GCE

History A

Advanced GCE **A2 H506**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H106**

Mark Schemes for the Units

June 2009

HX06/MS/R/09J

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Marking Instructions

AS/A2 HISTORY   SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

AS UNIT F961 & UNIT F962 – PERIOD STUDIES

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	A01a	A01b
IA	21-24	24-26
IB	18-20	22-23
II	16-17	19-21
III	14-15	16-18
IV	12-13	13-15
V	9-11	11-12
VI	4-8	6-10
VII	0-3	0-5

Notes:

(i)   Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.

(ii)   If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.

(iii)   Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.

(iv)   Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

Marking Instructions

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 50	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied
Level IA	• Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly **21-24**	• Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected • The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links. **24-26**
Level IB	**Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence** • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly **18-20**	• Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high. **22-23**
Level II	**Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic** Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear **16-17**	• Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages. **19-21**
Level III	• Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated **14-15**	• Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events **OR** answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions **16-18**

Marking Instructions

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Level IV	• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication. **12-13**	• Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. • Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained **OR** answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions **13-15**
Level V	• There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious **9-11**	• General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation **OR** there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question **11-12**
Level VI	**Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy** • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation **4-8**	• **Very little understanding of key concepts** • **Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements** • Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief **6-10**
Level VII	**No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge** • Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence **0-3**	**No understanding of key concepts or historical developments.** • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer **0-5**

Marking Instructions

AS UNIT F963 & UNIT F964 – Historical Enquiries

Maximum mark 100. 1 answer: 2 parts.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	A01a	A01b	AO2a
IA	6	8	16
IB	6	7	13-15
II	5	6	11-12
III	4	5	9-10
IV	3	4	7-8
V	2	3	5-6
VI	1	2	3-4
VII	0	0-1	0-2

Notes related to Question (a)

(i)   Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
(ii)   If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
(iii)   Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a	A01b	AO2a	AO2b
IA	9-10	11-12	26-28	20
IB	8	9-10	23-25	17-19
II	7	8	20-22	14-16
III	6	6-7	17-19	11-13
IV	4-5	4-5	14-16	8-10
V	3	3	11-13	6-7
VI	2	2	5-10	3-5
VII	0-1	0-1	0-4	0-2

Notes related to Part B:

(i)   Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
(ii)   If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
(iii)   Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

Marking Instructions

	Marking Grid for Question (a)		
AOs	**AO1a**	**AO1b**	**AO2a**
Total for each question = 30	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level IA	• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly **6**	• Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed comparison and judgement • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context **8**	• Response provides a focused comparison and/or contrast of both content and provenance • Evaluates qualities such as reliability, completeness, consistency, typicality, and especially utility, in relation to the question **16**
Level IB	• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly **6**	• Judgements are supported by appropriate references to both content and provenance • Very good level of understanding of key concepts • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context **7**	• Response provides an effective comparison and/or contrast of both content and provenance • Evaluates a range of qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question **13-15**
Level II	**Generally accurate use of historical terminology** Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear **5**	• Good attempt at explanation/ analysis but uneven overall judgements • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of key concepts • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context **6**	• Provides a relevant comparison and/ or contrast of both content and provenance • Answer lacks completeness in evaluating most of the range of available criteria (eg. limited use of the introductions and/ or attributions) **11-12**

AOs	AO1a	AO1b	AO2a
Level III	• Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated **4**	**A mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and/or differences. A judgement is unlikely** • Some/uneven understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and of many concepts relevant to the topic • Uneven understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context **5**	• Provides a comparison and/ or contrast • Makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or on provenance • The organisation is uneven, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph **9-10**
Level IV	• There may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication **3**	• Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts • Mostly satisfactory explanation but some unlinked though relevant assertions, description / narrative • There is no judgement **4**	• **Response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comment is largely sequential** • **Few points of comparative provenance or discussion of similarity/difference of content** **7-8**
Level V	• There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material. • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious **2**	• **General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic** • **General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context** **3**	• **Identifies some points of agreement and/or disagreement** • **The comparison and/or contrast is implicit** • **There is no judgement** **5-6**
Level VI	**There will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy** Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation **1**	• **Limited explanation but mainly description / narrative** • **Very little understanding of key concepts** **2**	• Very weak commentary on one point of agreement/ disagreement • Sources may be paraphrased with no real attempt to compare and/or contrast **3-4**
Level VII	**No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements** • Totally irrelevant answer • Very poor use of English **0**	• Weak explanation, and descriptive / narrative commentary on the sources **No understanding of key concepts** **0-1**	• No attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast • Sources are paraphrased or copied out **0-2**

Marking Instructions

	Marking Grid for Question (b)			
AOs	**AO1a**	**AO1b**	**AO2a**	**AO2b**
Total mark for the question = 70	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.	Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.
Level IA	• Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly **9-10**	• Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed explanations leading to careful judgements **11-12**	• Excellent analysis and evaluation of **all** sources with high levels of discrimination • Analyses and evaluates the limitations of the sources and what is required to add to their completeness as a set **26-28**	• Excellent analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion • Fully understands that the sources may either support or refute the interpretation **20**
Level IB	**Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence** • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly **8**	• Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Judgements are supported by appropriate references to both content and provenance **9-10**	• Focussed analysis and evaluation of **all** sources with high levels of discrimination • Analyses and evaluates the limitations of the sources and what is required to add to their completeness as a set **23-25**	• Focussed analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion • Understands that the sources may either support or refute the interpretation **17-19**

Marking Instructions

AOs	AO1a	AO1b	AO2a	AO2b
Level II	**Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic** Generally accurate use of historical terminology Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear **7**	• Mostly clear and accurate understanding of key concepts • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context. • Good attempt at explanation/ analysis but uneven overall judgements **8**	• Focussed analysis and evaluation of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination • Analyses and evaluates some of the limitations of the sources and what is required to add to their completeness as a set **20-22**	• Focussed analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation using most of the sources and appropriate own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion • There may be some imbalance between discussion of the sources and use of external knowledge in evaluating the interpretation **14-16**
Level III	• Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic *but there may be some inaccuracy* • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated **6**	**Shows a sound understanding of key concepts.** •Sound awareness of the significance of issues in their historical context •Attempts an explanation/ analysis but overall judgement may be incomplete **6-7**	• Refers to most of the sources to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating their evidence • Aware of some of the sources' limitations either individually or as a set **17-19**	• Sound analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation. • There may be some description and unevenness between use of own knowledge and use of sources • Answers which use the sources but no own knowledge in assessing the interpretation have a Level III ceiling **11-13**
Level IV	• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/ accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication **4-5**	• Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts • Some explanation but not always linked to the question • Assertions, description / narrative will characterise part of the answer **4-5**	• **Sources are discussed sequentially** • **Considers some of the limitations of the sources; but may not establish a sense of different views** **14-16**	• Some analysis and evaluation of the historical interpretation with increasing amounts of description • Response is more imbalanced than Level III in using sources and own knowledge • Answers that use own knowledge but make no use of the sources in assessing the interpretation have a Level IV ceiling **8-10**

Marking Instructions

AOs	AO1a	AO1b	AO2a	AO2b
Level V	**There is some relevant historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material** Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use Often unclear and disorganized sections; writing will often be basic and there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious **3**	**General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic** General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context **3**	**Limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them; they are discussed sequentially** Sources will be used for reference and illustration of an argument **11-13**	**Mainly description with limited comment on the context of the question** Little effective analysis of how far the sources support the interpretation **6-7**
Level VI	**Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy** • Answer may have little organisation or structure • Weak use of English and poor organisation **2**	• **Very little understanding of key concepts.** • No explanation. • Assertion, description / narrative predominate **2**	• **Weak application of the sources to the question** • **Weak attempt at analysis** **5-10**	• **Weak contextual knowledge** • **Mainly description with weak evaluation of the historical interpretation** **3-5**
Level VII	**No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge** Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence **0-1**	**No understanding of key concepts** • Weak explanation, assertion, description / narrative **0-1**	• Very weak application of the sources to the question • No attempt at analysis **0-4**	• Very weak attempt at evaluating the historical interpretation • Heavily descriptive • No contextual knowledge **0-2**

F961/01 British History Period studies
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1035-1642

From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035-1087

1   Assess the reasons for the importance of the Godwin family in the reign of Edward the Confessor.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might consider both the positive and negative reasons for their importance. Earls occupied an important place in Anglo Saxon society and the most powerful family in the period was the Godwins. They had a power base in Wessex, at the heart of the country. Earl Godwin probably played an important role in the accession of Edward the Confessor. Edith, Godwin's daughter, married Edward and this might have cemented an alliance. The strength of his position meant that he could pose powerful problems to the king, for example over the influence of Normans in England. It might be argued that Godwin was jealous of the influence foreigners exerted at court and over the king and this created further problems. Harold succeeded to his position and the role of the family became even more important when Harold emerged as the strongest Anglo Saxon claimant to the throne. Among the negative aspects that candidates might consider might be the personal role of Edward the Confessor. Although not a cipher, he was not a dominant head of state and this enabled the Godwins to play their part to the full.

2   Assess the reasons for the succession crisis at the end of Edward the Confessor's reign.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is likely that candidates will focus on Edward's failure to produce an heir, but nor was there anybody close enough in his family to exert an unchallenged claim. Harold became head of the Godwin family in 1053 but the period to 1066 showed his problems in maintaining his primacy among the nobility. However, some candidates might argue that Harold was widely accepted as king in England but there was not universal acceptance. Harold would face problems establishing himself on the throne. The near simultaneous challenges from William and from Harold Hadrada and Tostig did not give Harold time to secure himself on the throne. Candidates may suggest that there were others with claims and point to Tostig and Harold Hadrada, who mounted a powerful challenge. The reasons for the rival claims will probably be examined with the better answers explaining why each of these did not represent an unchallenged claim. William's claim, allegedly substantiated by Harold's promise, Edward's nomination and papal approval, was rejected by the Anglo Saxons who preferred Harold. Edward might have changed his preference on his deathbed and this added to the dispute. There is no need for candidates to look at the outcome of the dispute but it will be possible to take the argument to Hastings because this effectively ended the dispute over the succession. Some answers might consider Edgar the Aetheling, but this would be a bonus and his omission should not be regarded as a gap.

3   How serious were the rebellions William I faced as king of England?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might argue that Harold's death at Hastings removed the greatest danger; the defeat had also broken the military strength of the Anglo Saxon fyrd and earls. Some answers might refer to the opposition to William immediately after his victory at Hastings until he was crowned but it hardly amounted to a rebellion. The new king could rely on the fact that his main rivals were dead and that other important Anglo Saxon nobles from Northumbria and Mercia had promised allegiance. There was disorder until 1071 in Kent, Northumbria, the south west and the Welsh Marches. However, the risings were usually localised and were the result of local grievances rather than dissatisfaction with William's rule. These risings lacked leadership and were therefore less serious. The situation at Exeter, it might be argued, was more serious, but order was restored after a siege. It might be argued that with the support of the Danes the rising in Northumbria was more serious, particularly as it also involved Edwin and Morcar. Candidates might note that William always had a clear military advantage and the ability to use ruthless devastation to put down a rebellion. Castles also allowed William to deal with rebellion effectively. The guerrilla type resistance of Hereward was more of a nuisance than serious. This shows that there was continued resistance to William's rule.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450-1509

4   How important was the weakness of Henry VI in causing the civil war in England in the period from 1450 to 1470?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The king's personality was not one that enabled him to control the nobility. He was open to influence, often to unsound advice, but was also obstinate. Candidates might also consider the state of his mental health, which was variable, representing considerable weakness at the head of state. However, his weakness (an undermighty king) should be balanced by a consideration of the problem of ambitious nobles (overmighty nobles), such as Warwick, Somerset and York. However, it should be noted that the number of alienated nobility should not be exaggerated; most of the aristocracy continued to support Henry VI, suggesting an unwillingness to go to war. However, as a weak king he was unable to control, even less resolve, the rivalry between the ambitious nobles. Candidates might also discuss the role of Margaret of Anjou. The loss of land in France might be seen as an issue as some nobles had dual-landholding, but found that with defeats in France they were subject to the King of France and this placed a strain on their relationship with Henry.

5   'Edward IV was more successful as a king in his second reign than his first'. How far do you agree with this view?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates are likely to agree with the proposition as Edward was deposed at the end of his first reign, but died a natural death at the end of the second. However, some might challenge this view and argue that his failure to ensure a peaceful succession to his son means that the second period was no more successful. Candidates are likely to consider his relations with the nobility; in the first period of his rule he was dependent upon some powerful nobles such as Warwick and that created problems. He also tried to win over opponents by conciliation, for example Somerset and Percy, but that failed and both continued in rebellion. The problem created by Warwick was the most serious as it resulted in Edward's deposition. Some may argue that this was balanced by the support he did win from some group of nobles. However, some will argue that he was no more successful in his second period of rule as he created super-nobles who were only controlled by the sheer force of Edward's personality. Some candidates will consider how successfully Edward dealt with the problem of finance during his two periods of rule. In the first period he faced a lack of money, which he tried to solve by means of benevolences and forced loans. This was reasonably successful as most paid without complaint. In the second period he was financially very successful and actually died leaving the crown solvent.

6   How effective was Henry VII in dealing with the Yorkist challenges to his throne?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is likely that most answers will focus on the Simnel and Warbeck rebellions, but better answers might also consider the de la Pole threat, the Yorkshire tax rebellion and Suffolk. There might also be mention of the situation in Ireland and the general threat from Yorkist nobility who often found themselves under heavy financial burdens. Many candidates are likely to argue that Henry was successful as none of the challenges were able to remove him from the throne. They may also argue that Henry was successful as the Yorkist cause was reduced to using pretenders. However, the Simnel rebellion did force Henry into battle only two years after Bosworth and it was not impossible that a similar result might have occurred. Having defeated Simnel, Henry was able to show mercy and defuse the situation by parading the real Earl, the success of his policy can be seen when Warbeck rose and failed to gain support in Ireland, unlike the Simnel rising. Some answers may also suggest that foreign support for the Pretenders, particularly from Margaret of Burgundy, made it more difficult for Henry as he was unable to deal with her. Henry, it can be argued, did deal very successfully with Warbeck as his attempts at invasion were pathetic failures, and he was also able to keep him on the move between European courts.
 This might be balanced against the difficulty Henry had in capturing Warbeck, Scotland's willingness to give him aid and marry him to the king's cousin. Some candidates might consider some of the other steps that Henry took to limit Yorkist danger; there might be consideration of his marriage to Elizabeth of York and the imprisonment of the Earl of Warwick, son of Clarence, until the conspiracies of other plots provided an excuse for his execution. The other rebellions were handled quite well, although tax concessions had to be granted.

Henry VIII to Mary I 1509-1558

7   How successful was English foreign policy in the period from 1509 to 1529?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may argue that Henry was more or less successful. Some might argue that it was Wolsey who was more or less successful. This approach is satisfactory provided the candidate demonstrates enough understanding of Henry's role. Henry was successful in making England an active participant in foreign affairs, particularly given her relative power, but it might be judged that his achievements were limited. From 1511-14 he fought France and won the Battle of the Spurs in alliance with the Emperor Maximilian. He did capture both Therouanne and Tournai. The Battle of Flodden was also an English victory, but not for Henry himself although he did take the credit. A treaty was made with France that included the marriage of Mary to Louis XII. Candidates might assess the ultimate benefit of these early gains and conclude that they achieved very little of importance. Some may argue that in the short term they had diplomatic success as was evident in Treaty of London, 1518, and the Field of the Cloth of Gold, 1520. The 1520s saw Henry switching his alliance between France and Spain in order to maximise his influence, however there was little success and the failure of the Amicable Grant robbed him of his major opportunity. Charles' victory at Pavia lessened Henry's influence and also led to his final failure over his divorce. It might also be noted that Henry was left out of the peace at Cambrai, 1529, suggesting that his influence was not important. In conclusion candidates might suggest that England was isolated and lacking in influence in 1529.

8   To what extent was Northumberland more successful than Somerset in ruling England during the reign of Edward VI?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a wide range of issues available for candidates to discuss and it is unlikely that they will be able to consider all the areas, what matters is the quality of analysis. Many candidates might argue that Northumberland was more successful as he did not face the series of rebellions that Somerset did in 1549. However, some might argue that the one rebellion he did face, from Mary Tudor, resulted in his downfall. Some might even suggest that neither ruler was successful in dealing with rebellion. In the area of social policy candidates might argue that Somerset was more benevolent, although his Vagrancy Act does not support this view and the failure to enforce it could be used to show he was not successful. At the same time his establishment of the Enclosure Commission helped to provoke unrest in 1548-9 and could be used to show his policies were misguided. In financial terms many are likely to argue that Northumberland was more successful, Somerset spent a great deal of money on the Scottish War for little gain and was forced into debasement on a large scale, which might be linked to the unrest of 1549. However, Northumberland was able to bring some financial stability. In governing the realm Somerset's approach was often personal and this alienated him from many and may help to explain his downfall. His frequent use of Proclamations suggests that there were frequent emergencies, whereas Northumberland was careful to ensure a wider base of support. Some candidates might point to the work of Dale Hoak to show that Northumberland was a successful ruler who brought stability back to the country.

9   **How successful was Mary I in dealing with the problems she faced? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although historiography is not a requirement at AS, candidates who use the views of historians to support their arguments should be credited. Traditional accounts of Mary's reign have been negative, but more recent work Loades, Loach and Williams has portrayed her in a more positive light. Mary faced a number of problems on her accession and many will identify these and then assess how successful she was in dealing with them. Her first concern was the succession, she had to convince the Privy Council of her right to be Queen and then deal with Northumberland and his supporters. This was achieved relatively easily as Mary's accession was generally greeted with enthusiasm; she was able to overcome the problem of Lady Jane Grey quite easily as the latter had little popular support. However, there was still the problem of her legitimacy as she and her half sister, Elizabeth had been declared illegitimate by Royal Patent on 21st June 1553, but this issue was resolved. In order to bolster her security and ensure the long-term survival of the regime she needed to marry and produce an heir, particularly given her religious views and those of Elizabeth. The significance of her marriage can be assessed as it failed to solve the problem of providing an heir to the throne and also resulted in Wyatt's rebellion. There may be an assessment of how well the government dealt with the rebellion, some may conclude that its defeat shows success, but others may argue that it was a serious challenge that was only defeated through the last minute actions and defiance of Mary. The marriage may be taken further as the government did not solve the problem of being dragged into an unpopular war against France, which many perceived was for Habsburg ends and not English. The modest attempts at economic and financial reforms could also be considered. Although Mary left a legacy of debt she managed her finances well. The government cannot be blamed for the terrible harvests and devastating epidemic it faced. Some may even conclude that the issue of the succession was resolved satisfactorily as Elizabeth the legitimate heir, did inherit the throne. However, others may conclude that her failure to secure a catholic succession, her priority, was not achieved and therefore she did not solve the problems she faced.

Church and State 1529-1589

10   How far was the Church in England in need of reform in 1529?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.
Historiography is not a requirement at AS, but candidates who use the views of historians
to support their argument should be credited; however descriptive accounts of historians
views should not be unduly credited. In arguing that there were positive elements to the
church candidates might consider the evidence that people still volunteered money to the
Church, for example in wills, and this allowed church building to continue up to the eve of
the Reformation. They might also show that the payment of tithes was not unpopular, nor
was attendance at church courts, despite events such as the Hunne Case. The church
was satisfying the needs of most as Lutheranism and Lollardy found little support, whilst
the agricultural year was supported by the church calendar through events such as
Rogationtide or Harvest Festival, meanwhile in urban communities the number of guilds
and the production of devotional literature shows that the church was still flourishing.
Ordination rates were high until the Reformation and complaints about the behaviour of the
clergy were few. Some may argue that the situation was no worse than it had been and
support this by reference to comments by Chaucer or Langland. Anti-clericalism was a
problem, but it was not new and anti-papalism was not strong. There were calls for reform
from Colet and Melton, but these were limited. Candidates might also use the example of
Wolsey to show that there were individuals who were guilty of abuses, but even where
there was absenteeism this was often overcome by the use of curates. Some answers
might point to the anti-clerical legislation of the 1529 parliament, but this might be seen as
an attack on Wolsey, rather than a general attack on the Church.

**11   Assess the reasons for opposition to the religious changes during the reign of
       Henry VIII.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some
candidates may consider the reasons for the individuals or groups who opposed the
religious changes; for example they may write about Fisher's opposition to the divorce and
More's attitude to the Royal Supremacy. There may be consideration of groups, such as
the Carthusians who opposed the attack on catholic practices or the clergy and monks
who disliked the attack on monasteries and the rumour of changes to the parish church.
This approach is acceptable, what matters is the quality of evaluation. However, some
answers may take a more thematic approach or argue that until the Dissolution of the
Monasteries opposition was very limited. Some may argue that people saw it as an attack
on fundamental and traditional religious practices; they may use the attacks on saint's
days as evidence, or disliked the Royal Supremacy as it attacked papal authority, both of
which were traditional. Some may focus on the Dissolution as the key as this made the
religious changes apparent to everyone, but also had a social and economic impact and
use evidence from the Pilgrimage of Grace to support their argument. The attack on
purgatory may have worried many as it threatened people's ability to determine their after-
life. There were also many rumours about new taxes, the loss of church goods and why
parish registers were being introduced, again evidence from the Pilgrimage of Grace could
be used to support this line of argument. Many people associated the changes with the
divorce from Catherine and the influence of Anne Boleyn, who was disliked. For many
simply the fear of the unknown in a world where there was little certainty may have been
enough to cause uncertainty and even resistance.

12   To what extent were Elizabeth's religious views the <u>most</u> important factor in shaping the Elizabethan religious settlement of 1559?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates have studied the topic from 1529 and should be expected to know the background to Elizabeth's problems at her accession, but candidates should avoid the temptation to write long surveys that deal with settlement only in the conclusion. In the same way candidates should not take their answers much beyond 1560 as the question does not ask about her religious aims throughout her reign. Candidates might focus exclusively on the situation in 1558-1560 and this is an acceptable approach. They are likely to analyse her aims, problems and the resulting settlement. In considering Elizabeth's views candidates might point out that she was personally religious but not bound to a particular form of belief and practice beyond what was most advantageous politically. However, her background meant that she had protestant sympathies and she was orthodox, preferring the formality of Anglicanism to the radicalism of Puritanism. Although Elizabeth normally preferred to delay decisions she saw a settlement as important in view of the divisions at home and the situation abroad. Domestic issues that influenced the settlement included her legitimacy as queen, the presence of Catholics in high Church offices and determined Puritans who were reinforced by returning exiles. Some may argue that the Queen was forced into a more radical settlement by a group of radical Protestants in the House of Commons than she wanted. This may be supported by a consideration of the international situation which, it can be argued, suggested a more moderate approach as England was still at war and did not possess the revenue to keep fighting. However, this view might be challenged by those who argue that the Commons did not have sufficient influence to bring about these changes. The majority of the population was probably Catholic in a broad sense, not necessarily papist. Many may argue that the most important consideration was to bring about a widely acceptable settlement. There may be some consideration of the difficulty in getting the settlement passed and the concessions and compromises that had to be made. This may lead some to conclude that the Catholics did have some influence and use the evidence of the Catholic Bishops in the House of Lords to support their argument as Elizabeth had to imprison some Catholic Bishops to get the Act of Uniformity passed. It might be concluded that as Elizabeth was unwilling to allow Parliament to discuss the Religious Settlement for the rest of her reign that she was generally satisfied with it.

England under Elizabeth I 1558 -1603.

13   How serious were the problems Elizabeth I faced in 1558?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a wide range of issues that candidates might consider and it is unlikely that they will be able to cover them all, what matters is the quality of analysis. Elizabeth's position in 1558 was very vulnerable. She was not seen as the legitimate ruler by Catholics both at home and overseas. As a result Mary Queen of Scots was seen by many as the rightful ruler and her links with France further weakened Elizabeth's position. England was also at war with France in 1558 and this added to the danger and was made worse when Spain made peace with France as this isolated England and left them open to the possibility of a Catholic crusade. However, this problem should not be exaggerated as it was unlikely that Philip would help to put a pro-French ruler on the throne of England. Philip even offered his hand in marriage to Elizabeth, so provided she did not alienate him her position was more secure. It was possible that there might be a Catholic rebellion at home, but without foreign leadership this was less likely and the Papacy failed to give a lead, hoping that Elizabeth might rejoin the catholic fold. It was expected that Elizabeth would marry and that raised a number of issues over the choice, foreign influence and faction if she chose to marry an Englishman. However, she was also able to use the prospect of marriage as a tool to strengthen her position and buy time to secure her position at the start of her reign. The problem of the succession was crucial and parliament asked her in 1559 to name a successor. She also had to overcome the prejudices against female rulers following the reign of Mary, which had been reinforced by the disasters of the latter years of her reign. She also had to overcome the popular stereotype of women, which emphasised their physical, emotional and intellectual inferiority to men. There were social and economic problems to be dealt with in the aftermath of Mary's reign. The reign also began with war against France and this created major financial problems.

14   How successful were Elizabeth and her ministers in managing parliament?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may argue that relations with parliament were usually good; however there were disputes over marriage and the succession, but this was when parliamentary opinion was closer to that of the Privy Council than the Privy Council was to the Queen. These harmonious relations were reinforced by good parliamentary managers such as Mildmay and Norton. Most MPs knew that there were certain boundaries which they could not cross by expressing their opinions. It could be argued that such limitations on the manner of debate caused far less trouble than the Queen's use of prerogative to prevent debate on issues she considered too sensitive. This point of view might lead some to conclude that parliament was a subordinate body, but this might be balanced by the view that parliament had evolved and grown in political importance and was able to seize the political initiative at the expense of a tired and increasingly incompetent government – to sustain this view answers might focus on the 1590s. Some candidates might draw attention to the times there were conflicts, such as the succession and the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, however this could be balanced by noting that most legislation was local and passed with little debate. It is possible that some answers will consider the methods used to manage parliament, such as starting debate in the Lords, where after Cecil's appointment, there was a minister to lead debate. Answers might argue that MPs were becoming more educated and therefore were increasingly able and willing to challenge the control exercised on parliament through Privy Councillors and the Speaker. In addition they might argue that there were a growing number of Puritans in parliament who used it to try and bring about changes to the religious settlement. It should be remembered that Elizabeth still had the power to summon, prorogue and dissolve parliament when she wanted and that her ability as a speaker, as with the Golden Speech of 1601 was sufficient to win

support. Most parliamentary business was completed without fuss, but at other times there were crises, but they were usually worked through without too much trouble.

15   How effectively did Elizabeth I and her government deal with the problems they faced in the period from 1588 to 1603?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a large number of problems faced by Elizabeth and her governments in this period and examiners should not expect candidates to consider all of them, although a reasonable range is expected for the highest levels, what matters is the quality of analysis. The specification mentions a number of issues that might be found in answers: the defence of the royal prerogative, relations with parliament, the effects of the war with Spain, the Irish Rebellion and the Essex Rebellion. The Irish Rebellion was the heaviest expense of the reign and this and its length might lead candidates to argue it was not handled well, but it was eventually defeated and order was restored under Mountjoy. The Essex Rebellion was crushed easily, but some might argue that its occurrence ended the possibility of maintaining a balance between factions and that Robert Cecil would now dominate. There were conflicts between the Queen and her parliaments about monopolies and the crown's request for supplies, but neither weakened the Queen significantly and the Golden Speech might be used to show that she was still able to handle parliament well at the end of her reign. Financially it might be argued the Crown did not deal successfully with problems and income did not keep up with inflation. Some candidates might point to the social problems of the 1590s, which were severe, yet the government never faced the unrest of the 1540s and it appeared as if their legislation had been successful.

The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603-1642

16   How serious were religious problems during the reign of James I?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There were religious differences when James came to the throne, but they were moderated in the first instance because of the varied expectations of the new monarch. There might be reference to the diverse views and strengths of orthodox Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics. There were hopes of conciliation between the King, orthodox Anglicans and Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference, suggesting that divisions and problems were not that great. Bancroft's Canons of 1604 resulted in the ejection of puritan clergy, but it caused few serious problems, although it might be argued that it created distrust. This distrust was further developed by the King's choice of ministers, particularly Buckingham. The Gunpowder Plot had the potential to be serious and although it was the work of a small minority did increase antipathy and hatred towards Catholics. The puritan problem was, to some extent, mollified by the appointment of Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury. However, the 1618 Book of Sports alienated them. The religious problems were exacerbated by the issues of foreign policy and marriage. Parliament wanted a more active pro-protestant foreign policy and this highlighted divisions between King and parliament. When James finally came to the aid of co-religionists in the Thirty Years War in 1624 it was seen by most Protestants as too late. James was also seen as being too close to Catholic powers and this was given credence by the marriage negotiations with Spain over his son Charles. However, some answers might conclude that the problems were nothing like as severe as they would become under Charles.

17   How far were James I's financial problems of his own making?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates may argue that James inherited a difficult financial situation, revenue from taxation and assessment rates had not kept pace with inflation and the demands of war from the last years of Elizabeth's reign made the situation worse. These considerations might be balanced against the cost of James' court and his attempts to revise customs duties though the Book of Rates, which was unpopular. James' belief in Divine Right did little to help the situation and made parliament more reluctant to grant supply and use finance as a way to defend what they saw as just privileges to influence royal policy.

18   How successful was Charles I's personal rule?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Although Charles' personal rule was brought to an end by the financial needs created by the Scots War and was ultimately a failure, it is possible to argue that for much of the period it was relatively successful, bringing order and stability. It may have been unpopular with some groups, but Charles was able to rule for eleven years without calling parliament. At first the returns from Ship Money were high and other methods of taxation, although not always popular, did allow Charles to raise sufficient money, provided he followed a pacific foreign policy. However, this might be balanced by a consideration of the unpopularity of the rule of 'Thorough', although it did bring stability and order. There is little to suggest that if Charles had not tried to introduce the Prayer Book to Scotland and embarked on imposing his religious policy there that personal rule would have come to an end.

F961/02 - British History Period Studies
Option B: Modern 1783-1994

From Pitt to Peel 1783-1846

1   How serious were the radical challenges to Lord Liverpool's government in the period from 1812 to 1822?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to assess the various radical challenges facing Liverpool's government before reaching an overall conclusion about their seriousness. Candidates might establish the nature of the challenge and the extent to which it posed a threat to Liverpool's government. The radical challenge fed off the economic crises and agricultural difficulties that followed the end of the Napoleonic Wars and, although they failed, in hindsight the 1810s were difficult years. 1812 saw bread prices reach their highest in the nineteenth century and the 1815 Corn Law was seen as the hated bread tax to keep prices artificially high. The Continental System was followed by depression in 1815 with Poor Relief reaching its peak in 1818. At various stages the government was faced with seditious meetings, urban discontent and various plots (Luddism, the March of the Blanketeers, Pentrich Rising, Peterloo and the Cato St. Conspiracy). Many may argue that the government was not seriously challenged and that they handled the challenges with relative ease. However, Luddism in 1812-13 and rick burning in 1816 threatened both town and country. Such economic distress stimulated the revival of radical politics and the spread of revolutionary ideas continued via frequent protest meetings spreading democratic and republican ideas under the banner of Parliamentary Reform and old corruption. However, the challenge was undermined by an experienced government, a lack of cohesive leadership which was often impractical, divisions over aims and tactics, the fragmentation of a very regionalised response and moments of economic recovery. The government certainly took the radical challenge seriously. Candidates might find a route through the material by examining the government response or examining the activities of a national leader like Cartwright and his Hampden Clubs and Political Union Societies, or Hunt or revolutionaries.

2   How far was Peel able to reconstruct the Tory party in the period after 1834?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should able to examine the two sides of the debate before reaching a conclusion. During his leadership there were some positive achievements that candidates might be expected to discuss. The party was reorganised after the Great Reform Act and the 1832 election. The widening of the base of party support might be considered through the publication of the Tamworth Manifesto, which might be seen as visionary and more inclusive of a wider property-based electorate, although this is open to debate as a close examination of the 1841 election result reveals. Candidates might also consider the creation of the Carlton Club, but here they may argue that this was not the work of Peel. Peel was also able to defeat the repeal movement in Ireland, win the 1841 election (367 seats, compared with 175 in 1832) and pursue popular policies for much of the 1841-6 ministry, although this is also open to debate. There may also be consideration of issues such as Registration, leading from the front from 1834 and the 100 days, carefully choosing the right moment to challenge the Whigs. On the negative side Peel was not very successful at widening the base of support or overcoming the mistrust that many had in him after the Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Act. The two areas that many are likely to focus on when arguing that he was not successful are the 1841 election, this showed that most Conservative support still came from the rural areas of the south and Peel's attempts to broaden the party appeal had failed, and the Repeal of the Corn Laws, as far from

reconstructing the party he destroyed its unity. Some might also argue that it was not Peel, but simply the weakness of the Whigs that allowed him to reconstruct the party. It is also possible that some will argue Peel was not interested in reconstructing the party as he put the needs of the nation before party.

3   **How successful were Peel's economic and financial reforms in the period from 1841 to 1846?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to establish criteria for success and could use Peel's own cost-effective and carefully thought out reform schemes; economy and care with finance; stabilising measures in finance; recognising and controlling industrialisation and its worst effects and feeding a growing urban population. It is likely that many candidates will argue that the reforms were successful, but in the higher levels discrimination between areas may be expected before an overall conclusion is reached. Some candidates might also use those of contemporaries: his ability to push the measures through, his concern for working class budgets and the acceptability of much of what he did. Some may argue that the Budgets were particularly successful, linking the lowering of duties and a cheapening of the manufacturing base. At the same time they may point to the successful introduction of Income Tax to deal with the deficit inherited from the Whigs. The combination of sound government finance, a boost for manufacturing and broadening of consumption meant that it could be argued he was very successful. Peel could also be credited with the improvement in the economy in 1845 and this allowed him to bring in further free trade. However, the success can also be questioned; recovery occurring through a combination of factors, including the development of the railways. Some may argue that the Corn Laws, although controversial, were particularly successful as it made cheap food available to the ordinary people and therefore helped achieve social stability. It could be argued, by Peel's criteria, that Factory Reform was also successful as it preserved a free labour market, although this might be balanced against the failure of educational aspects. Bank and Company Reform may also be seen as very successful as a stabilised gold standard in the Bank Charter Act was the key to sterling's 19th century supremacy and to fiscal orthodoxy well into the 20th century and at the same time the Company Act and Railways showed the need for, and difficulties of, regulating industrial capitalism.

Liberals and Conservatives 1846-1895

4   To what extent were the reforms of Gladstone's first ministry limited in their achievements?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates might argue that the reforms were not limited as it is usual to see this ministry as the great reforming ministry; however at the top levels candidates should produce a balanced answer. The Education Act, although it played an important role in providing education for working class children, was an uneasy compromise between Anglicans and non-conformists and it created class divisions. Trade Union reform may have equalised the law between worker and employer but stopped short of what the skilled workers wanted-peaceful picketing and immunity from prosecution for strikes. Administrative reforms, such as the Civil Service and Universities, may have brought equality of opportunity, but there were still few who could take advantage of the changes. The Secret Ballot Act had a large impact, especially within Ireland. Irish legislation failed to have the required impact as the Land Act did not go far enough. The Licensing Acts annoyed temperance groups and the working class. Some candidates might approach the question by looking at the success or failure of the reforms in satisfying Liberal support and conclude that most of the reforms alienated some group of supporters; for example, they might argue that the Education Act failed to please the non-conformists.

5   'Disraeli became leader of the Conservative party because there was no-one else.' How far do you agree with this view?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might look to weigh up the strengths of Disraeli as a leader against his weaknesses and other possible contenders before reaching a balanced conclusion. In agreeing with the statement they might argue that Derby had not been interested in leading the party and was more at home horse-racing, whilst other possible contenders, such as Gladstone, had left the party. It might be noted that Derby had led the government in 1852 and 1858-9 and it was only ill-health that saw him resign. This argument may be further developed by looking at the weaknesses of Disraeli; he was after all an outsider for the Conservative party, not an Anglican. However, some might argue that he was their best speaker, had managed to pilot the Second Reform Act through parliament after Gladstone's failure and shown himself to have appeal. It might be argued that his successful guidance of the Reform Act through parliament was what guaranteed him the succession. Disraeli was responsible for many of the changes that helped bring the Conservatives back to power; he taught them that it would be pointless to try to win support for the reversal of the Free Trade policy, promoted reform when in office in the minority government, developed ideas on the need for social reform, appointed Gorst to reorganise the party machinery and appealed to the electorate as the spokesman for a party that would offer a strong foreign and imperial policy. These positive qualities should be balanced against the claim that there were no alternatives once Derby resigned in February 1868.

6   'Tory Democracy was the most important element of Disraelian Conservatism.' How far do you agree with this view?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. They do not need to know the details of the historical debate between a stress on traditional conservatism and newer Disraelian elements; however they will need to address the issue of Tory Democracy. Candidates may range widely across the whole period, although it is probable that they will focus on the period after 1867. The social reforms of the Second Ministry are likely to play a large role in many answers. Candidates might argue that Disraelian Conservatism was essentially a traditional English view of one-nation, supporting the traditional institutions of State: Monarchy, Aristocracy and the Church of

England. Earlier evidence would suggest that this was the key to fend off Whig/Liberal cosmopolitanism. Some candidates might point to Disraeli's novels, such as Sybil, to support their argument. The Second Reform Act could be used to show Disraeli restoring artisans to a system that had rejected them in 1832. In his second ministry he is concerned with the rural areas and clearing the church of Romish practices; this can be seen in his speeches at Crystal Palace and Manchester. Before 1872 it can also be argued that Conservatism saw foreign interests and the Empire as an extension of traditional values. Candidates could challenge the domination of conservatism by traditional English values and British interests by discussing whether Tory Democracy was ever the predominant force - an alliance between workers and Tory aristocrats against their common middle class liberal enemies, using worker numbers to gain power for a government who then delivered on social reform. Candidates might suggest other areas were the most important element. They might suggest the upholding of British interests abroad and in the Empire and this could be supported by considering the period from 1872-1880, with Disraeli seizing on Gladstone's weakness over the Alabama Incident and the Black Sea Clauses and focusing on Empire, with South Africa, Egypt, India and Afghanistan. Upholding British interests was a key in his speeches of 1872 and was much condemned by Gladstone in his anti-Beaconsfieldism campaigns of 1876 and 1879-80. Candidates may conclude that all elements were important, or that one was more important at a particular moment.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1856-1914

7   **To what extent were economic motives the <u>most</u> important reason for Britain obtaining influence and possessions in Africa from 1868 to 1902?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates are likely to argue that trading developments were at the forefront of imperial growth in this period and use examples from South Africa and Egypt to support their arguments. It would also be valid to argue that the protection of the Indian trade routes would explain the involvement in South Africa, the East African coast and in protecting the Suez Canal post-1875, controlling the shares the acquisition of Egypt from 1882, involvement in the Sudan in 1885 and 1898, Zanzibar 1899 and the Fashoda incident with France in 1898 over the White Nile. Trade also had a large impact on individuals and they might point to Cecil Rhodes with the Cape to Cairo railway, which was clearly for profit. The discovery of gold and diamonds, and clear economic interests, in the Transvaal were important. Coffee and Tea plantations in East Africa also became economically important in the later period. However, this should be balanced against other factors such as strategic advantage, religious and humanitarian motives, political and jingoistic considerations and personal gain. The importance of strategic factors could be stressed in the need to limit German involvement in East Africa and French involvement in North and West Africa. Pre-1886 the strategic interests of Lord Carnarvon and Bartle Frere were important. Some may argue that it is impossible to differentiate between economic and strategic motives where North East, East and Southern Africa are concerned. Some may conclude that strategic issues were often determined by economic motives, although there were exceptions.

8   **To what extent did the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902 mark a significant change in British foreign policy?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question focuses on the view that after 1902 and the Anglo Japanese alliance British foreign policy changed from one of splendid isolation to full involvement in European affairs, which culminated in the decision to go to war in 1914. There are arguments that foreign policy did not change as Britain had always been involved in European affairs given her Empire and the Mediterranean Agreements of the 1880s and 1890s and issues with the USA. At the same time the Anglo Japanese agreement did not deal with affairs in Europe, but with imperial concerns in Asia where the fear of Russian growth remained. The treaty did not mark a watershed as it was designed to deal with a specific imperial issue and protect India. On the other hand it could be argued that this was the first formal alliance that Britain had entered into for a long time. There is also likely to be discussion of the 1903 Entente Cordiale, some will argue that this also drew Britain further into European affairs, although this could be balanced by a consideration that all it did was resolve colonial problems in Africa and was simply an understanding rather than a military alliance. However, candidates might go on to argue that in the longer term it did draw England further into Europe as there were military talks with the French, particularly over the stationing of the navies and support for them over Morocco. At the same time Britain did try to maintain good relations with Germany and it was the Kaiser who appeared to push England to choose, taking the view that friendship with France meant enmity with Germany, which was not Britain's position. It should also be noted that throughout the period the main concern of Britain was to protect her Empire.

9 **How far was the German invasion of Belgium the <u>main</u> reason for Britain going to war in 1914?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates are likely to focus on the long-term problems in Anglo-German relations, but there must be some consideration of the importance of the invasion of Belgium in the decision to go to war. It was the invasion that triggered the declaration, although some may argue it was the occasion not the cause and that there were other reasons that caused it. Some may argue that the invasion provided a divided Liberal government with the excuse and justification it needed, to uphold the Treaty of 1830. There had already been resignations from the government and without the invasion it is unlikely that the government would have held together. War was seen by many as an illiberal act and therefore they needed the justification of the defence of a small nation to uphold the decision. However, answers may focus on the longer term problems of naval rivalry, the economic growth of Germany and imperial rivalry. Candidates might also consider the wish or need to support France following the Entente; if Britain did not support her following the military discussions of the previous years then her moral worth would be questioned. There may also have been concern that Britain would be isolated if Germany should win and it was therefore in her interests to ensure that this did not happen. Some answers might suggest that domestic problems also encouraged Britain to declare war as a short and glorious war would detract from the problems of Ireland, industrial unrest and the suffragettes. It might also be mentioned that declaring war was popular and most expected that it would be over by Christmas at the latest.

Domestic Issues 1918-1951

10   **How important was the First World War in the growth of the Labour party in the period from 1918 to 1924?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The focus of this question requires a relative evaluation of the War among the various reasons contributing to the development of the Labour party. In considering the war as important candidates might consider the role of Arthur Henderson and Cabinet responsibility, new organisation at grass roots level, the importance of changes in the Franchise in 1918, the increased number of candidates in 1918 as opposed to 1910, the unity of the party during the war on issues that affected the working classes, such as the war emergency workers national committee, and the new constitution of the party in 1918. These factors might be compared with the importance of the Liberal split during the war and its subsequent consequences. The 1922 election was also important in the emergence of the Labour party. Candidates may also consider the importance of the formation of the First labour government as this established the Labour party as the genuine alternative and gave them credibility. The role of Macdonald may also be considered as he succeeded Clynes, his qualities of leadership and his socialist philosophy which was of the organic evolutionary type. The 1923 election was also important as Asquith decided to back Labour because of the danger of Liberal absorption by the Conservatives.

11   **'Baldwin was the <u>most</u> important reason why the Conservative party dominated British politics in the period from 1922 to 1939.' How far do you agree with this view?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are many reasons for Conservative dominance in this period and examiners should not expect candidates to cover all areas, what matters is the quality of the argument. The divisions within the liberal party after the First World War meant that Labour emerged as the main opposition. There were some fears about their links with Soviet Russia and communism which worried many of the middle class. Labour were also seen as inexperienced and their subsequent division in 1931 left the field open to the Conservative party. The extension of the franchise to women benefited the Conservative party. Legislation passed by Conservative governments was often appealing and mention might be made of the work of Neville Chamberlain at the Ministry of Health. The leadership of Baldwin might be seen as a positive reason; he seemed to reflect the national mood and his brand of new Conservatism with its appeal to Englishness and morality was popular. He was seen as being moderate and non-confrontational, apart from the General Strike, following a policy of one-nation Conservatism. It might be argued that the Conservatives gained from the creation of a National Government as some of the unpopular policies were not associated with them. As the policies were introduced under the umbrella of a National Government it appeared to many as if there was no alternative, particularly to orthodox economic policies. The National Government did appear to handle some issues well; the Abdication Crisis of 1936 might be used as an example. Some might even claim that the social and economic measures undertaken to cope with the Depression were beneficial, particularly for those who were in work as their standard of living rose.

12 **'The Second Labour government (1929-1931) was a complete failure.' Assess this view.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates may argue that the short length of time spent in office by the government is a clear sign of its failure and this is reinforced by the divisions within the party that followed. However, this should be balanced against the fact that they were a minority government. Candidates might also consider the financial policies of Snowden at the Treasury, which were orthodox. The government was unable to deal with the economic problems created by the Depression and it is likely that this will form a central part of many answers. However, it is unlikely that any government would have been able to deal with the problem. The situation was worse for the Labour party as many of those who were made unemployed and would suffer from the proposed benefit cuts were their natural supporters and the people who they were supposed to represent. As they were a minority government they would be unable to pursue a socialist or radical policy on either unemployment or housing and this might therefore be considered a failure. Labour's constitution, through Clause IV, committed them to this but as a minority government and faced with Liberal and Conservative hostility they had little chance. The moderation of both Macdonald and Snowden might be argued to have been a success as it convinced some that Labour were safe and moderate, which was vital to win votes. It might therefore be argued that Macdonald's solution to the crisis was correct and that failure was the result of those who stuck to their trade union roots.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1945-1990

13   **To what extent was the Second World War the <u>main</u> reason for Britain's decision to decolonise?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many candidates are likely to agree with the assertion and may point to the economic difficulties created by the war and the political changes in Britain that the war had brought about as evidence, they may even suggest that dependence on the USA financially, that resulted from the war, was a further reason. Economic difficulties were serious as a result of the war, military and defence costs were crippling, but this was complicated by the belief that the Empire was less the problem than part of the solution to her economic difficulties as a closed imperial economy could guarantee markets, cheap food and raw materials. In order to overcome the financial problems at the end of the war Britain was heavily dependent upon the USA and they were opposed to colonialism and put pressure on Britain to abandon her Empire, in India in 1947, Palestine in 1948 and in 1956 to abandon Egypt and Suez. It was difficult for Britain to resist this unless they played the Cold War card, as they did in Malaysia. Candidates may also consider the pressure from colonial national movements such as the Gold Coast Riots in 1950, the Quit India Movement and the Mau Mau in Kenya. This also had an economic impact, that Britain could not handle after the war, and will provide candidates with opportunities to link together factors. Although there were many attempts to foster local elites and economies this strategy usually involved the acceptance of independence as a goal that tended to come sooner rather than later. This could be seen as the main reason for decolonisation by the 1950s. Some candidates may also argue that political change in the United Kingdom was particularly important; especially the attitudes of the political parties, originally united in resisting decolonisation this outlook had changed. Talk centred on managing decolonisation as part of trying to retain influence, this was certainly the view of Macmillan after 1957. Racism at home may also be mentioned.

14   **To what extent did Britain lose its position as a great power in the period after 1945?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Answers may start by considering what is needed for great power status, but this then needs to be linked to developments after 1945. The economic consequences of the Second World War for Britain meant that she became heavily dependent upon US aid, it forced Britain to hand over the initiative to the US in Greece, Turkey, Persia and the Mediterranean. There is evidence for candidates to use to show that Britain was unable to stand up to the USSR. However, there were still signs that Britain was a major power; candidates might point to Britain's place as a permanent member of the Security Council at the UN and the development of a British bomb, which was detonated in 1952. The loss of Empire might be used to show that British influence had declined, although some might suggest that the Commonwealth has kept some role for Britain. Most significantly many may consider the Suez crisis to show that Britain was no longer a great power and this lead ultimately to a withdrawal from east of Suez with the Gulf, Singapore and Malaysia by 1971. In some instances this was due to costs, again suggesting that Britain was unable to sustain its commitments. There may be consideration of an increased dependence upon the US and what that reveals about British power, this may be over nuclear weapons or détente. The development of NATO might be used to show that Britain was unable to defend herself, however this might be countered by reference to Britain's role in countering the USSR as unlike France she did not commit to a purely European role; Britain was involved in Korea. There may also be a consideration of Britain's involvement in resolving other conflicts in Asia. She was not involved in Vietnam as there were many other concerns and forces were overstretched. Involvement in Europe might be used to show that Britain needed closer European involvement and that her success, as in the Falklands, was limited to minor issues.

15   **How successful was the foreign policy of Thatcher?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates at the higher levels will probably identify the aims of her foreign policy, she had strong ideological convictions and a forceful style and use these as criteria against which to judge success or failure, rather than simply look at each event and assess it, however either approach is acceptable. It might be argued that her anti-communist views were very successful as she was in office as communism collapsed in Europe, but this was largely due to factors outside her influence. The consequence was the reunification of Germany, which she did not want. However, she was able to build up a working relationship with Gorbachev and initially use it to mediate between USSR and USA, but this was later undermined as the two powers reached an agreement at Reykjavik which would mean Europe would be exposed to the larger conventional forces of the USSR. Thatcher was able to limit the impact of this. This might be used as an example of occasions when Britain struggled to control US independence despite the special relationship between Thatcher and Reagan; other examples might include SDI and the invasion of Grenada. Thatcher did try to uphold British power and independence and this could be illustrated through reference to the Falkland's War and negotiations with the EU. Thatcher was able to get back some of Britain's contribution to the EU budget and it might be argued that this helped Britain's standing in Europe, but this was at the expense of a good relationship with France and Germany and would cause problems in the future. Britain contributed to the SEA as it was consistent with her belief in free market economics. However, this might be balanced by considering the nuclear dependence Britain had on the US and mention might be made of the presence of US weapons in Britain. British willingness to work with the US in support for Kuwait and the Gulf War might also be used to show that Britain was a major power.

Post War Britain 1951-1994

16   How far were Conservative scandals the most important reason for their defeat in the 1964 election?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Labour won in 1964 by the large swing in the popular vote but only by a narrow margin of seats-317 to the Conservatives' 304 and only a 5 seat majority in the Commons. Candidates should weigh up the importance of scandals in causing defeat against other factors. In considering the question of scandal most will consider the Profumo affair and its impact. Some answers will point to the youthful leadership of Wilson and his identification with all things modern, this contrasted well with the new aristocratic Conservative leader Sir Alec Douglas Home, who ran an ineffective campaign and did not handle television well. Wilson promoted his image with much talk of planning and the opportunities offered by the white heat of technology. The grey years of Gaitskell were over and Wilson exploited Conservative weakness, especially economic, with skill. However, many candidates will conclude that it was the Conservatives who lost the election in the years after 1959, rather than Labour or Wilson who won it. The Conservatives appeared too 'Establishment', the promotion of a peer to the leadership was a mistake given the satirists of the day. Party organisation lost its way after 1959; Butler replaced Hailsham and was in turn replaced by MacLeod. The affluence of the 1950s now appeared to be sluggish by comparison with elsewhere and the Conservative Chancellor imposed unpopular deflationary policies in 1961. Decolonisation and immigration unsettled some whilst a new economic policy, the New Approach, involving controlled expansion was undermined by De Gaulle's veto of joining the EEC. A radical Cabinet reshuffle, the Night of the Long Knives, unsettled his ministerial colleagues when it was intended to create a fresh and dynamic government. Macmillan's choice of replacement was botched; middle and working class voters were lost. Labour won on a modernising agenda.

17   How successful was the Heath government of 1970 to 1974?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Many will see this period as one of failure and will point to the Miners Strike and the Three Day Week, which appeared to epitomise the failed economic policy of the government. Heath has been criticised for failing to carry through the promised tough programme of economic and industrial reform on which the party had won the election of 1970. They started out determined to carry through a 'quiet revolution' by reducing the scale of the public sector and government intervention in the economy. The government was beset by a series of problems, but also made tactical errors of judgement. The Trade Union legislation was brought in very quickly and without sufficient consultation. The Industrial Relations Act was so broad in scope that it became a target for labour hostility; the good aspects were lost in the general bitterness about the method of its passage. The general refusal to comply with the terms meant it never became credible. The Ugandan Crisis inflamed hostility towards immigration, Ireland was another problem as Heath relied on the support of Unionist MPs. There were some achievements: taxes were cut, radical reform of tax and benefits system was well advanced when the government fell. However, it was the reversals of 1972 that the government is best remembered for. The decision to bail out Upper Clyde Shipbuilders, a year after refusal, was seen as a humiliating climb down. There was rising unemployment, combined with the determination to speed the rate of growth before entry to the EEC led to deliberate economic expansion, which flew in the face of the previous commitment to solve the problem of inflation. Voluntary wage control was impossible and Heath had to do this by law, the ultimate U turn.

18   **To what extent were Labour weaknesses the main reason for Conservative electoral victories under Thatcher?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a variety of reasons that candidates might offer for Conservative electoral success, however to achieve the higher levels candidates must write at least a good paragraph on the named factor even if they then argue that it was less important. When considering the weakness of Labour they might consider the weak leadership of Foot and Kinnock as major factors or they might look at areas of policy that were not popular with the electorate, particularly defence. Candidates might also consider the 'Looney Left' as a factor in discrediting Labour with the electorate. Labour were also closely associated with the Trade Unions and the question of too much union power, following the 'Winter of Discontent' might be seen as an issue. In the first period in office Labour weakness was an issue as with the economic problems of rising unemployment it should have been possible for Labour to have been a strong alternative. Against this candidates should consider the strength of the Conservative party. This might include the appeal of Thatcher as a strong leader, in contrast to the Labour party. Although she was controversial she appeared strong and willing to stand up to the Unions. The recovery of the economy helped later on, but crucial for the second term was the success of the Falkland's War and restoration of pride that followed; the Conservative party were able to take full advantage of it as opinion polls beforehand were not good. Some answers might suggest that Thatcher had a strong set of ministers around her, others might comment on the reforms, particularly the denationalisation and selling of council homes which helped to create a new class to which Thatcherism appealed. There might be some consideration of changes in voting behaviour.

F962/01 European and World History Period Studies
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609

The Crusades and Crusader states 1095-1192

1   Assess the reasons why Pope Urban II called for a crusade in 1095.   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may address two main areas of reasons: those to do with developments in Asia Minor and the Holy Land and those to do with Western Christendom and the papacy. There should be coverage of both areas for candidates to score in the higher bands. In relation to the developments in Asia Minor and the Holy Land candidates may refer to the appeal from Alexius Comnenus which reached Italy in 1095, the advance of the Seljuk Turks towards Constantinople, the supposed atrocities of the Turks and the difficulties facing both Christians under Muslim rule and Christian pilgrims. There may be reference to longer term developments such as the defeat of the Byzantine Empire at Manzikert. In relation to reasons to do more directly with Western Christendom and the papacy, candidates may refer to Urban II's desire to aid fellow Christians, to heal the rift between the Latin and Greek Churches and enhance the authority of the papacy both in the Byzantine Empire and in Western Christendom. In relation to the latter there may be discussion of the 11th century papacy's attempts to establish its authority over the western church (uniting the Church under the papal banner in an armed pilgrimage against the infidel would help this aim). There may also be reference to the desire of the Church to secure peace in western Christendom by diverting its warrior class to war against the infidel. In discussing all the above candidates may refer to Urban's appeal at Clermont in November 1095.

2   'The Second Crusade failed because there was no clear aim.' How far do you agree with this view?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates should address the factor in the question even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates in dealing with the given factor may discuss the context of the calling of the crusade (fall of Edessa) and the dilution of the specific aim to recover it, both in the Crusade appeal and in the preaching of Bernard of Clairvaux and in the way the crusade developed from the authorization of a crusade against the Wends and the diversion of crusading effort in the Iberian peninsula. In addition once the crusade reached the Levant, it became clear that to re-take Edessa was impractical, Antioch had failed to persuade Louis to attack Aleppo and the council at Acre after much discussion agreed to attack Damascus. However, dilution of aims was just one reason for failure and candidates may set discussion of this against other factors such as the divisions amongst the crusader leadership (both between Louis and Conrad and in the Holy Land), the defeat of Conrad in Asia Minor, the relative unity of the enemy forces, rivalries in the Holy Land, strategic errors and the strength of Nur ed Din.

3   Assess the view that the Third Crusade was a failure.   [50]

No specific answer is looked for but candidates will need to assess the degree of success or failure of the Third Crusade. In considering the arguments for failure, candidates may address the aims of the crusade, the outcomes of it and the historical context. They may well consider the failure to take Jerusalem or decisively defeat Saladin as well as the divisions between Crusade leaders (Richard and Philip), the rivalries over who should be King of Jerusalem and the disintegration of the German effort after the death of Frederick

Barbarossa. On the other hand candidates may stress the historical context – the relative strengths of the Saladin, the weak position of the remaining crusader forces in the Holy Land, the lack of support from the Byzantine Empire – and the achievements of the campaign – the taking of Cyprus, the taking of Acre, the defeat of Saladin at Arsuf, and the negotiated truce which guaranteed the continued survival of the rump of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and the rights of pilgrimage.

The Renaissance from c. 1400- c. 1550

4   How important was the papacy and the Church in the development of the
**   Renaissance in Italy?   [50]**

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to deal fully with the role of the
papacy and the Church even if they wish to argue that its importance was not as significant
as other factors. In relation to the Church and the papacy candidates may discuss some of
the following (in no particular order): patronage of Church towards humanists (like Bruni
and Bembo) and artists (like Masaccio, Raphael and Michelangelo), sculptors (like
Brunelleschi); influence of the Church more generally in shaping the context of
Renaissance art/sculpture and writing – the importance of religious themes and scenes
(candidates may refer to particular examples (Leonardo's 'Last Supper', Michelangelo's
'Pieta' etc.)); the role of specific popes – such as Julius II's employment of Bramante and
Raphael and Pius II who was himself a humanist scholar, or Nicholas V and Sixtus IV who
created and developed the Vatican Library and the popes Leo X and Clement VII who
made Rome the centre of the Renaissance. There may be some discussion of the later
period where the influence of Rome gave way to Venice, although religious themes
remained dominant. Such discussion needs to be set in the wider context of developments
in the Renaissance to answer 'How important?' – the role of the nobles, princes, guilds and
other patrons who commissioned and influenced the subject matter of the Renaissance,
the influence of classical ideas and literature, the individual genius of particular artists and
writers and so on.

5   To what extent did the Medici family influence the development of the Renaissance
**   in Florence?   [50]**

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to deal fully with the role of the
Medici in Florence even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important.
Discussion of the role of the Medici in Florence may include reference to Giovanni di Bicci,
Cosimo (Medici palace, church of San Lorenzo (Brunelleschi), monastery of San Marco
(Fra Angelico), Gozzoli's 'The Procession of the Magi', Piero, Lorenzo (patron of Ficino
and other Neo-Platonists)). Candidates may discuss the influence of the Medici in terms of
both patronage and their influence over the type and style of art. Such discussion needs to
be balanced against other influences, such as that of the guilds (wool, cloth, silk merchants
in particular), other prominent individuals (the struggle between the Strozzi family and the
Medici for example), the reaction against the lavish patronage and subject matter that
came with Savonarola after the fall of the Medici in 1494 (eg Savonarola's influence on
Botticelli, and the influence of the Florentine Republic after 1498 with its emphasis on civic
virtues).

6   Assess the view that the Italian Renaissance was the <u>main</u> influence on the
**   development of the Northern Renaissance.   [50]**

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to deal fully with the role of the
Italian Renaissance even if they wish to argue that other influences predominated. On the
influence of the Italian Renaissance, candidates may discuss the influence of Rome and
the Church, attendance of northern students at Italian universities such as Bologna and
Padua, the exposure of foreign merchants to Italian Renaissance art/sculpture etc. in the
major centres of trade (Florence, Milan and Venice). Candidates may discuss the influence
of Italian artists in the work of Holbein and Dürer and the influence of Italian humanism on
northern humanism. Candidates may balance such discussion against native and
distinctively northern characteristics/developments including, for example, the Christian
focus of northern humanism and its concern for true reading of the scriptures (albeit by
using the methods of Italian scholars) – there may be reference to Reuchlin, Erasmus, and
others. Similarly there may be reference to the distinctiveness and realism of northern

artistic developments, particularly in relation to Dutch art and the concerns of northern patrons and the influence of Lutheran and Calvinist ideas.

Exploration and Discovery c.1445-c.1545

7   To what extent were economic factors the <u>main</u> reason for undertaking overseas exploration in this period?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates are likely to argue that economic factors were the most important motivation although this will need analyzing and supporting. Candidates may discuss the desire to break into the spice trade – pepper, cinnamon, cloves – and the trade in luxury goods (silks and jewels) both of which offered the prospect of high profits – so the search was on for a new route to the east. This search was also motivated by the growing insecurity of supply (partly as a result of Ottoman advance). This desire helps to explain Portuguese search for a route round Africa and Columbus' attempt to find an ocean route across the Atlantic. A further economic motive was gold – a factor in Portuguese exploration of the African coast ('Gold Coast') and Spanish exploration of Latin America. A further economic motive was the search for labour (slaves) – especially for Portugal. Broadly economic still was the motive to find land to settle (Columbus' 1493 voyage included 1200 settlers). Consideration of economic motives needs to be balanced against other reasons. Candidates may consider the role of religion – to spread Christianity and find Prester John and other Christians – explorers testified to the dual motivation of religion and gold/spices. They may also consider the influence of the Renaissance (and its emphasis on human endeavour), issues of individual and national prestige/rivalry and the desire for knowledge.

8   Assess the reasons why Portugal was able to develop an overseas Empire in this period.   [50]

No specific answer is being looked for but candidates will need to discuss and evaluate a range of reasons to score well. Candidates may discuss some of the following reasons, some specific to Portugal, some more general. Candidates may consider the technological developments such as that of a suitable ocean-going vessel – the caravel, with its shallow draught, seaworthy construction and lateen sails, enabling effective handling in all winds – and the larger cargo vessel – the carrack. They may also discuss the development of the compass, astrolabe and Zacuto's method for calculating latitude. The development of gunpowder technology also enabled ships to be defended. Candidates may also consider Portugal's geographic position, its maritime experience, the significance of the capture of Cueta, and development of Madeira, the Azores and Cape Verde islands, the establishment of forts and trading posts on the African coast, military superiority and destruction of rival fleets, exploitation of divisions in the political situation in Asia. Candidates may also stress the roles of individuals from kings like Henry the Navigator and John II to explorers like Diaz, da Gama and Cabral as well as crucial agreements with the Spanish (such as that over the Canaries in 1479 and the deal with Charles V in 1529 over the spice islands).

9   'The Spanish Empire brought Spain as many problems as benefits.' How far do you agree with this view?   [50]

No specific answer is being looked for and candidates may agree or disagree to an extent with the view expressed. What is important is that candidates do not simply describe problems and benefits, but also evaluate their significance to reach a judgement on the balance between problems and benefits to Spain. Among the benefits we can expect candidates to consider the import of specie (mainly silver), the prestige for Spain and the Spanish Crown, the acquisition of land and territories for the Spanish Crown, the

opportunities for ambitious Spaniards for adventure and settlement in the New World and the growth of trade between Spain and the Americas. Amongst the problems, candidates may consider problems of control and organization both of conquistadors and the colonies established (the tensions between royal governors and the established colonists), the distorting effects that the import of gold and silver began to have on the economy, the security of the routes to and from the New World, the problem of the treatment of native populations and so on.

Spain 1469-1556

10   **To what extent were Ferdinand and Isabella's domestic policies influenced by their religion?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to discuss the influence of religion on domestic policy and need to balance this discussion against the influence of other factors to address 'To what extent?'. Candidates may discuss the role of religion for both Ferdinand and Isabella and may discuss the role of religion in their specifically religious policies (such as Church reform, the Inquisition and policies towards *convivencia*, Jews and Moors). Though not strictly domestic policy, there may be discussion of the conquest of Granada. There may be discussion of other domestic policies where religion plays little or no role: policy towards nobles, towns, administration, finance etc. Candidates may well argue that the influence of religion was stronger for Isabella than Ferdinand and that the motivation for most/all religious policies was a mixture of religious and other motives.

11   **How successful were the foreign policies of Ferdinand and Isabella?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may or may not include the conquest of Granada in foreign policy. Clearly the conquest of Granada was successful in terms of its main aim, but candidates may also discuss its consequences for Ferdinand and Isabella's position in Spain and their international reputation. Candidates may argue that because of the civil war and then the war with Granada, Ferdinand and Isabella were not able to pursue and active foreign policy until1492. They may argue also that thereafter their foreign policy was largely opportunistic. They may discuss the need to check France and the attempts to construct anti-French coalitions and marriage alliances, the attempts to intervene in Italy (to prevent French domination) and the attempts to expand influence in North Africa. Candidates may argue that success was considerable: with success in northern Spain (acquisition of Cerdagne, Rousillon and Navarre) and success in containing French influence in Italy through diplomacy and arms (Cordoba's generalship may be referred to) and cementing Aragonese interests in Naples and Sicily. They may also refer to North African conquests such as that of Tripoli (1510) and to the beginnings of a Spanish Empire in the Americas.

12   **How successful was the domestic policy of Charles I?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may assess success by, for example, testing polices against aims, results and historical context; analysis may also consider success at different times or in different areas but there needs to be some overall judgement as well about the reign as a whole. This is a question about domestic policy (in Spain) and discussion of foreign policy/ other elements of Charles' monarchia should not be credited unless it is in terms of its impact on the success of domestic policy. Candidates may consider: how well Charles dealt with his initial diffculties; his relations with the Cortes of Castile; policy towards Aragon; relations with the nobility; administrative reform; financial and economic policy; religion; the impact of absence, costs of foreign policy, Americas etc.

Charles V: International Relations and the Holy Roman Empire 1519-1559

13   To what extent were Luther's ideas between 1517 and 1530 simply a reaction against abuses in the Catholic Church?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may well argue that although abuses in the Catholic Church played a part, other factors played a great role in shaping Luther's ideas. In relation to the abuses in the Catholic Church, candidates may discuss the indulgences controversy and the *95 Theses*, the *Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* (with its attack on Church corruption/abuse) … Such discussion may be balanced against other influences, such as his theological studies and his belief in the efficacy of faith (they may refer to the so-called 'tower experience') and its development into the doctrine of '*sola fide*', the development of the idea of *sola scriptura* in response to the debate with Eck, the idea of the priesthood of all believers, the reliance on scripture led him to question the sacraments (*The Babylonish Captivity of the Church*). Candidates may argue that Luther's ideas were developed out of his own study of theology and concern for his own salvation and then in response to the debate and pressures his ideas unleashed rather than a reaction to the abuses of the Church – the latter provided more the occasion for the exposition and development of his ideas than the cause of them.

14   'The power of the princes was the main reason Charles V was unable to crush Lutheranism.' How far do you agree with this view?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for, but candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may well argue that the power of the princes was the main factor and discuss, for example, the limited ability Charles had to act without princely cooperation, the role of Frederick of Saxony, the Diet of Augsburg, the Schmalkaldic League, Charles' need to appease the princes to pursue his wars with France, the unwillingness of the Catholic princes to enhance Charles' power after the victory at Mühlberg, the revolt of the princes and the Peace of Augsburg. Candidates may also discuss the impact of Charles' absences (especially in the 1520s), the Diet of Worms, his initially conciliatory policy towards the princes, the nature of his authority within the Holy Roman Empire, the attractions of Lutheranism to princes, peasants, towns and so on, the variable attitudes of popes, and so on.

15   How successful was Charles V in dealing with the Ottoman threat?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may assess success by, for example, testing polices against aims, results and historical context; analysis may also consider success at different times but there needs to be some overall judgement as well about success as a whole. Candidates may discuss the situation near the start of Charles' reign and the threat posed by the Ottomans in the Mediterranean (fall of Rhodes, alliance with Barbary pirates) and the Balkans (conquest of Belgrade). In relation to the former candidates may discuss, for example, the capture of Tunis and its impact and the failure against Algiers; in relation to the latter, the defeat at Mohacs and the siege of Vienna and its impact. Judgements on success or failure may involve discussion of the role of factors such as the demands on Charles of other problems (e.g. war with France or the princes in Germany), available resources (e.g. no navy able to take on the Turks), the limitations on the Ottomans (e.g. their other problems, such as Persia, and the constraints of distance from Constantinople).

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556-1609

16   How successful were Philip II's religious policies in Spain?   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may discuss Philip II's faith, relations with the papacy, and the position of the Church and royal powers over it at the start of the reign by way of context. There may be discussion of: the differences with the papacy over matters such as Church jurisdiction; the need for reform and Philip's success in promoting it; the work of the Inquisition; policy towards *conversos* and 'heretics'. Candidates may argue that overall the success of Philip II's religious policies was variable by arguing, for example, that whilst Philip maintained control of the Church, relations with the papacy were uneasy; that there was some success in Church Reform and some evidence of a revival in religious fervour.

17   To what extent was Philip II responsible for the outbreak of rebellion in the Netherlands to 1572?   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to Philip II, candidates may discuss Philip's absence from 1559, his lack of understanding of the depth of feeling in the Netherlands, his religious policies (reform of bishoprics, the Segovia letters), his decision to send a Spanish army to the Netherlands, his appointments such as Granvelle and Alba and their policies. Such discussion may be balanced against the role of other factors, such as the actions of Margaret of Pama, Granvelle and Alba, the longer term context of regional, States and noble privileges, the burdens of taxation and the spread of heresy, the Iconoclastic Fury, hedge preaching, the roles of Egmont, Horne, William of Orange and Brederode, the Tenth Penny tax, the Sea Beggars and so on. Candidates may well argue that the outbreak of rebellion was caused by a combination of Philip's uncompromising rule from Spain and the actions of his lieutenants in the Netherlands in the context of a Netherlands and nobility jealous of their privileges/semi-independence, economic hardship and the spread of Protestantism.

18   How important was William of Orange to the success of the Dutch revolt?   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately: the focus must be on the assessment of the role of William of Orange, an assessment that may well involve evaluating his role against that of other factors. In relation to William of Orange candidates may discuss his abilities and contribution as a figurehead, statesman and military leader in the years up to his assassination and his importance as a symbol of national resistance thereafter. They may refer to his role in the initial stages of the Revolt, his importance in Holland and Zeeland in the early 1570s, his role in the Union of Utrecht, and his role in securing foreign support. Such discussion may be set in the context of the importance of other factors, such as the impact of Spanish policy, diversions and mistakes, the roles of other leaders such as Maurice of Nassau, the significance of foreign aid (especially from England), the significance of religion and the resistance of Holland and Zeeland and so on.

Paper Total [100]

F962/02 European and World History Period Studies
Option B: Modern 1795-2003

Answer any **two** questions from either **one** or **two** of the Study Topics.

Napoleon, France and Europe 1795-1815

1   **To what extent did the creation of the Empire in 1804 mark a <u>significant</u> change in Napoleon's rule of France?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. To score highly candidates should discuss elements of continuity and change before and after 1804. Candidates may point to the change from Republic to Empire and stress the increasing authoritarianism of Napoleonic rule (eg institution of hereditary principle, increasing use of *senatus consultum* and arbitrary arrest and the creation of an imperial nobility) and the lack of significant reform after 1804. Others may stress the elements of continuity and argue that authoritarian rule was implicit form the start (Napoleon's powers as First Consul, the changes to the Constitution, the 'sham' of popular sovereignty (there may be reference to 'plebiscitory dictatorship', the elements of the police state and so forth. They may argue that the story of Napoleon's rule was one of increasing dictatorship from the start and that 1804 was just one stage in this process.

2   **How far can Napoleon's military success in Europe from 1796 to 1809 be explained by the weaknesses of his opponents?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to the weaknesses of his opponents, candidates may discuss some of the following: the size, membership and organisation of their armies and their strategies/tactics, the competence of their generals, the divisions between political and military leadership, the weaknesses of coalitions and alliances and so forth. Such discussion may be contrasted with the size, membership and organisation of the French army, the battlefield tactics and campaign strategies reflecting both the legacy of pre-Napoleonic reforms and Napoleon's developments, the competence of the officer corps, Napoleon's generalship, Napoleon's combination of political and military leadership, the resources of France, and so on. Candidates may well support their arguments by reference to Napoleon's Italian campaigns, the Marengo campaign, Ulm and Austerlitz, Jena and Auerstadt, Eylau and Freidland, Wagram.

3   **To what extent does British opposition explain Napoleon's eventual defeat in 1814 and 1815?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to British opposition, candidates may discuss British naval supremacy and the use of Orders in Council, British diplomacy in organizing and subsidizing anti-Napoleon coalitions, British military action, especially in support of the Peninsular War, Wellington and Waterloo and so forth. Such discussion may be balanced against discussion of the impact of the Continental System, the growth of opposition to Napoleon, the Peninsular War and Russian campaign (1812), the arguable decline of Napoleon's generalship and armies, the improvements in his opponents' armed forces and officer corps, the adaptation to Napoleonic tactics, the efforts of the Quadruple Alliance and so on.

Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France1814-1870

4　　To what extent should Louis Philippe's foreign policy be considered a failure?　[50]

No specific answer is looked for. Failure may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. In assessing Louis Philippe's foreign policy, candidates may discuss some of the following: the Belgian question, events in Poland and Italy, the Mehmet Ali crisis, Tahiti and the Spanish marriage. Candidates may seek to compare the general approach of Louis Philippe (avoid war, cooperate with Britain) with the clamour in the French press for glory and a more active foreign policy. By the former the foreign policy may be judged a success, by the latter a failure ('France is bored'). Candidates may see failure also in the role apparently weak foreign policy had in undermining support for the Orleanist monarchy and contributing to the Revolution in 1848. Candidates may also point to the 'missed opportunity' of the Belgian issue and the humiliation of the outcome of the Mehmet Ali Crisis.

5　　Assess the reasons why the Second Republic was short-lived.　　　[50]

No specific answer is being looked for but candidates will need to discuss and evaluate a range of reasons to score well. Candidates may discuss some of the following: the tension between the Parisian/left wing revolution and the provinces reflected in the elections to the Constituent Assembly; the June Days and its repression and its legacy of bitter division; the weaknesses of the constitution (especially with regard to the roles of President and Assembly); the election of Louis Napoleon; the misjudgement of politicians who believed Louis Napoleon could be managed; changes to the franchise; Louis Napoleon's ambitions and exploitation of divisions; the carefully managed coup of December 1851 and the plebiscite of 1852. Candidates may argue that the key factors were the tensions between left and right, the popularity of Louis Napoleon and his careful propaganda, the misjudgement of the politicians like Thiers and the lack of support for the Republic from the workers after the June Days.

6　　How successful was Napoleon III's domestic policy?　　　　[50]

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. In relation to aims, candidates may claim that Napoleon had no clear aims beyond staying in power or may focus on his social and economic aims as outline, for example, in his widely distributed booklet, *The Extinction of Pauperism*. In relation to social and economic policy, candidates may point to some successes, for example, state stimulus to railway building (fivefold increase in extent) through operating leases and the considerable knock-on effects to other industries (6% p.a. growth in iron, steal and coal) and agriculture (extension of railway network stimulated production for urban markets). They may also point to promotion of banking and free trade (Chevalier Treaty with Britain) and the work of Haussman in Paris. There are qualifications to this success (such as the end of the railway boom in the 1860s and the need to rescue *Crédit Moblier* in 1867). In relation to political survival, candidates may argue that staying in power for 18 years was a considerable achievement achieved by retaining popular (at least peasant) support and modifying the constitution. Candidates may also argue that ultimately Napoleon III failed as opposition increased and economic woes increased in the late 1860s.

The USA in the 19ᵗʰ Century: Westward Expansion and Civil War 1803-c.1890

7 **Assess the reasons for the acquisition of territory by the United States from the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 to the Gadsden Purchase in1853.** **[50]**

No specific answer is being looked for but candidates will need to discuss and evaluate a range of reasons to score well. Candidates may refer to the Louisiana Purchase, the acquisition of Florida, Texas, New Mexico and California, Oregon and the Gadsden Purchase. Candidates may also refer to the acquisition of territory from the Indians. They may discuss the reasons for particular acquisitions and/or assess more general reasons for the acquisition of territory. Candidates may argue that one major reason for acquisition of territory was to prevent it falling into other hands and point to Jefferson's fears over New Orleans (seen as vital to US economic interests) being in French hands under Napoleon. They may point to the actions of individuals such as General Jackson in Florida. They may point to rivalry with Britain over Oregon and the need for land for settlement and the appeal of American settlers over Texas and California. They may also discuss the ambitions of different presidents (for example, Polk over Texas) and the propaganda associated with 'Manifest Destiny'.

8 **How important was the issue of slavery in causing the American Civil War?** **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately: the focus must be on the assessment of the role of slavery, an assessment that may well involve evaluating his role against that of other factors. In relation to slavery, candidates may argue its central importance as the defining feature of the South and its way of life and argue that the development of the United States and the implications of westward expansion if slavery was limited threatened the South's future. They may argue that it was the issue of slavery expansion in new territories rather than slavery itself that polarized the nation. Such discussion may be linked to other developments and factors, such as the emergence of a 'northern' Republican Party, the preservation of the southern economy in the face of the industrial north, the issue of States' rights (including the right to secede from the Union), the tensions roused by abolitionists and fire-eaters, violent incidents ('Bleeding Kansas' and John Brown's raid) and the consequences of the election of a Republican president.

9 **To what extent were superior resources the main reason for the Union victory in the American Civil War?** **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to superior resources, candidates may compare North and South in terms of the relative size of populations, the degree and extent of economic development, economic resources and railways, merchant navy and trade and so forth, arguing that in the long term the North's superiority would tell in any war of attrition. Such discussion need to be balanced against other factors that shaped the wars course and influenced its outcome, such as war aims, strategies, army sizes, generalship, morale, battles and campaigns, political leadership, pubic opinion, international opinion and support. Candidates may argue that at first the two sides were evenly matched and that, if anything, the South had advantages over the North and that resources only became significant as the war dragged on without decision.

Peace and War: International Relations c.1890-1941

10   To what extent was Germany responsible for the outbreak of the First World War?
[50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to German responsibility, candidates may discuss the aims and nature of Wilhelmine foreign policy, especially in relation to elements such as the Moroccan crises, the Dual Alliance and the 'blank cheque', and German actions in the arms and naval races. Such discussion may be balanced against the degree of culpability of other states (Russia, Austria, France and Britain), the role of militarism, imperialism, the Alliance system, domestic pressures, the Balkan crises and the decisions taken during the July crisis. Candidates may show awareness of the Fischer thesis, but this is not required.

11   How successful was the League of Nations in resolving international disputes in the
1920s?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may discuss the role of the League of Nations in some of the following disputes: Poland-Lithuania dispute, Aaland Islands, Corfu, Greece-Bulgaria dispute, Iraq-Turkey dispute. Candidates may argue that the League was successful in many of these but qualify this by recognizing their minor nature; they may also suggest that the limitations of the League's success was demonstrated in particular by the Corfu Incident when a great power was involved. Candidates may also suggest that often international disputes were settled in other ways: by the Conference of Ambassadors or by international treaties (such as the Locarno and Kellogg-Briand treaties). They may also claim that the League's success can be exaggerated because of post-war desire for peace. Candidates may also explain the limitations of League success by reference to the weaknesses of the League as a peacekeeping organization.

12   Assess the reasons why Britain followed a policy of appeasement in the 1930s.
[50]

No specific answer is being looked for but candidates will need to discuss and evaluate a range of reasons to score well. Candidates may set the policy in the context of the impact of the Great Depression, the weakness of the League of Nations, American isolationism and the growth of aggressive nationalism both in Asia and Europe in the 1930s. Candidates are likely to focus their attention on British policy towards Germany and may focus on the late 1930s. They may discuss some of the following reasons for the policy: feelings of justice and morality (e.g. Germany had some legitimate claims in relation to the Treaty of Versailles); economic necessity and the limited resources available to finance military expenditure; the time required for military rearmament; Britain's global responsibilities and the diplomatic realities (e.g. a weak/politically unstable France with its Maginot mentality, alienation of Italy over Abyssinia and US isolationism); and the influence of public opinion. Candidates may also point to the beliefs of some politicians that Germany could be reasoned with and that a strong Germany was important as a bulwark against Communism.

From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894-1941

13   **How successful were the economic and social policies of the Tsar's government from 1894 to 1914?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may focus their attention on the policies of Witte and Stolypin and may not distinguish clearly between economic and social policies. Candidates may consider policies related to agriculture and the peasantry and those related to industry and urban living and working conditions. In relation to agriculture and the peasantry candidates may point to the context of land hunger, rising population and harvest failures, subsistence farming dominated by the *mir*, and lack of mechanisation. It may be argued that government policy was motivated by government concern for its own income, the interests of the nobility and the desire to contain peasant unrest, and discuss measures such as peasant resettlement to Siberia, and Stolypin's measures to encourage peasant independence and release of state lands to the peasants. They may argue that by the time of his assassination in 1911 success was limited, with more success in encouraging peasant landownership than in creating viable consolidated farms. In relation to industry, candidates may argue that Witte's reforms focused on the encouragement of industry through protectionism and foreign investment, and argue that whilst there were some impressive percentage improvements in heavy industrial production and railway extension the levels achieved by 1914 were well below other great powers. There was also a price in terms of urban living and working conditions and here the government did little to regulate factories. !905 and the strikes of 1912-14 may be used as evidence of the limited effectiveness of reforms and policies to address the fundamental conditions in Russia.

14   **'The Bolsheviks were able to seize power in October 1917 mainly because of the weaknesses of the Provisional Government.' How far do you agree with this view?**
                                                                                        [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. The focus of the question is on 1917 and specifically reasons for the October Revolution. In relation to the Provisional Government, candidates may refer to the circumstances of its creation, its legitimacy and relationship with the Petrograd Soviet, its policies towards the war, the land question, the economy and its ability to deal with opposition. Candidates may argue that its fate was not inevitable and suggest the failure of the Kerensky offensive, of Kornilov's attempted coup and to deal with the land question were crucial to its fate. Such discussion may also discuss the exploitation of unrest by the Bolsheviks and the effectiveness of their propaganda and organisation after the return of Lenin, and the roles of Lenin and Trotsky in orchestrating the coup of October.

15   **How successful were Stalin's economic policies in the 1930s?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may focus their discussion on collectivization and the five year plans. They may refer to Stalin's desire to catch up with the West and destroy capitalist elements in industry and agriculture (and his targeting of Kulaks). In relation to the Five Year Plans candidates may discuss the differences between targets, propaganda claims and achievements, but may well still argue that results in terms of production were impressive. They may also suggest the second Five Year Plan learnt some lessons from the mistakes of the first (more reasonable targets and concern for infrastructure), whilst the third was dominated by rearmament. Candidates may also argue that whilst the economic results were impressive the social costs were high with highly controlled and disciplined workers and decline in living standards (at least in the early 1930s). In relation to agriculture, candidates may argue that the forced collectivization was successful insofar as farms were collectivized into Sovkhoz and Kolkhoz, but had a disastrous impact, at least in the short term, on agricultural production and led to famine in the countryside. They may also stress the social costs of the policy as the Kulaks were eliminated.

Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896-1943

16   **How successfully did Italian governments deal with the problems they faced from 1896 to 1915?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may identify a number of problems and assess the policies adopted by Italian governments to them, but there also needs to be some overall assessment of success. Candidates may point to the problems posed by the development of socialism and trades unions, relations with Catholic opinion, economic problems, questions of social welfare, unrest, the poverty of the South, the widening of the franchise, the legacy of the humiliation of Adowa, nationalist and imperial aspirations, violence, assassinations and the disorders of 1898 and 1914, emigration and so on. In relation to these candidates may focus on the leadership of Giolitti and his *trasformismo* approach, the use of repression and censorship, limited social reforms, taxation policy, the Libyan issue, the decision to widen the franchise and its results, and so on. Candidates may argue that for all Giolitti's ability to manage parliament, balance interests and introduce some limited reforms, his success was limited and many problems remained.

17   **To what extent do economic problems explain Mussolini's rise to power in 1922?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to the significance of economic problems, candidates may discuss the impact of unemployment, inflation, economic restructuring, problems in the countryside and the north-south divide and link these to the growth of socialism and the biennio rosso and the failure of the liberal governments of Nitti and Giolitti to deal with the problems effectively. They may also link the economic problems more directly to the rise of the fascist party and the direct action it was willing to take against strikers and communists (albeit after the main crisis had passed). Candidates may also discuss the other weaknesses of the liberal governments (for example, the failure to gain a creditable peace settlement, the failure of *trasformismo*), the fears aroused by the 'red menace', the legacy of nationalism, the ability and opportunism of Mussolini and the fascists, the attitude of the King and the establishment and the fateful decisions of 1922.

18   **How successful was Mussolini's foreign policy from 1922 to 1940?**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may argue that Mussolini's foreign policy had no clear aims or direction until the mid 1930s beyond some grand aim of restoring Italian prestige. Discussion in relation to the 1920s may refer to the Corfu Incident, the acquisition of Fiume and the Locarno Treaties as evidence of some limited success. Candidates may argue that in the 1930s Mussolini's foreign policy became more assertive and defined, looking for concessions from Britain and France, supporting Austrian independence, and a drive for Empire (Abyssinia). The Abyssinian crisis may be viewed as a turning point – 'success' was qualified by the costs and the loss of British and French friendship. After 1935, increased cooperation (e.g. over involvement in the Spanish Civil War) and alliance with Germany undermined Italy's international prestige and led Italy into a war for which it was unprepared. Candidates may argue therefore that whilst there were victories and successes, these came at great cost and in the end served to undermine Mussolini's reputation.

The Rise of China 1911-1990

19   Assess the reasons why it took the Nationalists (Guomindang) so long to establish their authority over China after the 1911 revolution.   [50]

No specific answer is being looked for but candidates will need to discuss and evaluate a range of reasons to score well. In assessing reasons, candidates may discuss some of the following: the state of China in 1911; 'sudden' nature of the revolution in 1911 and resulting power vacuum; ambitions of Yuan Shikai; the limited authority of government and local power/rivalries of warlords (the significance of the warlords may be stressed); the extent and nature of support for Sun Zhongshan (Sun Yat-sen) and the Nationalists (party formed only in 1912); the significance of the 4 May Movement; Sun Zhongshan (Sun Yat-sen) and the reorganization of the Guomindang; Foundation of CCP and links with Guomindang; the significance of the Northern Expedition and 'reunification' of China. Candidates may argue that not until the 1920s were the nationalists in a position to establish their authority and this depended in the end on military power and cooperation from sympathetic warlords and the communists.

20   How successful was the Great Leap Forward?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may consider economic, social and propaganda aims and may point to some impressive results and the lasting legacy of self-reliance, communes etc. However, they may also argue that the Great Leap Forward was a failure because its approach to economic policy was misconceived and targets were not rooted in sound economic analysis. Candidate's may argue that Mao's belief in mass effort by the peasantry to revolutionise China's industrial and agricultural production was hopelessly unrealistic, emphasizing, for example, the weaknesses of 'backyard furnaces' (the steel produced was practically useless and large areas were deforested to feed the furnaces), the limited success of the State Owned Enterprises, the weaknesses of Lysenkoism, 'sparrowcide', the collapse in food production and the 'three hard years' (50 million dead), economic crisis and the changes made in early 60s. On the other hand 'the blue ants' did achieve some impressive feats in creating canals, bridges, dams etc. through manual labour.

21   To what extent did Mao achieve his aims in the Cultural Revolution?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to explain Mao's aims in the Cultural Revolution and then assess its consequences in terms of those aims. Candidates may suggest that Mao's aims were to reassert his authority over the Communist Party and China and reverse the trend to the 'right' and the 'capitalist road' that had occurred after the Great Leap Forward. This may be coupled with a second linked aim to 'revolutionise' population, especially youth to ensure a 'Socialist road' and the peasant character of China's communist revolution. In assessing success candidates may discuss extent of Mao's authority, the role of Jiang Qing, the Gang of Four and the Central Cultural Revolution Group, the significance of the Mao personality cult (swimming in the Yangtse), Red Guards and the Little Red Book, attack on the 'four olds', removal of rightists (such as Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shaoqi), three in one committees, changes in education, medicine, agriculture, industry, culture, 'down to the countryside', self-criticism and struggle sessions, the 'cleansing the class ranks' campaign. Candidates may also discuss the fate of Mao's erstwhile ally Lin Biao, growing criticism of the Cultural Revolution in the 1970s and the return of Deng Xiaoping. Candidates may argue that whilst the Cultural Revolution reaffirmed Mao's dominance, in the longer term it did not ensure his vision of Chinese Communism as after his death Deng became dominant and the Gang of Four fell.

Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919-1963

**22   To what extent do the weaknesses of Weimar democracy explain Hitler's rise to
       power in 1933?   [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately
even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to the
weaknesses of Weimar democracy, candidates may discuss some of the following:
features of the Weimar Constitution such as proportional representation and article 48 and
the difficulties arising from coalition governments. This discussion needs to be related
directly to events in the 1920s and especially 1929-33 to link to Hitler's rise to power. Such
discussion may be balanced against discussion of other relevant factors such as the
context of the economic depression, fear of communism, Hitler, the organization and
propaganda of the Nazi Party, the 'backstairs intrigue' and so on.

23   How successful were Hitler's economic policies to 1945?   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Success may be assessed by reference to aims,
outcomes and context. Candidates may suggest that Hitler's main aim was to create an
economy which could support sustained rearmament and war, but he needed also to
deliver on promises to reduce unemployment. Candidates may argue that Hitler benefited
from the work schemes introduced by Papen and Schliecher in 1932 and that he simply
extended them and refer to the *Arbeitdienst* and government loans to private companies.
They may also discuss the degree of success of Schacht's New Plan and his system of
Mefo Bills. There should also be discussion of the Four Year Plan and then the war
economy and the move to total war. There may be reference to the 'Guns v butter' debate
and the evidence of looming economic crisis in the late 30s. Candidates may argue that
there was success (e.g. reduction in unemployment and the impressive figures for war
production) but also limitations (such as those related to autarky – by 1938 the trade deficit
was 432 million RM).

24   Assess the reasons for West Germany's 'economic miracle' in the 1950s.   [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and
assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. Candidates may discuss the
significance of some of the following in developing their assessment: the rebuilding of
Germany's industrial base after the destruction of WW2, the importance of Marshall Aid,
relative political stability following the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1949,
the economic policies of Erhard, the recovery in world trade in the 1950s, good labour
relations based on worker participation (laws of 1951 and 52), the ECSC and Germany's
joining of the EEC, the consolidation and mechanization of agriculture, low inflation, the
significance of immigration (from East Germany, Yugoslavia and Turkey) providing a pool
of cheap labour and so on.

The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s

25   **Assess the reasons for the development of the Cold War in Europe from 1945 to 1948.**

                                                                                              [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. In assessing reasons candidates may discuss some of the following: the significance of long term tensions and differences over ideology; the tensions in the wartime alliance over the defeat of Nazi Germany; the role of individual leaders (Churchill, Stalin, Roosevelt, Truman and Attlee); the military situation at the end of the war; differences and tensions at Yalta and Potsdam; the atom bomb; Soviet and Western fears and suspicions, strategies and policies.

26   **Assess the reasons why Berlin was a major source of tension in the Cold War from 1948 to 1961.   [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. Candidates may focus on the two crises surrounding the Berlin Blockade and the building of the Berlin Wall, but there needs to be some appreciation of the whole period to score well. In assessing reasons, candidates may discuss some of the following: the significance of the decision to dived Berlin into four zones; the strategic position of Berlin in the Soviet zone; the reasons for and consequences of the Berlin Blockade in 1948; the significance of West Berlin as an island of capitalism/western shop window and as the front-line in the Cold War; the stream of refugees to the west; the decision to build the Berlin Wall and its impact in the context of the failure of the Paris summit and the U2 spy plane incident.

27   **To what extent was Gorbachev responsible for the collapse of Soviet power in Eastern Europe?   [50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to discuss the degree of Gorbachev's responsibility and balance this against other factors to score well. In relation to Gorbachev, candidates may discuss the repudiation of the Brezhnev Doctrine and policies of perestroika and glasnost, the beginnings of the break-up of the Soviet Union and their implications for/impact on Eastern Europe, pointing to, perhaps, the legalization of Solidarity in Poland along with democratic elections there and in Hungary, followed by the collapse of communist regimes elsewhere. Such discussion needs to be balanced with consideration of other factors such as the longer term problems in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe that perhaps caused Gorbachev's changes in policy and stimulated popular protest – such as the growth of economic problems and the contrast with the wealth and freedom of the West, the growth of dissidence in Eastern Europe and the impact of the Soviet Union's inability to compete militarily with the USA.

Crisis in the Middle East 1948-2003

28   **Assess the consequences of the Suez Crisis (1956) for Egypt and the Middle East.**
                                                                                          [50]

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of
consequences and assess their relative significance and linkages to score well.
Candidates may distinguish between immediate and longer term consequences and/or
direct and indirect consequences. They may discuss some of the following with regard to
the degree to which: Suez secured Nasser's control of Suez and his popularity in Egypt;
Suez established Nasser as the leader of the Arab world and facilitated his ambitions to
create a single Arab state (e.g. UAR formed with Syria in 1958) but Arab world split as
many leaders against Nasserism; Suez gave encouragement to Arab nationalism (e.g.
Nasserites were successful in seizing powering Iraq); Suez marked the effective end of
British and French influence in the Middle East; Suez increased influence of Soviet Union
in Middle East (in Egypt and Syria); Israel could claim a victory – UNEF patrolled Sinai and
Eilat able to develop and Israel was confirmed in its policy of aggressive defence; US aid
continued to flow; Suez did little to end the Arab-Israeli dispute.

29   **Assess the reasons why the Six Day War (1967) was followed by another conflict
     (the Yom Kippur War) just six years later.**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to explain a number of reasons and
assess their relative significance and linkages to score well. In assessing reasons,
candidates may discuss some of the following: Israel's acquisition of territory was both a
deep humiliation for Arab World and solved nothing; Arab states were able to recover from
military destruction (Soviet aid); the absence of a peace treaty – the war only gave Israel
more defensible frontiers; Israel's annexation of East Jerusalem caused further
resentment; the failure of peace initiatives based on new UN Resolution 242 and the
Rogers Plan; the development of a more radical PLO under Arafat – terrorism stiffened
Israeli opposition to compromise; Sadat's aim to recover Sinai and remove Israel from
Suez.

30   **Assess the view that US action against Iraq in 1991 and 2003 was mainly motivated
     by the threat Saddam Hussein posed to Middle East stability.**   **[50]**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately
even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may treat
both actions together or separately (there is no need for strict balance of treatment).
Candidates may discuss some of the following in relation to1991: US distancing from Iraq
after Iraq-Iran war because of use of WMD against Iranians and Kurds and sympathy with
Israeli fears over development of missiles (Scuds) capable of using a nuclear warhead (but
strong trade links between West and Iraq); Western press vilification of 'Butcher of
Baghdad' and the 'super gun' also cooled relations; Saddam's rhetoric spoke of an anti-
imperialist and anti-Zionist campaign; Saddam's attempts to bully Kuwait into giving aid
(Iraq had huge debts) unsettled Arab world; Invasion took West and Arab world by
surprise, but was a naked act of aggression; Thatcher was key in persuading Bush Senior
to act under auspices of UN with many Arab states in support; and, of course, western
concerns over oil. In relation to 2003, candidates may discuss: the fact that 1991 cleared
Kuwait but did not topple Saddam; US close involvement in Iraq after the failed uprisings
by Kurds and Shias – no fly-zones etc – was a constant source of tension; security of oil;
fear of WMD's and missile technology that could be used against Israel; Iraq's alleged links
to militant Islam and Al Qaeda and the mentality of the 'war on terror' after 2001 (invasion
of Afghanistan, identification of Iran, Iraq, Syria (in Middle East) as sponsors of terror and
militant Palestinian organizations); Iraq's 'refusal' to cooperate with UN weapons
inspections and US/British bombing raids; aim of regime change as way of achieving
Middle East and world stability.

                                                                   Paper Total [100]

F963/01 British History Enquiries
Option A: British History Enquiries 1066-1660

1   The Normans in England 1066-1100

(a)   Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for the Papal relations with the Church in England.   [30]

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 differences in authorship and dates are very important here: Pope Alexander II, a known supporter of Kings, not least William I, in 1071 five years after Hastings but just after the Conquest period; Pope Gregory VII, known for his confrontational style (the Investiture Contest), in 1079. Sources **A** and **B** reflect these features. In Source **A** the Pope supports the new archbishop and invest him with many powers, not least authority to determine cases without reference to Rome, while in **B** the language suggests problems and demands ultimate obedience to the Pope over the King of England. Both have bearing on the relationships between the Papacy and the Archbishopric of Canterbury (effectively **A** is full of rapport, **B** full of tension) and between the Papacy and the King of England (**A** implies amity, **B** sets out problems). In a short space of time, much had changed, at least in terms of attitudes and requirements. Nonetheless even Alexander in **A** is careful to set limits – that decisions must be in accordance with Church law; they must be just. Contextual knowledge would point, by 1079, to changes both in terms of royal power over the English Church and to the question of Lanfranc's complicity in this. In terms of **judgement** both are valid, particularly as evidence of a changing relationship.

(b)   Study all the Sources

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Lanfranc's "harmonious relationship with William I" helped rather than obstructed reform of the Church in England.   [70]

Successful answers will need to make use of all five 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 argument here is whether Lanfranc's relationship with William assisted or obstructed Church reform. It assumes, as the basis of the historian Bates' assertion in source **E**, that there was a harmonious relationship, which **B** (Pope Gregory) contests, suggesting that Lanfranc may fear William, although the evidence points to complicity with William, a factor Pope Gregory tends to prefer ('his own fault') in his balanced judgement as to what is going on.

All the sources except A and B give mixed messages but **the argument that their relationship helped reform** is to be found in **A**, **C**, **D** and **E**. Source **A**, Pope Alexander, sets out a framework of considerable authority to Lanfranc within the English Church, and own knowledge could point out that William had had papal support for his conquest partly on the grounds that he would

support a continental reform agenda. Eadmer in source **C**, who is critical of William, does grudgingly imply that if William was happy with reform and it furthered his political authority, then his support for Lanfranc helped. This is supported when Orderic Vitalis in source **D** comments on the areas both agreed upon, the competency of bishops, simony and monastic discipline. Source **D** is effective evidence, coming from a Norman monk with English origins. Although written at least 50 years later when such 'Norman reform' attitudes had become commonplace it does comment on William's commitment to reform and of his efforts to find churchmen 'distinguished in life and doctrine.' The comments on monasticism are supported by Bates in source **E**. However source **D** is effectively a Norman monk and is likely to approve of such an agenda. His is a very rosy view of William and it is interesting and instructive that his focus is here. There is no mention of Lanfranc. The evidence that most effectively argues that a harmonious relationship is good for church reform is source **E**. Bates comments that Lanfranc could be effective because of his close relationship with the King, effectively Normalising the Church, centralising authority at Canterbury (over York), something which chimes with William's own destruction and re-ordering of the North in 1070, and providing synods with real power to drive an authoritative canon law and a continental monasticism. Own knowledge would suggest that European practice was imported retaining only some lower level English religious practice and personnel. New sees and sites were created and new structures put in place, diocesan and diaconal.

The alternative view, that **reform was obstructed by the close relationship of William and Lanfranc**, can be found in source **B** and by a different reading of sources **C**, **D** and **E**. Source **B**, Pope Gregory, is unambiguous in stating that William and Lanfranc hindered the relationship with the papacy and possibly Lanfranc may be in private conflict with the King ('fear'). This did not bode well for the Church but candidates might consider that this gave only one side - that of a centralising Pope, who like William, insisted on the central control of office (the investiture contest) - something which necessarily prevented internal reform. One could argue it was a clash of personality and authority rather than a reform aiming to affect the day-to-day running of the Church. Eadmer in source **C** is also negative about Lafranc's relationship, arguing that William insisted on reform loopholes over issues of justice and canon law when it affected his barons and officers, even when blatantly guilty. This can be supported from own knowledge and the tone of Eadmer is revealing. As a Canterbury monk writing later and who might be expected to approve of the primacy of Canterbury, this is telling evidence of the limitations to reform, albeit from a central, Canterbury, perspective. More effective answers might point out that all except **E** are religious sources, monastic and papal, yet are divided on the issue. Orderic Vitalis in source **D**, although generally approving of the reforms, can also be used to suggest that William, beneath the surface, was merely using Lanfranc. Like the pope in **B**, who mentions the possibility of 'fear' as the basis of the relationship, Orderic Vitalis informs us that William's first interest was in recording "church property" when a vacancy occurred. One might ask, as Pope Gregory did elsewhere, whether it was the King's function to appoint. It is also interesting that the criterion Orderic Vitalis mentions for religious office was 'a man most capable of governing the bishopric or abbey': i.e. William's priority was government and authority rather than reform as such. Candidates could also point to Bates in source **E** whose comment on the 'close – harmonious relationship' of Lanfranc and William is to do with assisting the Norman settlement of England rather than reform per se.

If one views Norman reform as good for the church then one will argue their relationship was positive. If there was another agenda, with Lanfranc as a political regent with blatant legal loopholes and political control as Pope Gregory alleged, and the Anglo-Saxon church lost its spiritual features, then one would view it as negative.

Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569
Attitudes to Religious Change 1552-1559

2(a) Study Sources C and D
Compare these Sources as evidence for the attitudes of people in London
concerning religious change.   **[30]**

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 Sources indicate that attitudes to religious change in London remained similar in some
ways, but that there were also changes due to the altered context. **Source C** reports the reaction
of the Protestant London audience to the condemnation and public burnings of martyrs in the
last months of Mary I's reign. They seem calm, sympathetic and comforting, yet brave in their
defiance of the authorities. In **contrast**, **Source D**, written at the end of the same year, under the
new Queen Elizabeth, suggests that lower class Protestants are unruly, irreverent and violent,
roaming the city in mobs, attacking Catholic congregations and inciting riots. This might be
explained by the lifting of Catholic repression with the accession of Elizabeth I.

Source C presents a **positive** view of Protestant attitudes in London because it is written by the
Protestant minister of an underground congregation there to a contact in Switzerland, so is
unlikely to express a **negative** view of Protestant attitudes. He does, however, suggest that
London Protestants hate and resist the Catholic authorities. On the other hand, **Source D** is
written by one Catholic to another, at the court of Philip II, at that time recently widowed after
Mary's death, and champion of the Catholic Reformation in Europe, so the view of Protestant
attitudes is likely to be negative. The English were xenophobic and Philip II was unpopular in
England. The implication is that repressed hatred of Mary and her Catholic advisers has led to a
boiling over of feelings on Elizabeth's accession. Catholic attitudes expressed in **Source C** are
seen as cruel and tyrannical, shown by the proclamation about free speech and the secretive,
underhand way in which the Bishop of London deals with the later wave of heretics. The Bishop
mentioned in **Source D**, however, is open in his views, thinking Elizabeth may retain
Catholicism, and given sympathy by its Catholic author.

2(b) Study all the Sources.
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation
that the rulers of England followed similar religious policies between
1552 and 1559.   **[70]**

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

Religious policies may cover a range of approaches from doctrine to the questions of approach,
enforcement, observance and encouragement. The emphases of candidates may vary and
examiners will need to be flexible.

Successful answers will need to make use of all five 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.

At first glance it seems obvious that Edward and Elizabeth followed a Protestant religious policy, whereas Mary's was Catholic, and there is plenty of evidence in the Sources to aid evaluation of this view. However, their religious policies have similarities - for example, establishing obedience to the official, uniform religion, healing religious divisions and controlling religious opposition. The personal part played by the monarch in religious policy is consistently evident. There are examples of a policy of leniency and persuasion; of education, regulation and inspection; and of controlling opposition by compulsion, punishment and persecution. **Sources A**, **B** and **E** show monarchs proposing a policy of doctrinal uniformity, whether Protestant or Catholic. Uniformity and obedience may be cross-referenced in all three Sources. The **provenance** of **B** and **E**, female monarchs, differs from **Source A** as Northumberland rules making the minor Edward's policies merely suggestions. An evaluation of the extent to which Edward influenced policy may be supplied by own **knowledge.**

Source E mentions both similarity and difference between Edward's and Elizabeth's Prayer Books, which may be developed using own knowledge. **Sources A** and **B** suggest a policy of persuasion, followed by a repressive policy towards non-conformity, whereas **Source D** suggests there is some confusion about Elizabeth's early attitudes about a uniform doctrine, but with some leniency in **Source E**. Own **knowledge** might be used to compare the broad 1559 Settlement with the narrowness of Mary's and Edward's later religious policy. The encouragement of **preaching** and **education** are royal policies mentioned in **Sources A**, **B**, **D** and **E**. There may be a discussion of the extent to which policy prioritised **Scriptures**, **preachers** and **universities** in Protestant reigns compared to the Catholic reign of Mary. The use of **bishops** and **injunctions** to enforce policy might be mentioned as a similarity in **Sources C** and **D**, despite shifts in denomination, though their means of enforcement differed. The **provenance** of **C** and **D** reflect the subjectivity of a Protestant in hiding during a Catholic reign and a Catholic observer at the start of a Protestant reign. The audience of these Sources may also affect their reliability.

A policy based on **religious peace** is found throughout the Sources. The banning of unorthodox preaching in **Source D** links with the licences mentioned in **Source B**. The repressive proclamation in **Source C** might be linked with the punishments for non-conformity given in **Source E**, and compared for their severity. Whereas Edward's suggestions for religious policy in **Source A** are positive, evaluation using **own knowledge** might mention the speed of Protestant reform under Northumberland and attempts to force Mary to give up the Mass. Mary's apparently lenient policy at the start of her reign seems similar to Elizabeth's in **D** and **E**. **Own knowledge** of the return to Rome might be used here. More negative policies are threatened in **Source B** and adopted in **C**, the burnings marking a change of royal policy to repression. **Own knowledge** is likely to focus on the changes in the official form of religion.

Candidates are likely to consider a range of policies: enforcement of uniformity, religious peace and control of the religious opposition. Policy had some consistency: leniency and persuasion; education, regulation and inspection, but also inconsistency in the balance of compulsion, punishment and persecution. They are likely to set their argument within a context of changes to the official religion. It is up to candidates to assess the similarity of royal policies, there being no set conclusion.

3   **The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60**

(a)   **Study Sources D and E**
       Compare these sources as evidence for criticism of Cromwell's rule as Lord
       Protector.   [30]

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

Both sources are retrospective accounts, written after the death of Cromwell and the Restoration
of the monarchy, so the authors can speak their minds. Both are hostile to Cromwell and
condemn Cromwell's reliance on deception, and the illegality of his rule (source **D** talks of the
Major-Generals 'ruling according to their wills and not according to law' while source **E** sees the
protectorate as 'full of oppression and injustice'). Both sources see his rule as oppressive and
his religious commitment as skin deep. But the sources also emphasize different facets of
Cromwell's arbitrary rule: **D** sees the army as Cromwell's partner, though evidently subordinate
to him since he purges them; source **E** addresses his over-arching aim (self-interest), his
ingratitude (his treatment of Vane), and his opportunism (abandoning the Major-Generals).

(b)   **Study all the Sources**

       Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the
       interpretation that Cromwell's main aim as Lord Protector was to build a godly
       society.   [70]

Focus: Judgment in context, based on the set of sources and own knowledge
Successful answers will need to make use of all five sources, testing them against contextual
knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and any limitations as evidence. A
range of issues may be addressed in focussing upon the terms of the question but no set
conclusion is expected.

Source **A** certainly supports the proposition, and candidates may note that this was an early
move (1654) in Cromwell's time as Lord Protector, suggesting that reform of the ministry was a
priority, and the theme of religious reform reappears in source **C**, in 1656. Baxter however, at a
distance that saw Puritan hopes diminish, may well look back too approvingly. Part of the Major-
Generals' brief was security, but also 'godly reformation' and Cromwell takes pride in their (to
him) considerable achievements in advancing this agenda. Source **B** suggests another priority –
that of stability and conciliation after years of civil war, and perhaps also division amongst
supporters of the regicide, demonstrated spectacularly in April 1653 when, goaded by the army,
Cromwell had dissolved the Rump with military force. Yet both **B** and **C** are Cromwell justifying
himself to parliament. Sources **D** and **E** offer a very different reading as to be expected from
critics: of Cromwell cynically using religion to advance himself and allowing 'true religion' to
atrophy (source **D**). Instead, as source **E** states and source **D** implies, Cromwell was really
interested in the accumulation and then exercise of power; and the implication here is that
Cromwell's professed commitment to 'godly reformation' was simply a smokescreen to gather
support which would then underpin his power. So there is much to debate here, and candidates
may suggest that 'healing and settling' was a priority in 1654 but was thrown off course by
Royalist uprisings such as Penruddock's (source **C**) while a more reformed society was never far
from Cromwell's mind. But as sources **D** and **E** indicate, his motivation has been debated from
that day to this.

F963/02 British History Enquiries
Option B: British History Enquiries 1815-1945

1   The Condition of England 1815-1853

(a)   Study Sources C and D
Compare these sources as evidence for attitudes towards the events at St Peter's Fields (Peterloo) in August 1819   [30]

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 Source 'as evidence for…' The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both stress the importance of the Manchester Yeomanry and both agree that casualties were caused by the panic in the crowd, people being trapped and trampled in the confusion ('they cannot get away in '**C**' and 'panic' and some were killed 'by the crush to get out of the way' in **D**). At that point the similarities end and the attitudes shown are in marked contrast to each other. They **differ** over who is responsible for Peterloo. '**C**' stresses that the cavalry were to blame; pointing out that they were first welcomed but that their indiscipline led to 'confusion' and a deliberate hacking through defenceless people, targeting women and children. In contrast '**D**' blames the radicals and those of that persuasion in the crowd who wanted to be martyrs. '**D**' argues they instigated it by holding an illegal meeting with 'revolutionary' banners ('starts' hostilities). The troops merely responded, although **D** is not entirely consistent. His comment that the 'attack' gave added impulse to the troops could be read to mean that they started it, especially as they had already penetrated to the centre wagons to arrest Hunt. On **provenance** neither source is especially reliable given their respective slants. Although '**C**' is from an eyewitness he could only see a small part of Peterloo ('stood on tiptoe'), although he acknowledges this ('as I understood it'). As a Radical, writing some time after an event that became enshrined in radical mythology, his tone is very slanted. Troops were 'welcomed' but then they 'hewed' through the 'naked hands and defenceless heads' of the people. '**D**' was not there but was from a member of the ruling aristocracy, concerned to stress sedition and to minimise casualties. The blame is thrown on to the Radicals who are seen as cowardly (Martyrs tried to make good their escape). It too was written long after the event, although based on 'family documents' (how reliable / useful?), although we are told the family is prominent). Both are useful pieces of evidence on the contrasting political attitudes of the time.

(b)   Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that the Radicals of 1815-20 failed because of government repression.   [70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.
Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.
Candidates will need to focus on the relative importance of the role of government repression, placing it in relation to other possible explanations such as economic recovery and the nature of that economy (declining artisans), a divided leadership, division between radical and moderates over methods, a failure of coordination and the lack of any unifying

force beyond Parliamentary Reform. The sources provide evidence for a variety of views, although only one (Buckingham in **D**) is from a government perspective. The others are from a variety of Radicals, mainly moderates. All the sources stress **government repression**, to be expected given that it was one of the radicals' rallying cries and so it figures heavily in their description and analyses of some of the major events of the period. Those who would agree with the view of repression could cite the use of **spies** referred to in both **A and B**. In the former Bamford warns the Blanketeers that they could be infiltrated whilst Shelley in '**B**', keen to exonerate some of the Pentrich leaders from responsibility, argues that Oliver acted as 'agent provocateur'. Own knowledge would suggest their comments to be reliable, despite the sympathetic 'tone' of Shelley in '**B**'. **Troops** are conspicuous in the sources. **B** comments on their use at the Pentrich trial (at Brandreth's execution 'cavalry hemmed in the multitudes') and **C and D** refer to Peterloo where their actions became notorious. Government also liked to use **the law** to restrict radical activity. Buckingham in **D** mentions the Manchester authorities banning the Peterloo meeting in 1819, hence the arrest of Hunt, whilst Cruickshank in **E** graphically demonstrates the impact of the Six Acts which can be amplified by own knowledge (the speeding up of trials, greater press control through stamps, the banning of drilling and training, the limitation of meetings over 50 unless JPs had given their permission and the power to search for arms). Cruickshank's view is that the government succeeded but is over-reacting and far too repressive, although own knowledge might comment on their temporary nature, how few Radicals were held and how they were designed more to reassure an anxious Commons than to repress Radicals. Government also **arrested** key ring -leaders like Hunt (and Bamford, the author of **A and C**). Sources **D and E** refer explicitly to arrests. There is plenty of other evidence of the government resorting to Acts (in 1817 for example) following in Pitt's steps.

Yet the sources also mention **other factors**. **Source A** implies the **impracticality** of the Blanketeers proposed **methods of protest**. They failed to listen to his advice and appeared pathetic. As a balanced account, friendly yet critical and able to judge from hindsight, its evidence is sound. However the stress on **numbers** in **B and C** could be counter productive, entrenching propertied conviction that the status quo must be preserved at any cost. Peterloo saw the height of all this. **Source C** also stresses how **moderate the aims** were in contrast with the assertions of **D** as to revolutionary intent. **E** demonstrates how dependent radicals were on the **spoken and printed word** and how easily it could be cut-off. Nonetheless this aspect of repression could misfire – it was often impractical, radicals found ways around it and cartoonists like Cruickshank undermined government by such barbed and clever satire. Own knowledge can extend the view that other factors were more important. Radicals like Bamford and Thistlewood **opposed each other**; the **recovery of the economy** post 1820 took the wind out of Radical sails, whilst methods (Blanketeers, Pentrich and Cato St.) varied from plot to mass meeting**. Geography, distance and climate** also played a part. With the exception of Cato St. and Spa Fields radical demonstrations took place in the North, not in London, where the government was more vulnerable.

The sources reveal much, although **D and E** are clear exaggerations (Castlereagh is portrayed as a devil in **E** and modern historians have questioned the radical image of repression). Bamford in **C** is more reliable, although at Peterloo his ability to detect what was happening was limited. Some candidates may question failure – the radical numbers were huge at Peterloo, whilst the crowd at the execution in **B** were not sympathetic to the government. Most candidates are likely to argue either that failure was due to Government repression or to the mishandling of protest by the radicals themselves. The sources present evidence, of mixed value, either way.

2   **The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865 – 1886**

(a) **Study Sources B and D**
     Compare these sources as evidence for the ideas behind Disraeli's social
     reforms in the 1870s.   **[30]**

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 Source 'as evidence for…'.
The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a
good answer.

Both Sources agree on the idea that the state needs to interfere when sanitary issues are
at stake. For both this is the issue where there is a justification for breaking with laisser-
faire and allowing a measure of state interference. They **differ** in the relative breadth **(B)**
and the narrowness **(D)** of their ideas. Disraeli in **B** takes a very broad ideological view of
Social Reform, to include pollution (air), clean water, inspection and food standards,
whereas Cross in **D** has a much more precise and limited view, confined by the principles
of laisser-faire. He is simply concerned to raise the existing standards of the housing stock
to a reasonable condition. Despite Disraeli's claim in '**B**' to be practical in approach, Cross
in **D** is closer to it. Disraeli has a wider mindset – that ideas on health should be a
government's main priority, that the health of the people should be considered as a whole.
He makes the historic connection between health and greatness which Cross in **D** does
not. Cross is more concerned to set limits to government action; neither it nor local
government should provide cheap housing. Private and individual initiative should not be
discouraged.

In part such differences are explained by the **provenance**. Disraeli in '**B**' is in opposition
and under pressure to rally the Conservative party. The Manchester speech is a piece of
public rhetoric to a large audience and is widely publicised. As such its ideas are sweeping
and, although it is unusual to discuss health, this is post the Second Reform Act where the
artisan vote was important. Candidates might comment that this was only a very small part
of a very long speech that stressed other issues. In contrast Cross in **D** is addressing, as
the Home Secretary, a very different audience, not the electorate but MPs. He is likely to
emphasise the cautious and liberal ideas underpinning his proposals, those of
individualism and a limited role for the state. His emphasis is on what is not done,
stressing just the sanitary aspect which had had much publicity in previous decades
(cholera, typhoid) the causes of which were now agreed upon. Candidates might consider
D to be the better evidence for reform ideas, given that it was based on a particular Bill and
the arguments that would sway MPs.

(b) **Study <u>all</u> the Sources**
     Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the
     interpretation that Disraeli carefully planned a programme of social reform in
     the 1870s.   **[70]**

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.
Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against
contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any
limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of
the question but no set condition is expected.

The sources may be used in a variety of ways to assess the interpretation that Disraeli's
aim was a carefully planned programme of social reform. It is likely that candidates will see
Sources A and B, both Disraeli, as being more supportive of this view whilst **C, D and E**,
Cross and the modern historian, as being critical of it, pointing to lack of substance, the

role of others and the historical context, which may be developed by own knowledge. Evaluatively they may also consider **A and B** as being of less credibility given the context of opposition (1871 and 1872) and opportunism (debates on Trade Union legislation and public political speeches) than **C, D and E**. In **C** Cross is confiding in his autobiography the reality of Disraeli's inactivity, whilst in **D** he is concerned to minimise the extent of what is proposed. Vincent in **E** may well have based some of his critical findings on Cross' evidence.

The case for a carefully planned programme is to be found in **A and B**. In **A** Disraeli outlines his understanding of the Trade Unions as working class bodies and is clearly convinced of their wealth and potential power. Own knowledge could be used to demonstrate a sustained interest in this in his own later legislation, giving the Trade Unions an undefined and largely unlimited right of picketing with legal equality between employer and employee (a careful plan to woo working men's votes?). In Disraeli's Manchester Speech (**B**) Disraeli appears to have a plan and candidates could clearly support this with reference to the legislation of 1874-6. It would appear to be a 'practical' and carefully planned programme with the focus clearly on sanitary reform, as the evidence of Cross in Source **D** would corroborate. Cross is clear in **C** that Disraeli has talked much about such a programme in 'all his speeches'. Certainly his 'colleagues', especially Cross, did have some modest proposals based, as D acknowledges, on firmly liberal and laisser-faire principles. Vincent in **E** makes reference to the 'miraculous year' of 1875 and candidates can point to Disraeli presiding over Public Health, Dwellings Acts, and Food and Drugs (and possibly speculate on the role of Disraeli's literary social vision the Young England novels). Some candidates might comment on a possible political motive with a plan to develop working class conservatism, securing their votes via social reform (Tory democracy). There is a hint of this in '**B**', the Manchester Speech. Vincent's account, which questions Disraeli's commitment, is rather unbalanced in its comments and this could be used to question his comments.

The case for a more limited and unplanned programme, in which Disraeli played a more casual role, is largely in **C, D and E**, with candidates challenging the value of **A and B**. Clearly in '**A**' Disraeli is not well informed as to working class problems, confusing the working class with skilled Trade Unions and assuming both to be 'wealthy'. No careful programme is suggested and candidates could argue that his later Union legislation was more a reaction to Gladstone's mistakes than a conscious part of a careful working class programme. Similarly in **B,** there are some very general and ill-thought through claims as to the health of the people, as is to be expected in a politician's speech. It was presumably this sort of speech that Cross had in mind when he comments in **C** that there was no programme of large legislative schemes, points developed by Vincent in **E** when he comments that Disraeli had to rely on the suggestions of others. Cross is a largely reliable source, although one might expect a tendency to focus on his own contribution, ignoring Disraeli's 'chairing' role in Cabinet and his support in Parliament. His speech in **D** makes no mention of Disraeli. Vincent questions both Disraeli's personal interest, in comparison with his colleagues, and the practical effect of what was achieved, given the lack of money and the permissive nature of the legislation. There was no hint of a welfare state and indeed Conservatives were content with liberal structures, eschewing reform programmes. Own knowledge might point to Disraeli's electoral promise in 1874 to leave well alone ('to cease from harassing 'liberal' legislation). Vincent also has the advantage of being able to put Disraeli's social reform into long term perspective, which sees it as a continuation of Liberal ideas. Other points to support a limited view of what was done are that Disraeli was later distracted by foreign policy and illness. His interest in the working class lacked real knowledge or understanding. Candidates are likely to conclude that the sources point to different interpretations of whether the social legislation of 1875 was carefully planned but can equally point more to one than the other.

3   **England and a New Century**

(a)   **Study Sources B and C**
        Compare these two Sources as evidence for attitudes towards the Irish Home
        Rule Bill.   [30]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.
Content. Source B (Carson) is strongly opposed to the Third Home Rule Bill
(introduced by Asquith in April 1912), seeing it as a "conspiracy" against Ulster.
However, **Source C (Redmond)** supports the Bill, and is opposed to any attempt to
weaken it, particularly through any plans to exclude Ulster.
Carson presents Ulster as a special case. Richer and more industrialised than the
south, but doomed to be permanently out voted in a United Ireland if the Bill is
passed. He stresses the loyalty of Ulster to the Crown, and the need to oppose the
Bill in the interests of Ireland, Britain and the Empire.
In **Redmond's** speech, the emphasis is upon moving forward towards greater Irish
self-government, and of avoiding Irish division. Ireland should be one nation:
Catholics and Protestants together. 'Partition is unthinkable.' This represents the
patriotic appeal to Irish history as viewed by moderate Irish Nationalism. Unlike
Carson his threat is a parliamentary one rather than that of civil disobedience and
possibly armed resistance.
Provenance. During this period, **Carson** emerged as the leader of the Ulster
Unionists. Later, he was to organise the Ulster Volunteer Force. His Belfast speech
(September 1912), launching the Covenant, is an appeal to popular protest. Nearly
half a million people signed the Covenant, some in their own blood. Not surprisingly,
the tone of the speech is extreme. It is clear that the Ulster Unionists would rather be
separated from the rest of Ireland than be subject to the Home Rule Bill. This is a
speech that launched a campaign of resistance and is drenched in the rhetoric of an
appeal to king and empire. Interestingly it avoids any mention of Protestantism and
religion, unlike Redmond in **C**.
Redmond, the leader of the Irish Nationalists, is speaking in the House of Commons
attempting to pressurize Asquith in the context of parliament. By January 1913, the
suggestion that Ulster might be excluded from the provisions of the Bill has come to
dominate political debate. At this stage, **Redmond,** confident in his political position
(offering necessary parliamentary support to Asquith's Liberal Government) is
unwilling to compromise over the Bill. Later this was to change due to various political
pressures. Both sources are effective evidence of the stances taken on Home Rule.

(b)   **Study all the Sources**
        Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the
        interpretation that a crisis arose in Irish affairs in the period 1912 to 1914
        mainly as a result of Asquith's mishandling of events.   [70]

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

The context is the period following the 1910 Elections (which left the Liberal
Government dependent on the support of the Irish Nationalists) and the Parliament
Act of 1911 (which meant that the Conservatives could no longer use the House of
Lords to block Home Rule). Once Redmond had persuaded Asquith to introduce the
Third Home Rule Bill (a moderate measure providing for an Irish Parliament in Dublin
with limited powers), the years 1912-14 saw a very intense political crisis, centred on
what should be done about Ulster and its Protestant majority.

The only Source which directly blames Asquith for the crisis is **Source E.** The modern historian describes Asquith's 'Wait and See' approach, giving examples of what later historians have seen as the Prime Minister's failings. Obviously, not all historians have taken this line. However, candidates may wish to add further examples of Asquith's prevarication over events like gun running, and the Curragh Mutiny. The outbreak of the Great War, which saved the Government in some respects, but also destroyed its Home Rule policy, is mentioned in the Source. By then, despite a conference at Buckingham Palace, chances of progress were minimal.

Elsewhere, Asquith and his Government are blamed by implication (at least). The dangers in the situation were clear from the outset. The Home Rule Bill is attacked strongly by Bonar Law (**Source A**) and Carson (**Source B**). The Irish Nationalists (**Source C** and **Source D**) welcome Home Rule as a first step, but soon despair of Asquith's dithering, which leads to a suggested policy of exclusion for Ulster, the cause of further divisions. **Source D** is particularly useful here. The nationalist Healy is speaking in March 1914, at a time when feelings are running high, and the Government is rapidly losing control. The tone in **Source D** is one of anger and disappointment. It is clear that Healy is critical of both Asquith and Redmond. He is particularly hostile to his leader, Redmond, who (according to Healy) has compromised on nationalistic principles, by giving in to Asquith. By now, exclusion had become a main area of dispute. That it was a thorny problem can be illustrated by the fact that the initial compromise involved four counties being excluded, later increased by the House of Lords to nine counties as a blocking move, and much later on finalised as six.

But the crisis could also be blamed upon the irresponsible attitude of Bonar Law (**Source A)** and the determination of Ulster Protestants led by Carson (**Source B**). **Source C** and **Source D** taken together indicate both Redmond's inconsistency over exclusion, and the pressures on Redmond from more extreme nationalism. Candidates might show awareness that all the main actors were under pressure from both sides e.g. James Craig; the Ulster Volunteer Force; the Irish Volunteers in response to the UVF; Sinn Fein etc. And, to an extent, the problem was insoluble. Ulster men like Carson were certain that the industries of the North would be destroyed if governed from the less-developed South. While on the other side, the Nationalists were committed to getting a United Ireland.

4   Churchill 1920-45

(a)   Study Sources C and D
Compare these Sources as evidence for Churchill's character.   [30]

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 Source 'as evidence for…'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Content: C and D offer different views. In **C** we find Churchill unable to see the wider picture and being opportunistic. We find him on bad terms with Britain's top soldier, unable to resolve a disagreement, petulant and childish. **D** finds him not living for the moment but able to distinguish main factors in a situation! We find him an inspiring leader, not a furious and immature person, unable to take advice**. D** suggests an understanding and energetic leadership absent from **C**, where the energy is misplaced and directed in fits of temper.
Provenance: **both** are from military men who worked closely with him although **D** is Assistant Secretary to the War Cabinet and may over the wartime period have fallen over Churchill's spell more than Brooke, but the big difference lies in the **date**. Brooke was writing under great pressure of the colossal responsibility of the day to day **running** of the war in 1943. Jacob was writing years after in a volume honouring Churchill and looking back on much more positive aspects. He is writing about a different side of Churchill. Yet there is also agreement. In **C** Brookes refers to 'toys' and Jacob in **D** corroborates this with reference to Churchill's obsession with anything new, radar, warships etc. For Brooke that was not the point – by 1943 he did not need heroic speeches or 'toys' but sound decisions about a war that involved a great deal of planning and coordination now that the US had entered, not wasting time as **D** acknowledges – 'matters which attracted his passing attention'.
The **nature** of the sources differs – **C** is written directly after a confrontation in a **diary** which though **later** published was at the time for private use. Jacob is writing very publicly at a time when Churchill's reputation stood very high and may not choose to recall the day to day frustrations. Some may know that Brook wrote very warmly about Churchill in other parts of his diaries and memoirs – but that is not looked for here. Brooke may be **unreliable** as an overall judgement as it expresses Churchill's limitations as war leader – his childishness and tendency to interfere; Jacob may be painting **too rosy a picture**, given the limitations of some aspects of Churchill's role in making wartime decisions, but there is also balance given his point that some of Churchill's ideas were 'old-fashioned'.

(b)   Study all the Sources
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the
interpretation that Churchill was a great war leader.   [70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge
Successful answers will need to make use of all five **Sources**, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues will be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.

The **debate** centres on Churchill's wartime leadership – did he take on too much, insist on personal involvement in leading decisions, interfere with the appointment of generals and have too much say in strategies which have come in for considerable criticism ? For example the involvement in Greece and Crete, the Mediterranean strategy in general, the trust he placed in Montgomery and his treatment of both Wavell and Auchinleck. On the other hand is his understanding of the importance of good relations with the USA; his towering moral force in insisting on victory and the rightness of the allied cause and his

inspiration. Not every aspect of this topic need to be tackled given the possible range of subject matter. Nor is a detailed knowledge of the decisions in the Desert War looked for.

Grouping. In considering the Sources, Source **E and B** are critical in a considered way; **C** is critical but is expressing the emotions of the moment; **D** offers praise though accepting that Churchill was 'somewhat old fashioned' and **A** could certainly be used to support Churchill as an inspirational leader.

The case against in **E** considers that Churchill interfered with the army too much, a point which also appears in **B**, a contemporary criticism. B is spoken after the major defeats in the Far East – which were Churchill's fault to some extent. The nature of B might lead to some caution in accepting it at face value. To censure a leader in time of war is unusual and Laidlaw Milne would be looking for evidence to support his attack on the PM.
C is very critical and Churchill was deeply upset by the publication of Brooke's diaries. However we are not looking here at a considered judgement but a heat of the moment response by a man under considerable pressure and facing a huge burden of responsibility. Nevertheless it does reflect the day to day strains of working with Churchill. Like **D** Thompson in **E** finds him old fashioned and he uses the example of the sacking of Sir Claude Auchinleck in 1942 as an example of Churchill's lack of judgement and vanity – finding in Montgomery a similarly showy and egotistical figure. Some may know that El Alamein in October 1942 was largely the result of Auchinleck's preparations and Monty's plan was not well-judged. Some may find other examples of Churchill's interference; or may reject the view because of eventual victory and the more evident leadership qualities referred to in **D and A**. The tone of **E** is somewhat polemical and strident. **A** could be evaluated in the context of Britain's position in 1940 when it stood alone and really needed confidence at the top. For all its rhetoric many found it it inspiring – it was intended to be a rallying cry and also a message to the USA. **D** could be evaluated in terms of Churchill being able to see many aspects of the war very clearly – the need for strong relations with FDR and Stalin; the need to ensure that D Day was well planned and the realism to see that the US had to lead, for example. The source is from someone close to Churchill, but it was part of an anthology written more than 20 years after the war when Churchill had become a legend. There could be a wide range of relevant own knowledge to discuss the question, so it is important to consider how candidates are using what they know rather than expecting specific information. In terms of judgements, some may stress the major contribution made in 1940 to morale and the courage of continuing the war against Germany. Others may be more critical of Churchill's wartime style of government. It is important not to expect a particular view but to see how well supported opinions are from both Sources and contextual knowledge.

F964/01 European and World History Enquiries
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555

1   **The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130**

     (a)   **Study Sources A and C**
                Compare these Sources as evidence for Pope Urban II's attitude to Islam.   **[30]**

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 Source 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources both can be compared in their tone and language content. **Both** take a tough line towards the Islamic faith. **A** is a clear and powerful appeal, using much emotive language towards Islam and promising remission of sins as a key outcome; the audience is a wide one, given that the appeal was reported and disseminated through Europe from small groups whereas **C** has wider feudal appeal; there is urgency in tone and appeal, a strong emphasis upon war against the Muslims who are identified as pagans. **Both** suggest the hostility towards the Muslim invaders and this is reflected in the language used. In **A** the focus is on the extermination of a 'vile race' and on aiding fellow Christians against pagans; in **C**, the latter are 'barbarians', 'frenzy', 'invaded and ravaged' figure strongly; liberation of the Holy Land is the goal. **Both** mention vows to fight Muslims. **Differences** lie in part in the target audiences and in part in the language used. Typicality lies in the nature of how the Muslim threat is expressed. In both the pope is the figurehead, the key mover, but he operates in somewhat different ways according to his target audience, the language being adjusted in some parts to fit the audience. The language is, in turn, focused and applied, powerful (**A**), more measured but strong still (**C**). There is a contrast between the feudal language in **C** and spiritual appeal in **A**, e.g. 'Christ commands'.

Comment on the **provenances** may include the reliability of the author of **A**, using a measured but intense tone in reporting the Pope's words, and the Pope himself in **C**, intense, personalised, subjective in tone in his letter, pouring out concern and zeal. Both are very typical of Christian views at the time.

     (b)   **Study all the Sources**
                Use your knowledge to assess how far the sources support the interpretation that Urban II, in preaching the First Crusade, appealed largely to social and material motives.   **[70]**

Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.
Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.

The question focuses on the nature of Urban's appeal for the Crusade, setting up argument and counter-argument. The Sources can be grouped according to both areas. Traditionally, religious appeal has have been seen as paramount but it is clear that other factors were there. The Sources offer a range of useful points, explicit and implicit. Sources **A, C and D** mention **religious zeal**, in different ways and there is reference also

in Source **E**. Source **B** and a good part of **E** feature **more material, non-religious factors**. **A** focuses strongly on religious zeal and zest, with powerful language devised to reach out to a wide audience. Like **A, C** dwells upon the power and role of remission of sins; again, the language is powerful; a **religious** appeal is paramount. **E** reinforces this before moving to other issues. **D** mentions religious appeal (salvation, liberation) and calls for a close liaison of church and lay leaders. Own knowledge of Urban's appeal can be adduced: plenary indulgences; his concept of the armed pilgrimage; the wide range of crusader types he was appealing to. Source **B** focuses upon **lands, resources, overpopulation, the removal of the reasons for dissent and unrest** and can be linked to a good part of **E,** where Urban's wider motives are addressed. Again, own knowledge can supply support in the form of evidence for economic and social tensions, political unrest, disorder as well as evidence for these being the issues that appealed. Therefore, though the Sources do have an **obvious religious appeal and direction**, but there are enough references to **other factors** to suggest that religious zeal was not the sole issue behind the preaching of the crusade (reviewed in Source **E**). Contextual knowledge can be used, as above and with reference to features such as: Urban's activist preaching of the crusade; contemporary religious devotions and enthusiasms, including pilgrimages; Urban's awareness of pressures on lords and knights; knightly codes of service and feudal ties; socio-economic pressures; civil unrest levels; popular enthusiasm and energy levels (The People's Crusade being but one major example). These areas can be linked to all the Sources. Better answers will see the linkage between Urban's strands of appeal but be able to offer a good counter-argument to the interpretation.

2   The German Reformation 1517-1555: The Impact of Lutheranism 1524-1530

(a)   Study Sources A and E
         Compare these sources as evidence for the religious attitudes and beliefs of
         German townspeople.   [30]

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 Sources **both** suggest that many German townspeople embraced the reformation in
the 1520s, and that this encouraged a desire for liberty, unrest and disobedience to
authority. In both cases, the context of the Sources is the calling of an imperial Diet with
the aim of reconciling Catholics and Protestants, so feelings might be untypical,
heightened due to the atmosphere and the presence of princes attending the Diet.
However, there are **differences**. Whereas Catholic practices have been 'utterly destroyed'
according to the Catholic friar in **Source A**, perhaps exaggerating the heretical nature of
his opponents in an emotive style, the Venetian observer in **Source E** takes a **more**
positive line, recording that 'the papists still have their churches, images and Masses',
though they are few in number. This suggests a considerate attitude among the
townspeople of Augsburg, in **contrast** to the ridicule of pope, Catholic hierarchy, saints
and practices suggested in **Source A**. Source A also suggests that Luther is the central
inspiration for reform, whereas **Source E** shows majority support for Zwingli's ideas. This
follows the Marburg Colloquy and the dispute between Luther and Zwingli over
Communion. The tone of **Source E** is more **objective** and suggests that doctrine is
important in shaping attitudes, whereas propaganda and disobedience to authority are the
underlying attitudes to religious reform noted in **Source A**. Division of the city into
opposing religious factions is the key issue in **Source E**, **unlike Source A**, where
Lutherans are the only group mentioned. **Source A** generalises to include conversions to
reform in other cities, whereas **Source E** refers only to those in Augsburg. Both Sources
are written by Catholic observers about a city where an imperial Diet is being held, but they
are five years apart and attitudes have radicalised. Religious change has become more
entrenched and diverse.

(b)   Study <u>all</u> the Sources
         Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the
         interpretation that the impact of the German Reformation between 1524 and
         1530 was under the control of the authorities.   [70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.
Successful answers will need to make use of all five 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.

Different types of authority are mentioned: the **Emperor** in **Source D**; the **princes** in
Sources A, B, C and **D**; and **town authorities** in **Sources A** and **E**. As far as the Emperor
and princes are concerned: **Source C** suggests Philip of Hesse was in control of the
reformation in his territories, as he is directing the dissolution of the monasteries there.
Own knowledge might be used to discuss whether other princes also controlled the
spread of the reformation, perhaps using own knowledge of the princes who signed the
Protest in 1529. In **Source D** the **Emperor** seems to have had some control: some
Catholic princes have succeeded in enforcing the Edict of Worms, so are preventing the
spread of the Reformation. However, he has lost control of other princes: in **Source D** the

spread of sects has occurred due to princely support for reform against his will. His request to ban further reform lacks conviction, suggesting that only some princes may be able to achieve this, and he concedes that the ban may not be 'humanly possible'. His **tone** shows resignation that his instructions may be unenforceable, based on past experience of his failures. **Own knowledge** might include the emperor's distractions, past Diets and Edicts, the unhelpful attitude of the papacy, and the unrest amongst imperial knights and peasants, hinted at in **Source B**, which had increased princely control within the Empire.

Source B suggests that reformation *should* **be controlled by the princes** or else the **lower orders** will take up arms and gain reformation by force, a spectre of civil war also raised in **Source A** by the Catholic friar. Müntzer, the prophetic author of **Source B**, played a major part in the subsequent **Peasants' War** showing a shift of control from Luther, in **Source A**, to the radicals. The Reformation subsequently spun out of control of the authorities until military victory allowed the princes greater control, so showing the irony of Müntzer's words. **Own knowledge** of this context might be used in evaluation.

However, **Sources A** and **E** suggests that the princes have no control of the imperial free cities or have lost control in their **towns**, where the reformation is proceeding according to the wishes of the nobles, merchants and townspeople. Own knowledge might include the cities which signed the Protest in 1529. In **Source E**, the authorities of Augsburg seem to have control, but they have conceded to the wishes of the majority of Zwinglians in order to keep law and order. Public order also seems under threat in Nuremburg in **Source A**, and the general view of the Catholic observer is that the authorities have no control of towns and cities. Own knowledge might be used to add that Luther has lost control of the movement he began, and cannot appear at the Diet due to the imperial ban.

Candidates are likely to consider alternative views on the extent of control over the impact of the reformation, by the Emperor, the princes, the town and city authorities. They are likely to see the reformation in a variety of ways: under the control of princes, towns and peasants, but outside the control of Emperor and papacy. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

F964/02 European and World History Enquiries Option B: Modern 1774-1975

1   **The origins and course of the French Revolution 1774-1795**

(a)   **Study Sources B and D**
Compare these Sources as evidence for contemporary views of the Revolution in the period from 1793 to 1794.   [30]

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.

In terms of **content** they offer a very different view of the Revolution. Robespierre in **B** sees peace and enjoyment of liberty as the key – **D** sees not peace but crimes and blood. **B** sees France aiming to become a model for other nations; **D** merely a country dominated by madness and ambition. This is a long way from the ideal of Virtue in **B**. This public virtue is very different from the people losing morale and having a blow dealt to social institutions. In Robespierre's vision in **B** law is in men's hearts; in **D** it is imposed only by the iron rod of a vile scoundrel.

In terms of **provenance**, Robespierre in **B** is making a public speech at a time of war and terror to provide a vision to encourage the development of a revolution under pressure; **D** is writing after the terror and the fall of Robespierre, in a state of shock about the extent of the violence and repression and able now to speak freely. Robespierre is speaking of aims; Des Essarts is speaking about practical consequences. **Both** adopt highly emotional tone and both are writing in public statements. **B** is far more political and from a figure at the very heart of the revolution; **D** is written from the perspective of an observer of the victims of this public figure and is not himself making a political statement, or at least not one to advance particular political policies as is the case with **B. Both** may exaggerate – Robespierre in **B** offers a very idealistic picture of laws which were highly repressive and a regime which adopted extreme measures; **D** sees nothing but a scoundrel and ignores the visionary and idealistic aspects of the revolution and its leader. In terms of utility, **B** offers the ideology which justified the Terror, while **D** shows how the Terror came to be seen out of context of the emergency conditions which contributed to its development – both represent a degree of mythology

(b)   **Study all the Sources**
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that harsh measures were introduced during the Terror mainly in order for France to protect itself from its enemies.   [70]

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, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set answer is expected.

The **discussion** here is whether the Terror and the repressive laws were simply measures necessary to defend France from threatening foreign armies, émigré forces and counter revolution at home, or had a wider social and political agenda. Candidates could see the

threat coming from within – from profiteers, non-juring priests, aristocrats, federalists. Émigré came to be a term of abuse which included internal enemies. In terms of **grouping** the Sources, B seems the clearest defence of measures being based on the need to fight the tyrants of Europe. A offers a justification based on foreign threats. C and A both suggest other motives and D rejects the necessity for harsh laws, seeing merely the exercise of tyranny.

Knowledge of the context in which the revolution became radicalized will help to assess the significance of **A** – there is reference to the 'enemies of Liberty' and the relatives and agents of émigrés which might indicate that the harsh measure was defensive. . However, the law was wide – who was to interpret the 'customs, connections, remarks or writings ' of those who were suspected? The law itself could be seen either as defensive measure in time of war or an extension of revolutionary extremism with the purpose being not only to attack domestic opposition, but to wage war on political and class opponents. This is certainly the view in **D** which see 'our best citizens; being killed by 'madness and ambition' not a desire to defend France from enemies. Here is not legitimate defence against enemies, but abominable tyranny, a return to ancient regime oppression, undermining public morale. **Evaluation:** this is written in 1797 after the fall of Robespierre and when immediate dangers from foreign counter-revolution had subsided. Unlike **B** which is written in the heart of the revolutionary wars, with France having raised the largest conscripted army in history and Carnot being in charge of the nearest thing to total war before the twentieth century. Robespierre rejects the ideas of laws being subverted and stresses the need for consent, but this view is open to criticism and may be justification for very severe wartime controls. Or perhaps Robespierre did see his own vision of Virtue – a sort of hard edged Classical vision of citizens showing their moral strength by defending the Republic – as an ideal in citizens' hearts.

C has a vision of imprisonment which goes beyond functional necessity in time of war – powerful laws are to be linked with the very nature of a Republic. The object of imprisonment and confiscation seems to be to defeat the foreigner, but they are also a way of celebrating liberty. The confiscation of goods for the Republic seems to go beyond the simple needs of war or defeating internal enemies to a sort of redistribution of property. Harsh measures are not seen as extraordinary but a part and parcel of the new state. **Evaluation** might refer to St.Just's position on the Committee of Public Safety and the mixture of practical response to enemies and the class warfare that can be seen in **A** ('Spare the aristocracy and you will bring fifty years of trouble') St.Just's political radicalism has to be taken into account when assessing how genuine his stated motives for Terror were.

Additional knowledge about the ideals and aims of the revolutionaries like St.Just and Robespierre would be relevant; as would the reorganization of the state for war and the nature of the war in 1793-4. Also the way that the revolutionaries destroyed their political rivals would support the view that there were motives beyond the purely defensive.

2   The Unification of Italy 1815-70

(a)   Study Sources A and E
Compare these Sources as evidence for Cavour's views on constitutional
government.   [30]

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 indicate that Cavour favoured a form of liberal and constitutional government. This is spelled out in the first sentence of **Source A** and the last line of **Source E**. An associated point of similarity, expressed in both **Source A** and **Source E**, is that Cavour believed government depended on popular support. **Source A** stresses Cavour's belief in strong leadership and his suspicion of political parties which dovetails with the comment in **Source E** highlighting Cavour's opposition to faction. A major issue developed in both is Cavour's hostility to street or mob action. This is articulated in the final sentence of **Source A** and in the reference to Cavour's fear of 'revolutionary passions' expressed in **Source E**. They differ in one respect at least. In **Source A** the implication of the second sentence is that Cavour was prepared to act in a dictatorial manner, a point developed later with reference to 'the constitution being reduced to a mere machine'. However, in **Source E** Cavour subtly portrays himself as merely part of a government and that, if anything, the King was the dominant political force.

The typicality of the sources and their dates should be evaluated. The author of **Source A** is favourable in his assessment of Cavour because he was a friend and he was writing just after unification and the death of Cavour when there was a tendency to exaggerate Cavour's role to the point of glorification. As such the author is prepared to accept Cavour's tendency towards authoritarianism as a price worth paying for the achievement of unity. Cavour himself was hardly likely to admit to being authoritarian which explains why in **Source E** he emphasises the role of the King and the government of Piedmont in taking the initiative in the Papal States. Cavour is speaking at a time of national triumph following the unification of all of Italy except Rome and Venetia which might explain the patriotic tone of this piece. In addition, Cavour was likely to trumpet the cause of liberalism to check revolution in addressing an assembly who owed their position to the constitutional system in place in Piedmont: some candidates may provide knowledge of the Statuto.

(b)   Study all the Sources
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the
interpretation that Cavour's priority was to promote the interests of Piedmont
rather than the unification of Italy.   [70]

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.

Most candidates are likely to suggest that **Source B and Source C** lend most support to the view under consideration whilst **Source A** appears to refute the statement. Most are likely to regard **Source D and Source E** as ambivalent. The second and third sentences of **Source B** state bluntly that Cavour's priority was to advance the interests of Piedmont. Given the reference to French support for Piedmont in a war with Austria candidates might refer to the terms of Plombieres which aimed to establish a northern state headed by the

king of Piedmont. The comments made about Cavour might reflect disappointment on the part of the author that Cavour was not more ambitious to unite the whole of Italy or, more likely, that he had reservations about French involvement in Italian affairs. Either way it does not alter the impression that Cavour's aim was the promotion of Piedmont rather than the unity of Italy.

Source C confirms Cavour's aims were limited to the creation of a Kingdom of Italy in the north only. Some candidates will explain the reference to 'promises ought to be kept' mentioning the deal struck at Plombieres highlighting the territorial arrangements agreed and the understanding that war would only be ended by mutual agreement. This may be linked to the comments arising from the analysis of **Source B** as indicated above. The 'years he had worked hard' allows scope to elaborate on the foreign and domestic policies of Cavour in anticipation of liberating Italy from Austrian influence for the benefit of Piedmont. Cavour's apparent willingness to continue the war without French support might be regarded as proof of his determination to achieve his aims of establishing an independent northern state under Piedmont. His commitment could be emphasised by explanation of the reference to 1848 and the caution of the military to carry on the war alone given the defeat at Custozza in 1848 and the fierceness of the battles of Magento and Solferino in 1859.

The imperative of Piedmontese interests is confirmed in **Source E.** This emphasises Cavour's clear concerns to ensure stable political conditions and protect the king and government of Piedmont from infection by revolutionary ideas. Knowledge about the Mazzinian views of Garibaldi and the rivalry between the latter and Cavour could be applied allowing some to debate Garibaldi's attitude to the monarchy in light of the support he received from Victor Emmanuel during his campaign and the transfer of his conquests to the King at Teano. Some might suggest that Cavour's action in intervening in the Papal States was motivated by his anxiety about French troops stationed in Rome. Others may interpret Cavour's caution as practical in the circumstances rather than as proof of his reluctance to support the full unity of Italy as he indicates his preference for such an outcome in describing 'our wonderful Italian movement' and, later in the source, his desire not to derail 'our national movement'. Many will appreciate that Cavour was trying to gain the support of the Piedmontese Senate which obliged him to pay lip service, at least, to the national cause.

Source A presents Cavour as an Italian nationalist backing 'the great enterprise' and that his policy was 'exclusively Italian'. The fact that Cavour enjoyed the support of the nation, which put their faith in his leadership, reinforces the nationalist credentials of Cavour. Yet, some might suggest that the nation referred to is Piedmont and its destinies are not defined, explicitly, in nationalist terms. The fact that 'Cavour's policy became more exclusively Italian' allows for the interpretation that if Cavour did eventually support the unity of Italy he may not always have done so. With knowledge the degree to which Cavour's aims shifted from the early 1850s, with policies aimed to modernise and strengthen Piedmont, to the events of 1859-60 when the state of Italy was created, might be discussed. **Source D** suggests Cavour aimed to unite Italy as he wanted to support Garibaldi ('We could not have stopped Garibaldi') and actually did so (in allowing 'the despatch of arms and ammunition') but that Cavour 'cannot support him openly' (for fear of France and Naples). Yet, the passage shows Cavour wanted to stop Garibaldi and by implication the unity of Italy but to do so 'he would have become a real domestic problem'. The popularity of Garibaldi in Piedmont was a factor Cavour considered with parliamentary elections imminent. Was Cavour's simply opposed to Garibaldi's campaign rather than concerned about the international response? The final sentence of this source underlines its ambiguous nature. Cavour is expressing his opinions in a private letter to a man who had demonstrated his commitment to Piedmont and the completion of the unification of Italy: candidates could refer to the events in the Central Duchies in 1859-60 and Ricasoli's role in them.

3   **The origins of the American Civil War 1820-61**

(a)   **Study Sources A and B**
      Compare these Sources as evidence for views about the 1850 Compromise.
      [30]

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 main **difference** is that Seward, in **Source A**, argues the Compromise breached the Constitution of 1787 which is denied by Clay in **Source B**. Similarly, in **Source A** Seward considers that the Compromise threatens the Union claiming that the denial of freedom implicit in the proposals will mean that 'the United States will cease to exist'. By contrast, **Source B** regards the proposals as a 'healing system of measures to reunite this Union', a theme developed further in Clay's speech. **Source A** emphasises the 'sovereignty of the people' rather than the states whereas Clay in **Source B** is more concerned to protect the rights of the states and interest groups. In **Source B** Clay declares 'Shall any man oppose the onward march of a great nation?' accepting the inevitability of compromise whereas Seward's comments in **Source A** are laced with a moral tone of responsibility to God not the desires of men. Both **agree** that the stakes were high as Seward in **Source A** implies unhappiness will result from the Compromise and in **Source B** Clay argues that the 'consequences … will be disastrous' unless the Compromise is accepted. In both speakers are patriotic and aware of the gravity of the debate: **Source A** wants to uphold the principles that underpinned the Union and Clay, in **Source B**, talks of his 'beloved country'.

Evaluation that explains Seward's and Clay's views on the Compromise as consistent with Northern and Southern views respectively can be expected. Details of the proposals would help demonstrate the perspectives of the two speakers. As a prominent member of the administration Seward supported President Taylor's stubborn opposition to Compromise. When Seward spoke in the early stage of the debate positions on both sides of the divide were stridently opposed to Compromise if for different reasons. The prospect of secession and war was very real, reflected in the stubborn tone of Seward's speech. As the author of the Compromise it is not surprising that Clay spoke passionately for it. However, Clay had a reputation as a conciliator based on many years of public service and the Compromise was typical of his views and approach. Also, Clay wanted to win the leadership of the Whig Party, led by Taylor, so he adopted a contrary position. The death of Taylor on 9 July 1850 was a further incentive for Clay to promote the Compromise with more chance of success: the new President, Fillmore, was less hostile to it.

(b)   **Study all the Sources**
      Use your own knowledge to assess how far the sources support the
      interpretation that southern interests were unrestricted between 1850 and
      1860?   **[70]**

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 case in favour of the interpretation is strongly supported by **Source E** which summarises the conspiracy known by many Northerners as Slave Power claiming this was evident in the events of the period including the Compromise allowing candidates the

chance to comment on different aspects of it, perhaps emphasising the option of slavery in New Mexico and Utah or the failure to ban slavery in Washington DC or the Slave Fugitive Law. In addition, the charge that slave-masters 'made Presidents judges', etc could be explained with reference to the election of Taylor, Pierce and Buchanan and the Dred Scott judgement. The reference to the election of Lincoln allows candidates to talk of his position on slavery. The more discerning will question the validity of this evidence. As a servant of Grant – one of the war heroes of the North – or simply as a Northern republican politician the author's perspective is clearly partial, even, partisan. Further, some of the charges made are not entirely convincing. Taylor may have been a slave owner but during the debate of 1850 he was opposed to Compromise. Neither was the decision in the Dred Scott judgement a simple case of Southern judges out-voting Northern ones.

Seward, in **Source A**, represented the view of many at the time that they were at a turning point when the union might sunder unless slave power was restrained. A link with **Source E** can be made and the background to the crisis in Texas could be referenced. Lincoln, in **Source C**, expresses reservations about the Kansas-Nebraska Act not least because of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise it entailed and because he saw it as a reverse for Northern principles of freedom. Rather as Seward implies, the outcome was likely to threaten the Union the protection of which was their main concern. The problem in Kansas-Nebraska and the subsequent resolution of the issue in 1854 as well as the events which engulfed the area in 1856 ('bleeding Kansas') could be explained and their importance in confirming the slave power theory in the minds of Northerners. The authors of **Sources A and C** both had political ambitions which they hoped to advance by adopting the positions they articulated. Seward's loyalty to Taylor was important and is outlined in the previous answer. Lincoln and Douglas were rivals for political power in Illinois. Victory for either in the debate on the issue of Kansas-Nebraska would help each gain support within the state. Most candidates will know that the rivalry continued to the Senate elections of 1858 and the famous series of debates between them.

A counter argument can be constructed on three of the sources. **Source D** clearly refutes the notion that southern interests were unrestricted. The article accuses the North of exploiting the South which it defends against the charge of slave power by emphasising her commitment to compromise. The reference to 'invaded our states' might be linked to John Brown's activities in Kansas in 1856 and Virginia in 1859. Their fears of Lincoln after his election could be explained and cross reference here to **Source E** would confirm the reality of these fears. Southern concerns about the 'complete ruin of her social, political and industrial institutions' might be explained by highlighting the trends in population and wealth in favour of the North. Southern claims to have compromised could be considered with reference to the 1850 Compromise or the Lecompton Constitution. The partial viewpoint of the article only a few weeks before South Carolina was to secede from the Union is worth comment.

Source B also refutes the interpretation. It explicitly states that the Compromise 'deals unjustly by no part of the Republic' and 'saves the interests of all quarters of the country'; rejecting the idea that Southern interests were given preferential concern. Details about the Compromise which restricted Southern ambitions might be cited including the ban on slave trading in Washington DC and the fact that California was declared a free state. Candidates might emphasise the author's Kentucky roots to explain his position.

4   Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

(a)   **Study Sources A and C**
       Compare these Sources as evidence for the aims of the Western powers
       towards the German Democratic Republic.   **[30]**

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

Both sources are **very similar** in the view of Western aims in 1961. Both date from the
immediate aftermath of the building of the Wall and see a Western attempt to undermine
the DDR through an aggressive policy of external and internal subversion. They differ in
their emphasis, Ulbricht in **A** as the Communist leader of the DDR, is more concerned with
the specific and allegedly serious impact on his country and in particular on East Berlin of
Western policy. He claims that the West is sending a wide variety of agents and
subversives to undermine the DDR politically, economically and socially. In contrast, the
Soviet source Isvestia, in **C**, is more focused on the wider Cold War agenda of subversion
and espionage. This can be borne out by comments on **tone**. Ulbricht (**A**) is more
intemperate, exaggerating the Capitalist 'low life' sent by the West to infect good
communists (teenage hooligans, prostitutes, traffickers and profiteers). Better answers
might link his images of blood, life force, seeds etc with Nazi racial imagery. Isvestia (**C**) is
more conventionally Cold War – agents, spies and saboteurs, the latter possibly a
reference to the June 1953 uprising. Ulbricht (**A**) focuses on Western penetration of East
Berlin but candidates might read this as implying that the West is using its attractions to
'suck the life force from the people', a veiled reference to the loss of skilled workers to the
West and portrayed here as a deliberate Western aim.

The **provenance** of both is questionable in relation to Western aims as both are official
communist sources, heavily controlled and censored, and it is likely that there was
collaboration between East Berlin and Moscow, Ulbricht and Kruschev, on the general
'line' to be taken re Western aggression. One would expect to hear that their purpose is to
justify the building of the Wall as a response to Western aggression (**A**'s 'anti-fascist
protection wall'), and, as official newspapers, **A** the main DDR organ, and **C** one of the two
key Soviet papers, this is what one gets. Both are remarkably similar. The more
exaggerated tone of Ulbricht (**A**) plays on the fear of Western 'negatives' as its audience,
its own citizens, are portrayed as directly at threat from crime and sleaze. He is naturally
more immediately concerned with the exodus of East Germans and is concerned to stress
that the bright lights of the West are deceptively corrupt. The USSR's Isvestia has a more
Cold War emphasis on spin and the achievement of protection and security for all 'working
people'.

In terms of **judgement** neither is especially helpful evidence of Western aims towards the
USSR as they take a standard propaganda line but they are useful for documenting Cold
War rhetoric.
Espionage was a reality. Some may consider Ulbricht as more useful given the influence
and more specifically DDR audience.

(b)   Study all the sources
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the
interpretation that in building the Berlin Wall the German Democratic Republic
was <u>mainly</u> concerned to prevent the fleeing of East Germans to the West

[70]

<u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u>
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 question requires an assessment of the relative importance of the DDR's motives in
building the Berlin Wall as suggested in the sources. There are 3 main possibilities, one
internal to the DDR and two external. The internal motive is suggested in the question as
the main reason - to stop the East German skill drain to the West that was threatening the
economic survival of the DDR. The external factors are either a defensive reaction to
Western attempts at subversion or as part of an offensive, continuing and gradual by both
the USSR and the DDR to absorb Western Berlin into the East German state.

The sources can bear a variety of interpretations and the following groupings would
suggest themselves. The **need to arrest the exodus to the West** is best stated in source
E, the historian, and, through inference, in source **A**, Ulbricht. Berghan states quite clearly
the threat posed by the loss of skilled labour to the most advanced of the eastern
Communist states, one based on industrial modernisation and a skilled and educated
workforce. Its statistics are reliable for the 1949-1961 periods. Rather obliquely Ulbricht
confirms this with his references to 'sucking on our workers' and peasants' republic'. As
the Communist leader of DDR such inferences carry great weight. Berghan, although a
Western historian writing during the Cold War (1982), does give a balanced view, referring
to both the official line and then the reality beneath. His evidence on the skilled nature of
the drain is especially telling. Knowledge can be used to substantiate this view – the open
frontiers between sectors in Berlin that allowed movement – the push/pull factors of poorer
DDR conditions and shortages that had already led to a rising in June 1953 on the building
sites. Source **D** could be used here to highlight the lack of basics (food etc) in contrast to
the subsidised entertainment and cheap classic books and records. This was heightened
in 1961. The numbers leaving increased because of a renewed drive to agricultural
collectivisation. The wall would close off their last escape route to the West. The figures of
those leaving in the first half of 1961 was 200,000, threatening to top the previous record
of 300,000 during the disturbed year of 1953 which also saw renewed oppression in the
aftermath of the June uprising.

The view that **the Wall was built as a reaction to Western subversion** can be found in
sources **A** and **C** (Ulbricht and Isvestia) and is also commented upon as the official line in
source **E** (Berghan). There is also some indirect support for this in the reported comments
of Ulbricht in **B** and in Trenkner's memoirs in **D**. However, as source **E** points out this in
the official line. Both **A** and **C** are propaganda, the view of the Eastern leadership, and
much is obviously made of the corrupt attraction of the West. Candidates might point out
that Ulbricht and the old guard of the SGD saw American youth culture as a threat and the
language of **A** could be usefully discussed here. Trenkner in **D**, a reasonably reliable
personal account from the West, corroborates Ulbricht's comment about 'sucking the life
blood of the DDR' as he buys up DDR goods and regularly visits the East to do so.
However, candidates could question his typicality and he hardly seems the subversive
implied by **A**. Nonetheless knowledge could be used here to point out that the West and
the Federal Republic poured large sums into West Berlin to make it a magnet and a
showcase of Western capitalism. West German television was broadcast into the East.
This would suggest, if not subversion, at least an attempt to undermine Communist ideals.

The view that the Wall was built as part of a strategy gradually to absorb Western Berlin into East Germany is found in **B** (Ulbricht's comments to the Conservative MPs, who, as was no doubt expected, quickly reported to MacMillan the British PM) and by implication in **C** (Isvestia), Ulbricht, no doubt deliberately, is using the language of creeping absorption of demanding some controls at Tempelhof (one of the main Western airports in Berlin) and on limiting airspace and over-flights, a clear reference to events during the airlift in 1949, and to the use of visas. Isvestia in **C**, talks of tightening the borders around West Berlin. However, how much weight is to be put on such evidence? The context of **B**, the Leipzig fair, and the off-the-cuff remarks to British MPs, would suggest the usual war of words rather than specific intent. Was he bullying and intimidating or reflecting a very real 'ratcheting up'? The wall is not mentioned but the tightening of the secure border around West Berlin is. Knowledge would suggest that in 1953 Krushchev had presented an ultimatum to the West demanding re-integration of West Berlin with the East over the next six months. It was ignored and nothing happened, as in the case here. He tried again with the new President Kennedy in 1961, this time insisting that US troops be withdrawn from Berlin. Kennedy refused. It could thus be argued that the Wall was the reaction. Something had to be done that would save face and to which the US could react only by useless protest.

Sources **B** and **C** can be seen as just part of the sabre-rattling and their influence contexts (the Leipzig bookfair and Britain as a US ally) would suggest this. If it was a diversionary tactic then this suggests that the Wall was mainly a means of preventing the fleeing of East Germans. Given that the figures in **E** are largely accepted this would appear to be the main trigger for the Wall.

5   The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945-75

(a)   Study sources B and D
Compare these Sources as evidence for the impact of the Tet Offensive on American domestic opinion.   [30]

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 and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources **agree** that American TV influenced US domestic opinion at the time of the Tet offensive. Source **B** suggests that the evidence shows that there will be no US victory, as suggested by the optimists in the past and that Communists hope 'any success in the offensive will improve their position in eventual negotiations'. Source **D** suggests that the media focussed on the 'initial success of the Viet Cong'.

But the Sources also **disagree**. Source **B** describes the situation as one of 'stalemate', as 'for every means we have to escalate, the enemy can match us'. But it does say that the Tet Offensive may have been a desperate attempt to end the war of attrition which the North could not win. Source **D** on the other hand, states that the media are presenting 'everything as a big American defeat, like that of the French at Dien Bien Phu.' Source **D** thus suggests a much more extreme reaction amongst the American public, and focuses on particular anti-war protest groups such as 'powerful' liberals and 'the young' who had already expressed opposition to the war.

Contextual **knowledge** might be used to show understanding of the significance of the particular incidents mentioned in Source **D**, the events in Saigon, such as the footage of an ARVN officer shooting a VC suspect in the head in full view of the TV cameras, which caused such shock in the USA. Johnson's advisers had turned against the war and he had declared in March that he would not stand in the forthcoming election.

The **provenance** of the Sources is revealing here. Source **B** is a spontaneous CBS broadcast at the time of the Tet Offensive, when shocking TV footage showed US 'superpower' forces coming under attack by Third World forces within their power-bases in the South Vietnamese capital. It does not tell us the impact on the US public, only the experienced reaction of an influential US broadcaster. Source **D** however is the considered opinion of the CIA in a secret intelligence briefing during the summer. The suggestion in Source **D** is that this media coverage distorted the truth of the military situation and failed to report US successes, so boosting support for the anti-war movement.

A supported **judgement** should be reached on which Source provides better evidence. Source **B** is useful in showing the immediate reaction broadcast to the US public. Source **D** may represent the military situation more accurately than Source **B**, and is much more useful for the impact on the US public, due to its later date. No set conclusion is expected.

(b)   Study all the Sources.
Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Tet Offensive of 1968 was a turning-point in the Vietnam War   [70]

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

The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped by interpretation. Sources **A**, **B** and **E support** the view of Tet being of major significance in changing the US direction of the War, but Sources **C** and **D** raise doubts and suggest the opposite, that it need not have caused a reassessment in Washington. The context is a change from NLF guerrilla tactics to a broad offensive on the cities, co-ordinated with a political uprising in the South. Source **A** sets up the objectives of the Tet Offensive and Source **B** suggests its impact, above all on the mindset of many Americans, while Source **E** confirms this and offers further contextualisation as to the domestic impact, not least linking it to the growing anti-War movement there. The realisation that 'crossover point' would never be reached, in Source **B**, when more VC died than could be replaced, made observers suggest that the War was unwinnable.

Own knowledge might be used to confirm this shift in US public opinion and its impact on domestic American politics, including the decision not to grant Westmoreland 200 000 more troops and Johnson's decision not to stand in the 1968 presidential election, leading to Nixon's promise to seek an honourable peace and the beginnings of military de-escalation. Source **E** adds the perception of South Vietnamese collapse and lack of co-operation with US objectives, leading to the beginnings of an attempt to 'Vietnamese' the War after 1968 and make Saigon shoulder more responsibility for its conduct.

In **contrast**, Source **C** questions the significance of the Tet Offensive, suggesting it was, in fact, a defeat for the North, written itself from a Northern perspective and with hindsight after the North had succeeded in winning the War. This might bring its purpose and reliability into question. The impact of Tet in undermining the morale of the Communists in Source **C** – 'we were surprised the Offensive had any success at all' – is confirmed in Source **D** – 'the Vietcong has suffered badly'. There seems to be an element of surprise in Source **C**'s admission that 'we were told the Americans felt as is they had lost'. There is surprise too in Cronkite's spontaneous and influential report, in Source **B**, suggesting that it was the media coverage, rather than the Tet Offensive itself, which marked a turning-point – the end of optimism, featured in Source **B**, and a growing anti-War movement in Sources **D** and **E**. **Own knowledge** might be used to extend the discussion of the extent of public outrage during 1968 and the impact of media reports in the light of international as well as domestic opinion.

Candidates are likely to consider whether or not Tet itself caused the change of US policy, as it revealed the nature of the war – a stalemate, or conversely, that a misinterpretation of the situation by the media unleashed a crisis of confidence in public opinion, which began the move towards US military de-escalation. They are likely to set the Sources within the changed context – from NLF guerrilla tactics in rural areas to co-ordinated attacks on a wide range of targets, including the cities, and US military de-escalation. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History (H506)
Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H106)
June 2009 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F961/01	Raw	100	69	60	52	44	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F961/02	Raw	100	70	61	52	44	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962/01	Raw	100	66	58	50	42	35	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F962/02	Raw	100	69	61	53	46	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963/01	Raw	100	65	58	51	44	37	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F963/02	Raw	100	70	62	54	46	39	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964/01	Raw	100	66	59	52	45	38	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F964/02	Raw	100	70	63	56	49	42	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H106	200	160	140	120	100	80	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H106	20.1	42.8	66.6	83.6	93.5	100.0	10478

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@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