

28 November 2011 – 11 December 2011

A2 GCE HISTORY B

F985 Historical Controversies – British History

Candidates answer on the Answer Booklet.

OCR supplied materials:

- 16 page Answer Booklet
(sent with general stationery)

Other materials required:

None

Duration: 3 hours



INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Write your name, centre number and candidate number in the spaces provided on the Answer Booklet. Please write clearly and in capital letters.
- Use black ink.
- Answer **both sub-questions** from **one** Study Topic.
- Read each question carefully. Make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- Do **not** write in the bar codes.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is **60**.
- This paper contains questions on the following 4 Study Topics:
 - The Debate over the Impact of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1216
 - The Debate over Britain's 17th Century crises, 1629–89
 - Different Interpretations of British Imperialism c.1850–c.1950
 - The Debate over British Appeasement in the 1930s
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure of argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Extract in the one Study Topic you have studied.
- In answering these questions, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you understand and interpret the Extract as well as to inform your answers.
- **You may refer to your class notes and textbooks during the examination.**
- This document consists of **8** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

1 The Debate over the Impact of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1216

Read the following extract about the impact of the Norman Conquest and then answer the questions that follow.

The Norman kings profited from their new kingdom in three chief ways. First, there was the widespread theft of treasure, particularly from churches. This was substantial and deeply-felt by its victims but it was short-lived, and within a generation Norman lords were replacing what had been lost with treasures of their own. Secondly, and much more long-lasting, there was the exploitation of land. The landed wealth of William and of his magnates was increased very significantly. The majority of late eleventh-century English lords built their fortunes on their English, not their Norman lands: a fact that was crucially to affect their political attitudes until the loss of Normandy in 1204. Finally, there is taxation. Contemporaries stressed the greed of William I and William II above all else. Thus the landed and cash resources of England were largely diverted to the advantage of Normandy.

At the same time, while trade remained largely in the hands of natives, many of whom survived and even prospered after 1066, sometimes by intermarriage with the colonists, local markets were often controlled by a local lord who exacted tolls: some English towns were settled by Norman merchants on a considerable scale, and traders from Caen and Rouen, like Thomas Becket's father, established themselves in London and elsewhere. Trade between England and Normandy almost certainly increased in volume, but there is no evidence that it came close to supplanting the much older links between England and Flanders. The Normans never established commercial dominance in England.

Orderic Vitalis provides the best-known evidence for integration. English and Normans lived peaceably in the towns; they intermarried; French goods were available in the markets; the natives adopted French fashions. 'Everyone lived contentedly with his neighbour.' Yet how much credence should we give to this portrayal of a golden age? Orderic, himself a product of integration, is writing c1125. By this time assimilation had certainly occurred, and the prevailing consensus stressed continuity and harmony. But this passage explicitly relates to the period before the 1069 rebellions: it is hard to believe that such racial harmony prevailed at this early date; more probably Orderic is both projecting back conditions prevalent to his own day, and seeking to highlight the disorders of 1069–70. Integration, like colonisation, certainly proceeded at an uneven rate.

At Southampton there were 65 French immigrants concentrated in French Street, worshipping in churches dedicated to saints favoured in Normandy – Michael and John. In both Nottingham and Northampton there were new boroughs where property was almost, if not exclusively in Norman hands, including such great men as Robert of Mortain and Geoffrey of Coutances. Canterbury was a wealthy and populous city, an unparalleled ecclesiastical centre, highly attractive to cross-channel settlers. Yet although there were many immigrants into the city and its surrounding area, coin and other evidence argues for a wealthy and self-confident native population gradually absorbing French influences but never overwhelmed by them. There was probably little distinction in dress; in fashion particularly that of the English wearing their hair long while the Normans were short-shaven, there are some indications that by the reign of William Rufus it was the latter who copied the former, and not the other way around. Nor was there an 'imperial' architecture, as seen, for example, in parts of India under British rule. While some Anglo-Norman churches undoubtedly borrowed features from Norman models, others used themes found in Anglo-Saxon architecture. In part this may have been due to the continuing use of native masons, but it may equally have been a conscious decision for continuity on the part of the patrons, the bishops and the abbots.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) In their work on the Norman Conquest some historians have focused on colonial aspects of the conquest. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of the Norman Conquest. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

2 The debate over Britain's 17th Century Crises, 1629–89

Read the following extract about Britain's 17th century crises and then answer the questions that follow.

The Solemn League and Covenant signposted a British commitment to war not just between but for the three kingdoms. In terms of the awkward relationship between England, Scotland and Ireland in the seventeenth century, the treaty was of fundamental significance in 'the Scottish moment' – the brief period from 1638 to 1645 when the Stuarts' ancient and native kingdom set the political agenda within the British Isles. Although the export of the Covenanting ideology from Scotland was characterised by religious language, negotiations had been based primarily on practical politics and military experience, a combination initially welcomed by pro-Parliamentarian writers like the journalist Marchmont Needham in his first edition of *Mercurius Britannicus* in August 1643. The treaty was no less welcome to writers like Edward Bowles as the effective counter to an untrustworthy king who had been continuously plotting against the 'Long Parliament' since its beginning and who had recently reached an accommodation with the Irish Confederates.

Although its intervention did not enjoy the swift and spectacular success it had in the Second Bishops' War, the Covenanting army helped secure the victory of the Parliamentary forces. In terms of set battles, the Covenanting army made little contribution to the parliamentary war effort after the combined victory at Marston Moor in Yorkshire on 2 July 1644. Its three-year stay in England led to no meaningful establishment of Presbyterianism within the Church of England in terms consistent with the Solemn League.

Accordingly, Covenanting intervention has tended to be written off in both English and Scottish historiography as a naive and ultimately fruitless endeavour to shape the outcome of the civil war. The Scots demonstrated a limited ability to control events and tended to become the tools, if not the playthings, of rival Parliamentary interests, originally called the peace and war parties, who came to be labelled politically as the Presbyterians and Independents respectively.

However, the interests of the Covenanting movement were British, not just English. Their beliefs were maintained as far as was politically possible. This was recognised by accredited international diplomats from France and Sweden. The Scottish Covenanters were also the driving force behind the Committee of Both Kingdoms, which co-ordinated the war effort against the Royalists, and centralised restructuring of the English shire committees to provide ideological as well as military and financial support for the New Model Army. The Covenanting army of intervention remained the largest in the field in Parliamentary service. Furthermore, Scotland effectively expanded its territorial bounds to an unprecedented extent through the Covenanting armies of occupation, south from the Tweed to the Tees and on to the Humber, and west from the Solway Firth to Lough Neagh. This expansion, which was the greatest by any army from the three kingdoms prior to the Cromwellian occupations of Ireland and Scotland in 1650–51, provoked genuine if unfounded fears of Scottish imperialism in both England and Ireland throughout the 1640s.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. [30]
- (b) In their work on 17th century Britain some historians have focused on long-term social and economic developments. Explain how this has added to our understanding of Britain's 17th century crises. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? [30]

3 Different Interpretations of British Imperialism c.1850–c.1950

Read the following extract about British imperialism and then answer the questions that follow.

Sex was part of the politics of the Empire. Sex was something that needed regulating and managing. Unrestrained sexuality was an unending threat to Empire; it undermined notions of British moderation and produced inter-racial liaisons and sometimes offspring. These were not minor considerations, but central to the functioning of imperial government. Sex always threatened the foundations of Empire and civilisation, needing to be restrained and reined in.

A liaison between a local colonized woman and a colonizing man in no way disrupted the existing racial or sexual power base. Sexual contact between a white woman and a non-white colonial man, however, was always and everywhere troubling. The idea that a white woman would consent to such a relationship was, for most colonists, unimaginable. Southern Rhodesia prohibited sex between white women and black men in 1903. White women everywhere were effectively excluded from white society if they chose an inter-racial liaison. As racial attitudes hardened, the prospect of mixed-race offspring was increasingly unacceptable. There was a constant fear that mixed-race women would attract white men and the resulting sexual liaisons would dilute the racial stock, with babies even less English. Inter-racial sex was unfortunate, but inter-racial marriage was unimaginable. Such marriages were certainly not common; the social banishment they entailed ensured their rarity.

At the Fort William Cantonment in India, the grass-cutters petitioned in 1897 for the return of women's jobs. Husbands and wives traditionally worked alongside one another. Officials suspected husbands of selling their own wives. The image of sexual slavery implicit in these views of women sold by greedy husbands was a powerful one. 'What is a common prostitute?', asked a colonial civil servant in India in 1870. In answering his own question he condemned large numbers of colonial subjects as immoral:

The women who walk the road every evening to the west of the Cawnpore Cantonment, the coolie women and milk sellers, who are employed at the barracks. All of them married women, and by reputation respectable household women, are as much prostitutes as the professional ones.

This reading of prostitution as commonplace and unremarkable was a clear marker of the sexual inferiority of colonial societies.

Colonial policy stressed control in a variety of forms. In some instances, it was the assertion of male control over wayward female sexuality; in others it was controlling the unbridled native lust. In all cases, however, controlling sexuality was seen as a critical colonial practice. While it may seldom have captured press headlines, sexuality was a central concern in both the Westminster Parliament and in local colonial governance. The control of white colonial sexuality was just as critical as the managing of native habits. Colonial power cannot be a mere one-sided form of oppression. In the intensifying discouragement of interracial sex lay fears about the dilution of racial superiority. The collapse of racial difference could spell not just the end of European superiority or distinctiveness but, more pressingly, the end of Empire.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) In their work on British imperialism some historians have focused on the impact that the Empire had on Britain. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of British imperialism. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

4 The Debate over British Appeasement in the 1930s

Read the following extract about British appeasement and then answer the questions that follow.

To begin this book, I will expose my prejudices. I think that Churchill could have prevented the Second World War. If Churchill had controlled British foreign policy, he would have made a 'Grand Alliance', to group other European countries round a firm Anglo-French alliance. The Alliance would have pledged defence against any German armed attacks. It might have stopped Hitler, or caused moderate Germans to stop him.

I wrote these sentences before starting to compose this book. Historians, however, must explain what happened and not dream about what might have happened. So this book aims to find out what Churchill tried to do in the 1930s, to work out how it differed from the 'appeasement policy' of British governments, and how and why they rejected Churchill's idea and kept him out of office.

The great issue separating Churchill from the governments after 1932 was the urgency of rearmament. Should the idea of national crisis be spread? Was preparing for war the best way of preventing it? Chamberlain blocked controls being applied to industry as a dangerous interference with ordinary trade; his most effective argument was that economic strength made Britain powerful. In Churchill's opinion loud stress on the desperate urgency of arms production would defeat the obstacles which shortages of skilled labour presented.

By the end of 1937 Chamberlain had settled on appeasement as the best means of preventing war. In 1938 he exploited fear of the power of the German air force to justify his policy. In fact, the Germans never developed an effective strategic bombing force, as the British and Americans did after 1942.

More evidence is unlikely to emerge on what Hitler might have done had he been faced in September 1938 or August 1939 with the threat of armed resistance from a Grand Alliance. In September 1938 a few German generals discussed an attempt to overthrow Hitler. One of them, Franz Halder, the Chief of the General Staff, later blamed the war on the British. All was ready, he claimed, when the news of Chamberlain's flight to Munich showed that the essential condition for the plot had gone. The British policy advocated by Churchill, so Halder claimed, would have enabled the plotters to proceed.

Chamberlain's and Churchill's objectives were identical. Both intended to preserve the independence of Britain and its Empire. Their methods were totally different. Chamberlain's plan was to work with a Hitler rendered rational and moderate by concessions arranged by Britain to deal with justified German grievances. The problem with this was that it strengthened Hitler inside Germany, so making easier his pursuit of the irrational. There are authors who suggest that Chamberlain might have done better to accept the free hand in the east for Germany. The assumption is of a lengthy German-Soviet war of which Britain could dictate the outcome. One problem is that the British military assumed the quick defeat of the Soviet Union, which would have made Hitler irresistible. These problems take us even further into the uncertainties of what might have been.

British internal politics need less speculation. One thing is sure: throughout the 1930s Churchill urgently preached the need for British military strength. Like many, but not all, of his demands, the one for British armaments won more support as threats from Europe grew.

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**
- (b) In their work on British appeasement some historians have focused on economic issues. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of appeasement. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

**Copyright Information**

OCR is committed to seeking permission to reproduce all third-party content that it uses in its assessment materials. OCR has attempted to identify and contact all copyright holders whose work is used in this paper. To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced in the OCR Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download from our public website (www.ocr.org.uk) after the live examination series.

If OCR has unwittingly failed to correctly acknowledge or clear any third-party content in this assessment material, OCR will be happy to correct its mistake at the earliest possible opportunity.

For queries or further information please contact the Copyright Team, First Floor, 9 Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 1GE.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group; Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.