct media, and this could provide a successful structure for an answer, but a comparison is not in any way required. The key to success is nonetheless for a candidate to find an effective analytical structure within which the necessary balanced evaluation may be made. One possible approach could be to break down 'popular culture' into separate elements for discussion (e.g. leisure activities; social and class attitudes; education/self-improvement; shared values). Alternatively, answers may look in turn at different social groups or classes and assess any impact of newspapers, radio and television.

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 To what extent were British governments influenced by developments in the mass media during the century from 1896?

Focus: evaluation of the impact of the new forms of communication on governments.

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. Some politicians and governments saw the opportunities offered by the developments and responded positively or manipulated the new media skilfully (Lloyd George, Baldwin and Churchill may be used as examples earlier in the period, while Wilson and Thatcher are good later examples). Politicians who were less alive to the opportunities, or less effective in their use of the media, might include Eden or Douglas Home or Heath. Many answers may well focus on times of crisis. That is fine as far as it goes, but the question is not just about times of national crisis and for **Band I** answers must go beyond such exceptional circumstances in their consideration of the full period.

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 Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1918

16 To what extent was mass conscription the key factor in success on the battlefield during the period 1792-1918?

Focus: evaluation of a given factor in bringing success in war.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The development of 'a nation in arms' by France in the early part of the Revolutionary Wars developing into more regulated conscription in the later Revolutionary & Napoleonic period. This might be contrasted with the use of long service professionals and mercenaries by the dynastic armies of France's enemies. The reaction of France's enemies to conscription might include the tentative use of *Frei Korps* and *Landwehr* by Austria or the traditional use of conscripted serfs by Russia's long service army. A good topic for discussion would be the development of the *Krumper* system in Prussia after 1808. Candidates might note that Britain never embraced conscription in this period and yet her army was successful. For the period of unification the different systems used by the combatant powers might be examined, generally candidates will point to the superior organisation of manpower by Prussia and the resulting large size of her army in proportion to her population. The defeat of France's long service army by Prussia's reservists despite superior French weapons technology in the 'Imperial' phase of the Franco-Prussian War. The changes in conscription arrangements in European states at the end of the 19th, especially changes in France to create a large reserve army. The First World War may be used in some answers as an example where conscription played a key role in warfare (Britain used a long service professional army support by Territorial battalions at the start of the conflict, replacing this with Kitchener's army of volunteers and finally conscription). The American Civil War falls into the mainstream of the debate, the North having a preponderance in manpower.

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 Assess the impact of the development of military strategy on the conduct of war during the period 1792-1918?

Focus: evaluation of the impact of changing methods of strategy on war.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The emphasis of the question is strategy - the organisation, movement and supply of armies within a theatre of war rather than the tactics used by armies in battle. Candidates might also discuss the term at its highest level, looking at, for example: the direction of war at state level, war aims. The influence of Napoleon is an obvious area for discussion, the targeting of concentrations of enemy troops as opposed to geographic objectives. The writings of Jomini & Clausewitz are relevant. The wars of the middle part of the period will probably be discussed in the light of the development of the Prussian general staff and the strategic theories of von Moltke the elder. The plans of the various powers on the eve of 1914 are valid areas for discussion – and some candidate might take the analysis beyond the Schlieffen Plan. Negative argument might be encountered arguing for lack of development in strategic thinking by the armies of some states in the period, the Crimean War would be an example, as to the performance of the staffs of the French & Austrian armies in 1859, 1866 & 1870-71. For those wishing to discuss the American Civil War the campaigns of the Confederate general Lee and the later aggressive Union offensives might be contrasted with the rather lacklustre strategic understanding of the likes of the Union commander McClellan.

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 To what extent did the development of military technology revolutionise warfare during the period 1792-1918?

Focus: evaluation of the impact technology on the warfare.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will probably concentrate on battlefield weapons starting with the smoothbore muskets and artillery on the Revolutionary and Napoleonic warfare that were weapon technologies that had essentially remained the same for the entire 18th. Post-Napoleonic technologies might include the introduction of the percussion cap allowing more effective infantry fire by reducing misfires. The introduction of the Minié rifle and its derivatives making the rifled musket the standard infantry long arm of the mid-19th century, the French and British used such weapons with devastating effect in the Crimea. In the American Civil War the Minié technology showed that the increased range of the rifled musket greatly reduced the effectiveness of artillery. The introduction of the breech loading rifle in the form of the Dreyse needle rifle by Prussia placed more emphasis on skirmishing due to the increased rate of fire. The Chassepot rifle used by France in the Franco-Prussian War was the first effective breech loading rifle in service, far superior to the Dreyse but used by defensive firing lines allowing superior Prussian manoeuvrability to defeat the French. By the 1890s, bolt action rifles were in service with full metal jacket ammunition putting an end to the dense infantry formations of the early part of the century. The development of the machine gun could be charted, the use of the crank loaded Mitralleuse in the Franco-Prussian War, the Maxim technology creating true automatic fire by the early 20th leading to the use of the machine gun in World War I. Artillery technology follows the introduction of rifled artillery in the mid-19th century with the rapid development of breech loading artillery accompanied by more common use of steel in gun manufacture. Artillery played a critical role in the wars of 1866 (with Austria having the superior artillery park) and 1870-71 (Prussian guns dominating). The early 20th century saw the introduction of effective recoil systems – e.g. the French 75mm quick-firing field artillery that increased rates of fire. Increase in calibre of guns to the massive guns of WWI. Some may consider the development of methods of indirect fire, which might entail reference to communications technology such as semaphore, the heliograph & wireless. Answers may also assess advances in munitions technology – propellant and warheads. By the First World War, artillery became the real killer on the battlefield. Other areas for discussion could include: communications, medicine, transport (steam trains and ships). The First World War saw, for example, aeroplanes, chemical warfare. Strong answers will attempt to broaden the discussion to include these alternatives.

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 Assess the view that the German nation was more divided than united during the period from 1815 to 1919.

Focus: evaluation of the extent to which the German people were united.

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 extent to which the German people were more divided than united in this period. Candidates may understand that the Prussian Empire in 1871 represented *Kleindeutschland* and an enlarged Prussia. They may argue that it was a Prussian Empire rather than a German Empire; it certainly did not unite all the German people even geographically. The exclusion of Austria from the process of German unification may be dealt with. Divisions within the German Nation after 1871 might be illustrated through the *Kulturkampf* and the rise of socialism, or the domination of the Reich by the elites. Candidates may argue that territorial boundaries rarely exactly match where the people of that nationality live and that divisions within a nation based on class or culture do not necessarily define the unity or otherwise of that nation. All modern nations have exhibited such divisions. They could certainly argue that the German Empire from 1871 physically united the majority of Germans. Candidates may argue that the German nation was very divided from 1815 as a consequence of decisions taken at the Congress of Vienna, but could also argue that the German Confederation from 1815 did loosely bind most Germans into a Confederation with a Diet. Answers may argue that the growing emergence of the nationalist movement after 1815 to the development of more radical nationalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries demonstrate an emergence of national unity amongst the German people over this period. Some may show that the First World War both united the German nation, at first, but that divisions soon arose and were entrenched by 1918. Similarly, whilst Versailles divided the nation geographically, it united the nation in condemnation and bitterness.

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 To what extent was the development of German nationalism mainly determined by economic factors in the period from 1815 to 1919?

Focus: assessment of the relative importance of the various reasons for 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 explain the importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates may show understanding of how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870-71. Military strength depended upon economic strength. 'Coal & Iron' rather than 'Blood & Iron' could be usefully debated. The impact of the extraordinary developments in the German economy after 1871 may be discussed by many. Candidates must, however, show that they understand that economic factors were not the sole factors determining the fortunes of German nationalism in this period and answers may be most effectively when they clearly address 'mainly'. For example, the Great War left Germany broken and half-starved despite the German economic domination of continental Europe in 1914. Economic factors undeniably contributed to Prussia's domination of Germany from 1866, but opportunistic and skilful leadership, both for and against German nationalism, should not be overlooked. The development and impact of ideas on the emergence and development of nationalism may be explored.

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 Assess the reasons why Prussia was less successful in dominating the German states in the period from 1815 to 1865 than in the period from 1866 to 1919.

Focus: evaluation of the reasons for Prussia's emergence as the dominant German power from 1866 and an explanation as to why Prussia was more successful at dominating the German states from 1866 than previously in this period.

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 reasons why Prussia was less successful in dominating the German states and less successful at challenging Austria's dominance of Germany in the first half of the period 1815-65, and for Austria's replacement by Prussia as the dominant German power from 1866. In terms of Austria's domination, the impact of decisions taken at Vienna and Austria's role within the Diet might be discussed. The role and influence of Metternich through to 1848 could be explored. Candidates may wish to discuss how Austria was able to regain control, imposing the 'humiliation' of Olmutz after the tumultuous days of 1848-49 and the establishment by Prussia of the Erfurt Union. Candidates may explain why the balance of power within Germany was actually changing and how Olmutz probably represents Austria's last assertion of dominance. (Candidates are not expected to have any knowledge beyond the Specification, but any who do demonstrate relevantly an understanding of Austria's wider decline after 1849 are to be given credit). The importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussia's eventual dominance over the German states and gaining of the leadership of Germany, might be explained. Candidates may demonstrate understanding of how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870-71. Military strength depended upon economic strength. The role played by Bismarck may well be highlighted by many candidates in terms of explaining the reasons for Prussia's dominance over the creation and development of the Empire. How the Constitution enabled Prussia's domination of the other German states after 1871 could usefully be explored, as could the leadership of Wilhelm 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 (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.

Russian Dictatorship 1855–1956**22 'The rulers of Russia preferred repression to reform.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1855 to 1956?**

Focus: assessment of the nature of Russian government.

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 the phrase 'preferred repression to reform' in their answers. When arguing in favour of the assertion on the question, examples may be drawn from across the period, from Alexander III's imposition of the Reaction from 1881 and the influence of Pobedonostev to the repression of Lenin (e.g. Red Terror) and Stalin (e.g. Gulags, purges and show trials). Candidates may argue that some of the rulers only introduced reform under duress, for example Nicholas II in 1905 and Lenin in 1921. However, when arguing against the assertion, candidates can also draw on a wide range of evidence; examples could include: Alexander II's intention to introduce 'reform from above' from 1856, Lenin's post-revolutionary reforms, the reforms initiated by Khrushchev towards the end of this period. Stalin may have valued repression but was arguably equally determined to impose change on the USSR. Candidates may also argue that rulers were at times forced into the adoption of repressive policies because of adverse circumstance, or to ensure their regime's survival (e.g. Lenin during the Civil War).

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 'Stalin was more effective than any other ruler of Russia from 1855 to 1956 in dealing with opposition'. How far do you agree?

Focus: assessment of the relative success of the rulers of Russia at dealing with opposition.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should consider the effectiveness of rulers at dealing with opposition throughout the period, for example showing awareness of the reasons why opposition was so often unsuccessful rather than concentrating only on Stalin and why he was able to deal with opposition successfully. Candidates may argue that Stalin was extremely successful in this regard, for example by reference to the OGPU/NKVD or the Purges and Show Trials. Candidates might suggest that many of those who perished under Stalin were only 'opponents' in his imagination – that much of what he did was brutal and unnecessary. Candidates may argue that there was significant continuity between Lenin and Stalin and that Lenin's victory in the Civil War, his crushing of the revolt at Kronstadt and his banning of all other political parties and factions within the Communist Party give him an equal claim. Of the Tsars, more answers may argue in support of Alexander III than Alexander II and Nicholas II. Both of the latter faced significant opposition: ultimately one was assassinated whilst the other abdicated. Yet Alexander III did impose the Reaction successfully from 1881 and, arguably, demonstrates that he too dealt very successfully with opposition.

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 How far do you agree that life for peasants was uniformly bleak during the period from 1855 to 1956?

Focus: assessment of the living and working conditions of the peasantry throughout this period.

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 condition of the peasantry and the treatment the peasants received, both before and after 1917. 'Uniformly bleak' is the key phrase in this title; candidates may well consider how valid this premise is. It could be argued that the peasantry made little progress in many ways during this period, however there were periods of reform both before and after 1917 that may enable candidates to successfully challenge this assertion. The peasants were given (albeit illusory) glimpses of reform, e.g. Emancipation in 1861, the Peasants Land Bank from the 1880s, the Decree on Land in 1917, the NEP from 1921. Both Tsarist and Bolshevik regimes had a temporary Kulak policy under Stolypin & the NEP. Peasants were only serfs under the Romanovs, but some candidates may argue that there was little real improvement or that collectivization was a 'second serfdom'. Arguably, the communists did much more to introduce social reform, for example in the sphere of education, than the Tsars. Similarities before and after 1917 include their harsh treatment by both regimes; 'squeezed dry' to finance industrialization. Famine hit, e.g. 1891, 1921 & 1932, regardless of regime. Control through the Mir, Land Captains & the Kolkhoz was a common feature, although distinctions may clearly be made.

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 Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877

25 'The Constitution of 1787 created more problems than it solved in the development of stable government in America'. How far do you agree with this view of the period 1763 to 1877?

Focus: evaluation of the success of the Constitution.

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 reason why the colonist rebelled against British rule in the period 1763-83 in order to show how far the Constitution of 1787 met the aspirations of the American revolutionaries. Candidates may also compare the Constitution with the Articles of Confederation, which it replaced, to identify how far it improved the prospect of stable government within America. In the period after 1787 candidates may mention the continued tension between the Federal and State governments; the development of sectional conflict resulting in Civil War as aspects of issues which the Constitution may be regarded as not solving. Alternatively, candidates may mention the separation of powers as a way of safeguarding against tyranny. The Connecticut Compromise on the composition of the Congress helped to end conflict between large and small states on issue of representation. Also, the fact that ten Amendments had to be incorporated in Constitution in 1791 suggests that it had not dealt with important issue (especially civil rights).

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 How far did the role of president change during the period from 1789 to 1877?

Focus: evaluation of the changing role of the presidency.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may start by arguing that the position of President Grant as President in 1876 was markedly different from the post first filled by Washington in 1789. Washington was 'above party' in 1789-1801 while during the 19th century the president became the 'chief of party.' In addition, successive president exploited their commander-in-chief powers to despatch US troops abroad without Congressional consent (notably but not just Lincoln). More astute answers may argue that presidential power varied quite considerably with the individual occupant of the office. For example, Jefferson, Jackson, Knox and Lincoln stand out as powerful activist presidents, while Quincy Adams, Tyler, Pierce and Buchanan could be regarded as relatively weak presidents in relation to Congress. To prove that Congressional power was still potent in the latter part of the period, answers may consider the impeachment of Andrew Johnson and the weak presidency of Grant (1869-77).

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 To what extent was slavery the dominant issue in North-South relations in the period from 1787 to 1877?

Focus: evaluation of the important issues dividing North and South.

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 issue of slavery was central to North/South relations for much of the period. The issue of slavery arose at the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 over the issue of representation in the House of Representatives. Slaves, for voting purposes, were regarded as 2/5th of a free man. The balance between Slave and Free State dominated national politics, as witnessed by the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and the Great Compromise of 1850. Candidates may well cite the Civil War (1861-65) and Reconstruction (1861-77) as highlighting the importance of slavery as an issue of enormous significance. Alternatively, answers may cite the major and on-going issue of State Rights v the Federal government. This was seen, for example, in the championing of State Rights by Jefferson, the Second Bank of the US incident in early 1830s, South Carolina's threat of secession in 1832, the lead-up to the Civil War (especially from 1854 with the consequences of the emergence of the Republican party and the Kansas-Nebraska Act). Some may wish to argue that the Civil War was really a struggle for State Rights, not the abolition of slavery. Some answers may explore economic differences as an issue of importance between North and South. Some may demonstrate how slavery was an economic as well as a moral question, and strong answers might go further to argue that slavery and State Rights can both be viewed as issues around which a greater struggle was fought out: the economic contest between the needs and interests of industry and of plantations.

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 To what extent was the Second World War (1941-45) the major turning-point in the development of African American civil rights during the period 1865-1980?

Focus: evaluation of the key points that changed African American rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may mention FDR's Executive Order 8802 of June 1941 which outlawed racial discrimination in defence industries. The Second World War also saw the creation of the Congress of Racial Equality ('CORE') by James Farmer, which played a major role in 1960s the civil rights movement. The War also saw tens of thousands of African Americans fight in the armed services in segregated units overseas. When they returned, many became determined to end discrimination. Candidates may compare the War with other turning-points in the development of civil rights such as the 1877-1930 period which saw a deterioration in rights or the 1950s and 1960s which saw major improvement in rights. Overall, candidates may be expected to identify which aspects (if any) of the Second World War demand the epithet 'turning-point' and to what extent the War stands as a major turning-point compared to other periods that generated major 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 (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 How far did the civil rights of Asian and Hispanic Americans change during the period 1865-1980?

Focus: evaluation of change in the rights of two groups.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may juxtapose the position of Asian and Hispanic Americans in 1980 with their position in 1865. In 1865, both groups occupied an inferior social and economic position within US society. Asian Americans, in particular, were without civil rights. The Chinese Exclusion Act 1882 greatly reduced Chinese immigration. For those Chinese Americans within US society the majority lived in Chinatown ghettos. Similarly Japanese Americans faced discrimination. This reached its height in the Second World War when the entire Japanese American population were incarcerated in concentration camps. However, by 1980, along with African Americans, they had received full civil and political rights. Yet with affirmative action only a limited number of places in university and government employment were reserved for Asian Americans. Hispanic Americans also had very limited rights in 1865. However, the more wealthy had the right to vote. Immigration of Hispanics was severely restricted until Johnson's Immigration Act of 1965. Also, many Hispanics had limited rights as many came illegally to work as agricultural labourers from Mexico and Latin America in general. Hispanics from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico had greater rights, including a representative in Congress. The civil rights legislation of the 1960s gave full political and civil rights.

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 To what extent did the Federal government hinder the development of trade union rights during the period 1865-1980?

Focus: evaluation of the role of Federal government in the development of union rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

On occasion, Federal government directly back 'Big Business' against organised labour - most notably in the period 1865 to the 1930s. Presidents in the 1880s and 1890s (such as Cleveland) and Republican Presidents in 1920s deliberately sided with business interests against labour. The Homestead Strike (1890s) and anti-left wing activities, such as the Red Scare (1919-20), stand out. From the 1930s to 1946, by contrast, unions received considerable support from Federal government led by Democrats. The National Industrial Recovery Act (1933-35) and the Wagner Act (1935) gave unions recognition and power to collectively bargain. The Second World War encouraged the development of union membership and influence in government. The Taft-Hartley Act (1947) reduced trade union power again, but under Kennedy and Johnson (1961-69) union rights were extended alongside increases in the minimum wage. The Republican governments of Nixon and Ford (1969-77) returned to firm support for 'Big Business' against organised labour.

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 2006

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these. If in any doubt, consult your Team Leader.

1 The Arts and History

To what extent have either the visual or the expressive arts been dictated by the nature of the society from which they originated? Answer with reference to any period you have studied.

The phrase 'visual arts' is meant to encompass painting (or other iconographic representation, such as photography), architecture and/or sculpture. The phrase 'expressive arts' refers to those forms of art – e.g. music, film or drama – in which expression is central to the way in which individual works are *presented or performed*. Clearly, categorisation of works of art as 'visual' or 'expressive' can be a matter of interpretation – e.g. a visual painting can have an expressive quality (albeit something the observer has to find within it) – and examiners will be sensitive to this. In other words, the main consideration is not the categorisation but the quality of the argument.

The argument is likely to turn on the extent to which a particular work of art, or body of work – visual or expressive – was typical or untypical of its social and/or cultural context. For example, the plays of Shakespeare, in one sense, reached far beyond the conventions and limitations of Elizabethan society, yet, in another, were deeply intrinsic to it. Similarly, candidates may wish to consider the extent to which a particular artist was 'true to his/her art' or constrained by contemporary social and/or cultural norms – e.g. Shostakovich v. the Stalinist state, or Florentine patronage v. individual genius, and what were the consequences of this kind of conflict.

As in previous years, this question will allow candidates to use images of the art form itself as source material. If they do, they must not make the common mistake of assuming that visual sources somehow 'speak for themselves'; they need to be critically handled in the same way as written sources.

More successful responses will present a balanced argument that takes account equally, of the art itself *and its relationship to the social context*. Some may reach towards a synthesis, showing, for example, how great art could spring from an *interfusion* of individual genius *and* social or cultural norms.

Less successful responses may be more likely to focus on either the artist or the works of art themselves – so that the study has more art criticism in it than history.

2 Economic History

Assess the link between economic factors and major changes in society in any period you have studied.

This question invites candidates to assess the importance of economic factors – fiscal demands, developments in trade and commerce; the growth of capitalism, industrial growth or decline – as a cause of social change. The argument is likely to be concerned with the extent to which social change derived its impetus from economic, political or religious/cultural causes – or from a combination of all three. How far was emigration caused by economic hardship? Did levels of poverty in 16th Century England owe more to fluctuations in the economy or to direct government intervention? Were Stalin's 5-Year Plans driven by a desire to improve social conditions in Russia or to compete with the West? Were women given the vote in 1918 because of their contribution to the wartime economy or because of militant political action? Alternatively, candidates may *reverse* the causal link, e.g. by considering the impact of social or demographic change as a driving force for economic change as in Industrial Revolution.

More successful responses will identify the need to assess the *relative importance* of economic and other causal factors in bringing about changes in society. They may also perceive that it is unlikely that any one factor could have caused a 'major change in society' in any given period – leading them to a more balanced judgment, in which one factor is seen to be dominant but the contribution of others is acknowledged.

Less successful responses may settle for a narrative account of the change in question, or for a 'listing' of the causes of change, without analyzing their relationship to each other, or considering their relative importance (thus not fully answering the question).

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these. If in any doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3 The Individual in History

Evaluate at least two competing interpretations of any individual you have studied.

The key word here is 'evaluate'. Whilst each interpretation will first need to be described and contextualised, this alone will not be sufficient, no matter how well-informed the resulting account may be. In order to *evaluate*, candidates will first need to *test* each interpretation separately, against evidence from an appropriate range of source material – primary and/or secondary. 'Critical use' in this sense will involve considering the value as well as the substance of the evidence each source contains and making a judgment about the *degree of support* it offers for one or other interpretation. In this way, evaluation is more likely to reflect each candidate's own work. Having evaluated each interpretation, candidates then need to adjudicate between them (state a preference).

The subject of each 'interpretation' may be the whole career of an individual, or a significant action or sequence of actions undertaken by the individual over a shorter period of time – for example, Richard I's contribution to the Third Crusade, Florence Nightingale's work in the Crimea, or Field Marshal Haig's command of British forces during the First World War. The only condition, of course, is that both interpretations must be focused on the same issue.

More successful responses are likely to take full account of the need to evaluate each interpretation, by making critical use of source material. They will go on to state a preference for one or other interpretation on the basis of the testing process. This should lead to a balanced, supported judgement, in which, for example, the merits of the rejected interpretation are acknowledged. Some candidates may go beyond this to look for a synthesis, which may, for example, integrate acceptable elements of each interpretation, or argue that one interpretation is capable of absorbing, or accounting for, the other. There again, some responses may argue that no adjudication is possible because two historians, whilst apparently in disagreement, are actually concerned with different facets of the common topic – in which case, this must be fully explained/justified.

Less successful responses may be based on 'ready-made' controversies from 'tertiary' sources. However, these rarely contain valid *evaluations* of the competing interpretations presented and are therefore unlikely to score highly. Alternatively, they may base their judgments on a comparison of the *authors* of each interpretation; in which case, they must go well beyond simple assertions of 'bias' to explore critically the *wider context* in which different historians operated.

4 Local History

Using examples from any locality, assess the strengths and limitations of local history.

[note: 'locality' can be any hamlet, village, town or region in the world]

This question invites candidates to reflect critically upon any (serious) local study they have carried out. Reward for the argument will be given for the extent to which the candidate is able to explain *both* the strengths *and* limitations of the study in question - for example, in terms of the extent to which it was able to throw light on national developments, or the extent to which the usefulness or validity of the findings was limited by the range and quality of available evidence. Reward for critical use of sources will depend on each candidate's ability to 'roll out' this discussion of the use of available evidence. How difficult was it to find evidence for the study? Was there too little or too much evidence available – if so, what particular problems did this cause? How useful was the evidence (i) for carrying out the local study, (ii) for making national comparisons?

More successful responses will provide a relevant structure for their argument around 'strengths' and 'limitations' and an extensive critique of the evidence they have used (including a physical site, as appropriate). Some candidates may assess purely in terms of how illuminating the local study is about national developments – a perfectly valid approach as long as it is balanced and supported. Others may recognise that vividness, vibrancy and emotional appeal may be *both* strengths *and* limitations of local study.

Less successful responses may lapse into a description of their investigation and its findings, without giving sufficient consideration to broader statements they can make from this about the 'strengths' and 'limitations' of local history in general.

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these. If in any doubt, consult your Team Leader.

5 Military History

‘Military history has no purpose other than that of recounting the details of particular battles and wars.’ With reference to any period you have studied, how far do you agree with this view?

This question invites candidates to consider some of the broader purposes of military history – for example that of showing how war can be seen as an instrument of imperial policy (e.g. Boer War), as a religious or ideological imperative (e.g. Crusades, Vietnam, Hitler’s war in the East), as an expression of dynastic conflict (e.g. Hundred Years War, Wars of the Roses, French Wars of Religion); or as an agent of social, cultural or political change (e.g. Crimean War, First or Second World Wars).

‘To what extent?’ indicates the possibility of an argument – in this case about the overall purpose of military history. What is gained or lost by relating warfare to its social, economic or political context? What does it add to our understanding of either? Are the social, economic or political consequences of war more important than war itself? Some candidates, of course, may validly question the implication in the question - i.e. that the recounting of military events is of relatively little value *on its own*, compared with the ‘bigger picture’. They may argue, for example, that war has been, sadly, a central part of human experience which needs to be analysed and explained in its own right, so that military historians – even those concerned with recounting particular battles or campaigns - need to demonstrate the full range of historical skills, explaining key events and developments in the same way as political or economic historians.

Candidates are likely to find no shortage of source material – primary and/or secondary - on this topic, though they may have to look quite carefully for extracts that either comment on, or give direct evidence of, the wider relevance of military history.

More successful responses, based on well-chosen examples from the work of different historians, are likely to recognize the strengths and limitations of both sorts of treatment (detailed narrative; wider perspective) and form an argument around this, based upon critical use of source material. Some candidates (as suggested above) may argue successfully that the study of warfare is a valid end in itself, or that it forms the essential base upon which wider ranging studies necessarily depend (synthesis).

Less successful responses may lose sight of the requirements of the question and *either* be concerned only with the causes, course and results of their chosen conflict, *or* with comparing interpretations of its wider significance.

6 Political History

Which has caused the greater threat to established government: the powerful or the powerless? Discuss with reference to any period you have studied.

This question is about the relative danger to established authority posed by popular protest or the challenge of over-mighty subjects (in its various guises). It will involve analysis of the aims, composition and tactics of one or more popular movements and an assessment of how close it/they came to success; and a similar analysis and assessment of the degree of threat posed by more powerful groups, be it through factional intrigue or direct threat of force. How strong were the forces of authority to resist each kind of challenge? Did the different kinds of movement have similar or different kinds of aims? Did one tend to be more successful than the other? If so, why? Candidates will need to be careful in the way in which they characterise different kinds of challenge to established authority. Terms such as 'riot', 'rising', 'coup d'etat' 'rebellion', or 'revolution' mean different things – each one defining the extent of a movement's organisation, or the limits of its intentions or ambitions.

Probably the best approach will be, first, to identify examples of 'threats' to established authority that involved both the 'powerful' and 'powerless' – e.g. Weimar being more undermined by elites than by the mass movements which opposed democracy; the Tsar being more undermined by failure of key figures of importance to support him in 1917 than by the mass demos and strikes; the French monarchy in 1789 undermined by selfish nobles more than by Paris mobs; Charles I overthrown by the determination of landed gentlemen rather than by the clamour of Levellers. The argument will be more difficult to make if examples of threat ('top-down' or 'bottom-up') are chosen from different events. This is feasible, but particular care will need to be taken in the comparison, making sure that differences in context are noted and that comparison is made on the basis of common criteria – e.g. strength of authority; quality of organisation; scope of intentions etc. – and that these are used as a means of structuring the argument. This should allow an overall judgement to be made at the end.

More successful responses are likely to be characterised by well-informed comparative analysis, supported by critical use of evidence and followed by a balanced judgement.

Less successful responses may demonstrate an approach in which the causes, course and results of each example are described, followed by a 'bolted-on' assertion about the threat posed.

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these. If in any doubt, consult your Team Leader.

7 Religious History

With reference to any period you have studied, assess the view that internal divisions have done more to weaken religious movements than external threats.

'Internal divisions' might take the form of sectarian disputes – e.g. those that bedeviled the Puritan cause before and during English Revolution, Elizabeth's struggle to define the Church of England, or the challenge to the Established Church of Methodism and Nonconformity in the 18th and 19th Centuries. 'External threats' refers to examples of persecution by an alien Church, or foreign political authority – e.g. the threat posed by Philip of Spain to English Protestantism, his *actual* suppression of Protestantism in the Spanish Netherlands, or the persecution of Huguenots in 16th century France. In fact, the reign of Elizabeth provides a rare example of both types of threat during the same period. The same might be said of Europe during the Catholic Reformation, or of the German Church under the Third Reich. The term 'religious movement' can be taken flexibly to mean a national Church (e.g. Church of England), a breakaway group within it (Puritans), or a distinctive sect lying outside of a national Church (Methodists).

Again, at least two examples will need to be found, one to exemplify each side of the proposition. In this question, candidates may wish to structure their responses around e.g. 'the impact of internal divisions' and 'the impact of external threats', using *common criteria* such as width, length or depth of impact - leading to a balanced judgment.

Alternatively, a 'case study' approach may be preferred, in which examples are described and the relative level of threat posed by internal divisions and external threats is assessed and evaluated (again, using *common criteria*). Either approach could lead to interesting lines of argument – e.g. that the more ruthless the suppression of religious movements, the stronger they tended to become, or that internal divisions can strengthen as well as weaken a religious movement. Whichever approach is adopted, the argument must be built upon critical use of evidence from primary and/or secondary sources. This might involve, for example, examining areas of agreement or disagreement among historians that are relevant to the argument, or interpreting and evaluating primary sources in context.

More successful responses will identify the need for *comparative analysis* and that this must be done on the basis of *common criteria*. They will build their arguments on critical use of evidence and will be aware of the need to reach a balanced judgment.

Less successful responses may settle for an account showing how religious movements were susceptible to both internal division and external persecution, without making the necessary comparison and evaluation.

8 Science, Technology and History

With reference to any period you have studied, assess the relative importance of factors that tended to advance scientific and/or technological progress.

This question uses the subject of Science and Technology to test candidates' understanding of causation. In particular, it invites them to demonstrate techniques for determining the relative importance of factors that have advanced progress in respect of any scientific or technological endeavour. Candidates should begin by identifying a range of factors and then assess their relative importance (i.e. show why one factor was more or less important than others) to the explanation (i.e. 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 this key factor (e.g. the availability of coal to the process of industrialisation), or counterfactual reasoning (of which factor can it be said that the development in question could not have occurred without it?).

More successful responses are likely to take on 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 primary and/or secondary source material.

Less successful responses may consist of largely descriptive accounts 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.

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these. If in any doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9 Social History

With reference to any period you have studied, assess the effectiveness of attempts to resolve the problem of poverty.

This question calls for candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of methods used to alleviate poverty in any period studied. Candidates need to develop their argument by making critical use of source material and this should lead to a balanced judgment.

Candidates will need, first of all, to describe and explain the problems caused by widespread poverty in the period in question. In explaining why corrective measures were necessary, candidates will be in a position to assess their suitability for solving the initial problems, and to evaluate the extent of their success. The difficult part of the argument is likely to be that of measuring effectiveness in the light of contemporary beliefs and attitudes. For example, we would consider Victorian workhouses to be a fairly brutal kind of solution to problems caused by widespread poverty and the impossible strains this placed on traditional methods of relief. However, it made perfectly good sense to the Victorians, for whom 'laissez faire' comprised a more persuasive set of principles and guidelines for social policy than 'intervention'. They might even have prided themselves on both the effectiveness and efficiency of the new system. The point being made here is that judgments need to be 'periodised' and the 'sense of period' needed to do this can be developed through careful use of primary sources. Finally, when making overall, relative judgments, candidates may wish to refer to systems of poor relief in other periods (in the example given, this could involve critical comparison of the working of the workhouse system after 1834 with methods used in the reign of Elizabeth I) in order to measure rates of progress or regression in provision.

Successful responses will build a balanced argument that examines the strengths and weaknesses of provision for the poor in their selected period and base this on critical use of appropriate source material. Judgments will be additionally informed by a sense of period and by comparison with prior and/or subsequent methods of dealing with the problem of poverty.

Less successful responses may offer narrative descriptions of provision in their chosen period, without addressing the need for evaluation ('How effective ...?').

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?

[note: answers may focus on one state (e.g. Kenya), region (e.g. East Africa), larger area (e.g. Sub-Saharan Africa) or continent]

This question presents candidates with an opportunity to assess the impact of European culture on other parts of the world. It is anticipated that 'the influence of European culture on other parts of the world' will be interpreted as the process usually known as 'imperialism'. Taking a suitable example from any period they have studied, candidates need to present a balanced view, paying equal attention to both benefits and drawbacks. They will also need to develop a 'sense of period' when interpreting contemporary sources – since these may justify or celebrate imperialist activities in terms that are no longer deemed acceptable. Candidates will also need to be careful when making judgments – arguably, there were benefits *and* drawbacks for *both* sides (though not necessarily evenly balanced) and these will need to be carefully distinguished.

More successful responses 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 primary and/or secondary 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 responses 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.

Advanced Subsidiary & Advanced GCE History 3835/7835

Unit Threshold Marks

		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2580	Raw	60	45	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2581	Raw	60	45	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2582	Raw	60	45	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2583	Raw	45	37	32	27	23	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2584	Raw	45	37	32	27	23	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2585	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2586	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2587	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2588	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2589	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2590	Raw	120	91	82	73	64	56	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2591	Raw	120	91	82	73	64	56	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2592	Raw	90	72	64	56	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2593	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)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3835	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total aggregating candidates
3835	18.69	43.23	67.46	84.60	94.49	100	14415
difference from June 2005	+0.56	+0.01	-1.33	-1.61	-0.58	-	+741

The mean mark was 197.39 (out of 300) which represents a fall of 1.19 marks.

Specification Aggregation Results: 7835 A Level History

Threshold marks (in UMS)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
7835	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total aggregating candidates
7835	22.77	51.98	78.48	93.58	98.82	100	12777
difference from June 2005	-1.46	-0.48	+0.34	+0.17	-0.25	-	+309

The mean mark was 418.71 (out of 600) which represents a fall of 1.38 marks.

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

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 2006