



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2004

GCE

History

Course essays: Unit 3

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS UNIT 3 : COURSE ESSAYS

General Guidance for Examiners



A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options or alternatives offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Sections B and C) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

All of the Unit 3 Course Essays will be marked by reference to a common level of response mark scheme for AS for questions requiring an extended response without (explicit) reference to documents or sources. Details are provided on the following pages.

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

In marking Coursework Essays all examiners must, to decide on levels and placing of a response within a level, refer to:

- the generic essay mark scheme and its descriptors for AS
- the exemplification of AS level descriptors
- the indicative content designated by the Principal Examiner
- additional content (i.e. not in the indicative content) which is relevant and targeted
- guidance on discriminating within a level.

B: Levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response *without* explicit reference to documents or sources.

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-9**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **10-14**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **15-17**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **18-20**

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1: 1-4 Marks (3) (Middle = 3)**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating, with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2: 5-9 Marks (7) (Middle = 7)***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant, but outline only, description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Level 3: 10-14 Marks (12) (Middle = 12)

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but be limited grammatically.

Level 4: 15-17 Marks (16) (Middle = 16)

Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question, and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5: 18-20 Marks (19) (Middle = 19)

As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well-directed prose.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where that level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills**:
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
 - well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark *positively*, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

Important Note

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from that lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism*****A: The Military Orders in the Latin East in the Twelfth Century**

How important was manpower shortage in the Crusader states as a reason for the development of the military orders during the twelfth century?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers are likely to consider a range of reasons for the growth of the military orders, both the Knights Templar and Hospitaller. This should include the events surrounding their formation. Reference may be made to a variety of factors, in particular the needs of pilgrims for protection and the events of 1119. The manpower shortage in the Crusader states was made apparent that year with the Battle of the Field of Blood, while the same year also saw significant attacks on parties of pilgrims. Other relevant factors include the roots of the Hospitallers in 1070 and their caritative role, the actions of men such as Gerard (*founder of the hospice which in 1113 became the order of Knights Hospitaller*), Raymond du Puy (*who led the militarisation of the Hospitallers*) and Hugh of Payens (*who formed a brotherhood in 1119 to secure the pilgrim roads to the Holy places*). Candidates should consider the lack of manpower in Outremer, the need for the permanent presence of a regular army of trained soldiers and the problems of feudal society in providing manpower. The nature of crusading as a temporary penitential pilgrimage should be balanced against the needs of the Crusader states for manpower, their failure to attract sufficient new settlers and their tenuous geopolitical position. Candidates may focus on the potency of their message as an ideal, or the wider monastic revival as a context for their growth. Some may also focus on the stimulus provided by Bernard of Clairvaux and the Council of Troyes in 1129, which marked the formal creation of the Templars, links with the Cistercians and “In praise of the New Knighthood”. These would place the development of the orders firmly in the context of the religious revival of monasticism. Good answers may show the role of change through time and emphasise the militarisation of the orders in the period after the 1150s.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism***B: The Development of new Monasticism in Twelfth Century Europe**

How important was the House of Clairvaux in the growth of the Cistercian Order during the twelfth century?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers are likely to consider a range of reasons for the growth of the Cistercian order, in particular the role of the House of Clairvaux, founded 1115 as the fifth monastery in the expanding order. The influence of Clairvaux will focus on its role as a mother house to 159 monasteries of the 339 Cistercian abbeys founded by 1153, and the impact of Bernard of Clairvaux, abbot from 1115 to 1153. Bernard was an inspirational figure and by the time of his death in 1153 his abbey at Clairvaux had sent out monks to create 68 new abbeys. Candidates may examine the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, his charismatic personality and personal example of austerity and asceticism, his prestige and his inspirational role. Bernard's "golden eloquence" in articulating Cistercian ideals, especially his letters and debates with Peter the Venerable as a means of promoting the New Monasticism, may be included as well as an understanding of the decline in influence which followed Bernard's death in 1153 with the growth of criticism and dilution of the order's economic ideals and purity.

Balanced answers should also consider alternative reasons for growth; the spiritual success of the order; the impact of Citeaux as a mother-house; Stephen Harding; the social catholicity of its appeal; the role of the "Carta Caritatis" in maintaining discipline while expansion took place; the impact of economic success; their focus on the wilderness; benefactors and uncultivated land; sheep farming and wool production; manual labour and the use of conversi; the flood of endowments; papal privileges; the economic context of European

demographic and economic expansion; its constitution and organisation, especially visitations as a means of preserving Cistercian ideals.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*****A: The Origins of the French Wars of Religion**

How important were economic and financial issues in France in contributing to the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion in 1562?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers would be expected to consider **the extent and effect of economic and financial issues** e.g. answers might refer to:

- the theory that the price revolution of the 16th century hit the nobles particularly hard because they made money from rents and yet lived extravagantly; they were not able to take part in trade and so they sold/mortgaged land; many nobles then were attracted to Calvinism as a way of gaining from the Church and came into opposition with Catholic nobles and the royal family. Some evidence shows this is an exaggeration - there was no economic collapse of the nobility as a whole - some lesser nobility did have their pensions cut and consequently moved to support opposing factions. Other evidence suggests that nobles were able to increase their rents and exploit their privileges as 'seigneurs' to remain solvent. Many nobles did dabble in some 'industry' e.g. glass manufacture and in some areas the nobility doubled and trebled their incomes.
- There were times of crisis e.g. the harvest failure in 1557 which led to bouts of inflation and taxation, especially the taille, did increase - but these were sporadic rather than widespread. In many parts of France e.g. Normandy, Auvergne the nobility actually grew richer. The problem may have been one of relative decline; the merchants were becoming wealthier and often gaining government posts, making the nobility feel that they had to act.
- The monarchy, however, did have less income – there was a debt of 40 million livres as a result of the Habsburg-Valois wars; crown income was approx 12m livres p.a. which was

one of the factors in the calling of the States-General in 1560, and this body refused to grant money to the crown, making it more vulnerable.

Other factors also contributed to the outbreak of the war e.g.

- the weakness of the Government as seen in the lack of an effective monarch after Henry II – Francis II became king at 15 and was unable to control the powerful noble families who then vied for influence (Guises, Bourbons and Montmorency). The lack of an effective bureaucracy, a uniform legal and taxation system, meant that government fell into the hands of the strongest. This unleashed other forces as a result of clientage and religious allegiances.
- Religious divisions became more sharply delineated; Calvinists grew to approximately 10% of population and developed strongholds in the Centre and the South. Support grew amongst the lower nobility who were clients of the great families. The Bourbon family converted to Protestantism whilst the Guises remained staunchly Catholic.
- Catherine de Medici, the Queen Mother and a devout Catholic, made these divisions worse through her handling of the situation i.e. her treatment of the Huguenots after the Tumult of Amboise and then her attempts to bring about conciliation through the Colloquy of Poissy. It took only another incident, the Massacre at Vassy, to bring about open war.

Answers may come up with a range of different permutations but should be demonstrating interaction and debating relative importance of economic/financial issues versus other factors to provide good responses. Answers which do not distinguish between the economic and financial issues should not be unduly penalised; it is the relative contribution of these against others which is the focus for evaluation.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*****B: The Role of Individuals and Ideas in the French Wars of Religion**

How important was Coligny's contribution to the Huguenot cause in the years 1560 to 1572?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should be aware of Coligny both as a soldier and as a politician to arrive at an appropriate conclusion.

Coligny was a member of the House of Montmorency, who initially worked closely with Condé until his death in 1569, and then led the protestant party until his assassination in 1572. His importance might be seen in:

Political affairs e.g.

- his occupation of the office of Admiral of France (administrative only) which put him at the centre of government and allowed him to influence policy;
- his close liaison with the Prince de Condé, (until he died in 1569 when Coligny became the leader of the Huguenots until his own death in 1572);
- his influence over Catherine de Medici e.g. in relation to her policy of religious moderation after the Tumult of Amboise, in petitioning her for rights to worship for Huguenots in 1560 and in 1561 when he became a member of the Council (Charles IX was king and Catherine de Medici was regent) and in relation to the Colloquy of Poissy in 1562 which was summoned to attempt to resolve religious differences. This assembly resulted in concessions to the Huguenots in the Edict of St Germain which allowed Huguenots to worship in the countryside. However it was short-lived and the wars broke out soon after this.

- He became a member of the King's Council in 1571, receiving a large pension; hated by the Guises.
- He supported the marriage of Henry of Navarre to Marguerite of Valois; was suspected of exercising undue influence on the king although never proved.

Military issues e.g.

- during the wars, Coligny was a military leader – he was accused of being party to the murder of Guise in 1563, fought continually to achieve rights of worship for Huguenots e.g. he was highly critical of the Peace of Amboise 1563 and became the object of a number of kidnap attempts. After the death of his brother in 1569 he became the de facto leader of the Huguenots.
- He supported the Orange faction in the Netherlands and wanted French intervention against Spain – this made him dangerous from the Catholic viewpoint as Catherine de Medici was anxious not to antagonise Spain. This may have also diverted royal attention from Huguenot activities in France.
- He was deprived of his office as Admiral thus diminishing the influence exerted by Huguenots on the government. Subsequently he conducted a successful campaign which resulted in significant concessions for Huguenots (Peace of St. Germain-en-laye).
- Massacre of St Bartholomew 1572 – much debate centres around whether this was a deliberate plot to get rid of the Huguenot leaders. Attempted assassination of Coligny sparked fears of Protestant retaliation. Thus eventually led to the murder of Coligny and other leading Huguenots. Some historians consider the motives to have been religious rather than political. Although the immediate effect was disastrous, ultimately the massacre strengthened the Huguenot cause, both politically and militarily e.g. the emergence of the Midi as a political and military stronghold, the development of Huguenot theories of resistance and republican ideas etc. Coligny's death had hardened attitudes on both sides and could have contributed to the emergence of the Catholic League. It certainly stimulated further war.
- Some answers might want to compare Coligny with Anthony of Bourbon and Louis, Prince of Condé – Bourbon failed to impose his right to become Regent for Francis II and Condé was diverted to peace mission to Netherlands, although subsequently was probably behind the Conspiracy of Amboise. However, he took no other active role after this until 1562. Condé led initially successful campaigns in the first war and gained some support from German Protestant princes. He was killed in battle (Jarnac) 1569 in the 3rd war. Coligny's role was more varied, diverse and successful overall.

Answers might conclude that Coligny was important because he had kept the Huguenot struggle going and through his death became a martyr which inspired others:

- on the other hand his actions merely perpetuated the wars and it was another 20 years before France had internal peace.
- Protestantism, although tolerated within limits, had not become the religion of France and Henry of Navarre had to become a Catholic to be accepted as King.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative C : The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715-1743*****A: The Regency, 1715-1723**

Examine the extent to which the Regent Orleans was successful in dealing with the Parlements.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers would be expected to establish criteria for measuring success which could be in the short and long-term with some distinction made between the interests of Orleans as Regent and the overall interests of the monarchy. Depth of coverage is not expected on the longer-term consequences.

On success with Parlements:

The restoration of the Right of Remonstrance to the Parlement of Paris in 1715 gained Orleans the revoking of Louis XIV's Will which had made Orleans subject to a Council of Regency. Thus he had established his sole Regency with the goodwill of Parlement who co-operated in overturning the legitimisation by Louis XIV of his illegitimate sons. Orleans was now Louis XV's heir, and death in childhood was not uncommon; Parlement also removed the duc de Maine's military power, a victory for Orleans, and both helped consolidate his power-base. Parlement's goodwill was furthered in 1717 as Orleans appointed the leading Parlementaire, d'Aguesseau, as his Chancellor. This "honeymoon period" continued with the inclusion of some Parlementaires in the Polysynodie (the councils of nobles created by Orleans).

When Parlement later proved recalcitrant over the issue of registering Unigenitus and over Law's financial schemes Orleans' resolute reaction – the 1718 Lit de Justice; restrictions on

the Right of Remonstrance; having three Parlements arrested; exiling Parlement to Pontoise in 1720, with the threat of even further exile, and the creation of new courts – finally gained their capitulation and the registration of financial edicts. Although clear echo of the events in the previous Regency at no point did Parlement threaten the resistance which had led to the Frondes, even though the financial and economic exhaustion of France made popular support menacingly possible. The restoration of Secretaries of State in 1718 on the collapse of the Polysynodie enabled Orleans to circumvent the Parlements, to some extent, in implementing policy by the means of Ministerial Letters. Orleans can be argued to have succeeded where Louis XIV had failed, in gaining the registration of Unigenitus in 1720 by the Parlement anxious to end its Pontoise exile.

The resistance of Brittany, partly led by the Parlements of Rennes, was dealt with adroitly by Orleans' anti-Spanish stance: when the Spanish offered support to Brittany he exploited Rennes' Gallican attitudes to bring them to heel against the Ultramontane Spanish and thus isolated their noble allies in Brittany. The Parlement did not protest at the execution of the noble leaders of Breton discontent.

Failure with Parlements:

The restoration of Remonstrance had led to Orleans' short-term difficulties but was most significant in the longer-term giving Parlement the opportunity to resist the Crown and to present itself as the defender of the people against the "despotism" of Louis XV and Louis XVI.

During the later years of Louis XIV Parlement, as defenders of Gallicanism, and some as Jansenists, had resisted the registration of the Papal Bull Unigenitus. This continued under Orleans and became intertwined with Parlement's resistance to Law's system. Chancellor d'Aguesseau's opposition to Law led to the Chancellor's replacement and his resentment was expressed in Parlement. This stiffened its resistance to the financial measures, already stimulated by the challenge of Law to the profits of individual Parlements as rentiers and lenders of capital to the Crown. Compromise with Parlement over financial measures weakened Law's system. It could be argued that the registering of Unigenitus was a small price for Parlement to pay for victory over Law, particularly as Parlement also posed as defenders of those affected by inflation and those ruined by the crash of the system in 1720. The hedging of the registration of Unigenitus with so many restrictions also limited its effectiveness and enabled later Parlements' dispute over its enforcement. The Peace of the Church in 1720 was so ambiguous it could be seen as success for both Jansenists and their opponents, what it was not, in the longer-term, was a success for the monarchy. Thus Orleans might be held partly responsible for the division in the Church for the next half century, which led to the major confrontation in the 1750s with Parlement over billets de confession, in which Louis XV had little choice but to uphold Unigenitus. Candidates should not be expected to have great depth of knowledge post 1726.

An overall conclusion might be that Orleans was successful in preserving the authority of the Crown and had avoided the instabilities of earlier Regencies in his relations with Parlement. Orleans could not be held responsible for the difficulties over Unigenitus inherited from Louis XIV, nor could the Regent be blamed for Louis XV's later failings as he had shown that the Crown, even under a Regency, was capable of keeping Parlements under control. However the restoration of the Right of Remonstrance and the issue of Jansenism combined in the future to have major detrimental effect on the absolutism of the monarchy. The

potential for this had clearly been demonstrated during the Regency in Parlement's defence of Gallicanism. Orleans' own religious indifference had perhaps led him to underestimate the significant flaws of his compromise.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715-1743*****B: Cardinal Fleury, 1726-1743**

How effective was Cardinal Fleury in preserving the authority of the monarchy in the years 1726 to 1743?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

It will be necessary to establish some definition of the foundations of royal authority so that Fleury's effectiveness may be evaluated. These could be Divine Right; the monarch not being accountable to any earthly authority, including his subjects, but entrusted with their well-being and accountable to God; alone holding the right to make law but bound by the laws and customs of his kingdom; all ensuring the monarch was absolute not arbitrary in the exercise of his power; held in respect by his people and unchallenged.

Almost every area in which Fleury was effective also had its shortcomings: -

In preserving the authority of the Crown over the law and Parlement Fleury can be seen as effective: in compelling the Paris Parlement to register the King's declaration that all clergy should support Unigenitus in 1730; in the major assertion of royal authority in 1732 with the exile of 139 judges when they had refused to conduct their judicial duties. On the other hand Parlement continued to strengthen its position as the defender of Gallicanism against what it claimed as the Ultramontanism of the Crown.

Even though the Parlement of Paris formally condemned the 1732 pamphlet, *Judicium Francorum*, its arguments were ominous for the authority of the monarchy: that the Parlements of France were one body representing the nation and that the monarch could not contract with the people save through its authority found willing supporters later in Louis XV's reign and beyond.

Divine Right was not, as yet, seriously challenged by the dissemination of enlightened thinking. The authority of the monarchy was preserved over the Church by Fleury reaffirming its tax privileges, and over religious belief by the upholding of Unigenitus. This was aided to some extent from 1731 by Jansenism entering its convulsionnaire phase (claims of miracles/emotion and disorder at a Paris cemetery), as a result Parlement did not criticise the closing of the cemetery and Jansenism lost some support.

Foreign policy is not an issue covered by the Specification but some candidates might comment on Fleury's adroit diplomacy and preservation of peace ensuring that military expenditure was manageable, and the Crown was not exposed to a loss of confidence as a result of military defeat – unlike the subsequent endeavours of Louis XV.

The financial strengthening of the Crown aided the preservation of its authority. Fleury's deliberate policy of reassurance after the failure of Law's system, through measures such as the restoration of coinage and making regular payments on royal debt, was effective. The policy of retrenchment aided by the effectiveness of Orry as Controller General from 1730-1745 produced the only balanced budgets of the eighteenth century. There was, however, no fundamental reform of the system which left the monarchy dependant on an inefficient tax basis and loans which could not support the costs of war, whilst the re-establishment of the power of the Tax Farmers can be seen as a retrograde step.

The well-being of the people and stability were aided by economic prosperity and overseas trade flourished, Fleury had encouraged this and industry by re-imposing heavy tariffs. Although trade was building on its earlier stimulus by Colbert and Law and nothing was done for agriculture, on balance a secure economy meant contented middle and upper classes with no pressing reason to challenge the authority of the Crown.

It might be argued that the authority of the King in government was preserved by Fleury being only a Minister of State rather than First Minister and the intendants continued effective representation of the Crown in the supervision of the provinces.

The conclusion might be that Fleury did preserve the foundations of royal authority but that these were not fundamentally strengthened. Their continued preservation would rest heavily on the qualities of Louis XV when he finally decided to take over from the Cardinal. Although originally the tutor of Louis, Fleury cannot be held responsible for the later failings of his lazy pupil.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative D: Europe, 1825-1850*****A: European Diplomacy, 1825-1835**

How effective was Great Power co-operation in resolving the problems raised by the Belgian Revolution of 1830?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Mark as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative Content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The peaceful resolution of the Belgian Revolution of 1830 was due to the co-operation of Britain and France and the acquiescence, rather than full support, of Austria, Russia and Prussia (the Holy Alliance). The London Conference of November 1830 was a remarkable display of collective responsibility on the part of the Great Powers and the introduction of Conference Diplomacy gave the Concert of Europe a new lease of life in the short term. However, the Belgian Crisis was not fully resolved until the King of Holland formally accepted the independence of Belgium in 1839, only from then on were the Great Powers able to guarantee Belgium's permanent neutrality. Candidates may also argue that the real credit for the peaceful solution of the Belgium Revolution belongs to Palmerston's determination and diplomatic skills, rather than to the collective co-operation of the Great Powers. The Belgian Revolution had the potential to cause conflict rather than co-operation between the Great Powers. William, King of the Netherlands, appealed to the Holy Alliance powers to defend the 1815 settlement, whilst the Belgians looked to the new regime of Louis-Philippe to stop the suppression of the revolt by force.

Conflict was avoided and co-operation began when Prussia accepted French calls for non-intervention in October 1830. The Anglo-French proposal for a conference in London was accepted by all the powers involved and the success of that conference owed much to the co-operation of Palmerston and Talleyrand. At London, an armistice to localise the conflict was agreed upon. Shortly after the powers accepted Belgian independence and early in 1831 its neutrality. The co-operation of the members of the Holy Alliance during negotiations was

passive rather than active, as they were distracted by revolutions first in the Russian territory of Poland and then in Austria's Italian Provinces.

The Great Powers did effectively co-operate, resolve and agree on the terms of the separation of Belgium from Holland, which included the settlement of boundaries, financial issues and the politically sensitive issue of a new monarch. They also issued a collective ultimatum the Dutch King to accept their terms or face a united opposition. The Great Powers collectively agreed for French and British troops to be despatched to Belgium in August 1831 in order to force the retreat of the Dutch army from Brussels. The co-operation of Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia also ensured that France could not realise its ambitions for territorial gain by the partitioning of Belgium.

In December 1832 another Anglo-French operation, again initiated by Palmerston, with the consent of the other powers, evicted the Dutch from Antwerp. Therefore the successful solution of the Belgium Revolution clearly necessitated the coercion of the King of Holland by Britain and France acting on behalf of the Great Powers. In effect Russia, Austria and Prussia played only a small role in the settlement of the Belgian crisis and were more willing to accept Palmerston's solution for Belgium due to the restraint shown by Britain and France towards the revolts in Poland and the Italian States.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative D: Europe, 1825-1850*****B: The Revolutions of 1848 and their immediate aftermath to 1850**

How important were economic factors in causing the 1848 Revolutions in Europe?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Mark as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative Content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The 1848 revolutions were the most widespread geographical popular disturbances of the 19th century. They had a direct political impact on France, the German States, the Habsburg Empire, and the Italian States – but they did not affect the whole of Europe. The roots of the revolutions can be linked to a conjunction of several crises, one of which was economic, that were felt across Europe, but the triggers of the Revolutions can only be found by an examination of the political circumstances and disputes that the individual European states faced in the spring of 1848. **Note** that evidence on individual revolutions does not need to be extensive, as this is a general question about the causes of the 1848 revolutions.

Economic Factors include:***Crisis in Agriculture***

Acute potato blight 1845, failure of the grain harvest 1846, steep prices rises in staple food stuffs (100-150% on average), producers of cash crops (cork, olives, hemp, flax) and of silk faced dramatic decreases in demand. Incomplete railway systems prevented the import and distribution of foreign grain to disadvantaged areas; food riots in Venetia, Verona and the Low Countries.

Crisis in Industry

Crisis of overproduction 1845-47 saturated markets, increase in unemployment, decrease in wages.

Crisis in the Financial Sector

A sudden rise in bankruptcies - especially among the *petite bourgeoisie* shopkeepers and wholesale merchants. Crippling levels of indebtedness for many industrial and agricultural producers, investment capital plummeted, rapid decline in all construction work (especially the French railways). Governments forced to borrow heavily to subsidise food prices or to pay for imported grain.

However, candidates may argue that economic factors were not that important for a number of reasons.

- The worst of the agricultural crisis was over by the winter of 1847-8 due to the reasonable good harvests of 1847. This was reflected in the general lack of enthusiasm for the Revolutions in spring 1848 from the rural populations of Europe.
- The Revolutions did not sweep throughout Europe as the countries on the extreme fringes of the continent were not affected – these included the industrially advanced nations of Britain and Belgium which should have been worst hit by the economic downturn. Russia (with its huge rural population) found time to suppress revolutionary activity in the Habsburg lands and Wallachia.

Other factors may arguably be more important these include:

Crisis in Society

Dramatic 30% population growth in Continental Europe between 1800-1850 aggravated the impact of the economic crisis. Europe's peasantry faced land hunger and semi-feudal oppression (in the Habsburg Empire). Artisans faced hunger due to unemployment and those who still worked spent 70% of their income on food. The lower middle classes felt threatened by big business and faced bankruptcy. An over-expansion in higher education led to an increasing number of unemployed university graduates who turned to liberalism and nationalism in protest at their governments ineptness.

Crisis in the Political Leadership of Europe

Europe's leaders were plagued by a lack of self-confidence and failed to intervene effectively to alleviate the social distress brought about by the economic crisis. Governments and regimes became discredited amongst the rural populations and urban masses and in essence voluntarily capitulated during the Revolutions. Certain monarchs and ministers attracted an exceptional degree of personal unpopularity – King Louis-Philippe and Guizot in France, Metternich and 'Ferdinand the Loony' in the Habsburg Empire, King Ludwig in Bavaria and Frederick William IV in Prussia.

The specific circumstances in individual cities and nations

Research has proven that the immediate cause of the 1848 revolutions were often found in the peculiar and specific circumstances of the individual cities and nations. The first revolution of 1848 began in Sicily on 12 January and peasant grievances and liberal demands for freedom drove it from Bourbon rule. Revolution spread to Naples where demands for a constitution were granted on 27 January. In France, the uprisings in Paris were a spontaneous response to the government's decision to ban the great reform banquet meeting on 22 February. In the Habsburg Empire, Kossuth's demands for constitutions and greater Hungarian independence on 3 March encouraged student radicals to demonstrate in Vienna on 12 March and Metternich's incompetent handling of the uprisings led to his dismissal a

day later. In the German states, the wholesale granting of constitutional demands followed the abdication of Louis-Philippe.

Conclusions

There is no doubt that Europe faced a serious economic crisis in the mid-1840s and was intensified by a dramatic growth in population. The crisis was worsened by increasing industrialisation, which served to swell the ranks of the working classes, alienated the artisans and add influential demands for political change through the growth of the factory owning capitalist class. There is also evidence of a collective malaise and incompetence within Europe's leaders and governments. However, the triggers for individual revolutions are to be found in the immediate political circumstances of spring 1848.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870-1914*****A: The Balkans, 1870-1890**

How important is nationalism in explaining why there was a crisis in the Balkans in the years 1875 to 1878?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The uprisings and rebellions escalating across the Balkans from 1875 signified the threat of an emerging Balkan nationalism as the Christian populations determined to win independence, and as the Turks tried to resist any further disintegration of their crumbling empire in Europe through enforced repression. In 1875, the oppressed Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina rose in rebellion, and in 1876 the revolt spread to Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro. Candidates should also focus on the nationalism of some of the major powers, as Russia saw opportunities through Pan-Slavism for territorial gains to extend her military and commercial interests, and Austria-Hungary strove to resist the spread of nationalism to her own multi-racial empire. In turn, Britain and France were concerned at the threat of further Turkish deterioration and Russian advancement, and Germany wanted to avoid taking sides.

Candidates will also need to assess nationalism in relation to other factors which helped to sustain the crisis over the period in question; for example, the unsuccessful diplomacy of the major powers, the repression of the Bulgarians by the Turks and the chaotic power struggle in Constantinople. The final stage of the crisis was triggered by the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War in 1877, leading to the Treaty of San Stefano in the following year. Russia's unrealistic demands made renegotiation inevitable with the Congress of Berlin.

Better candidates need to do more than describe the crisis from 1875, but should prioritise the causes, seeing the connections between Balkan nationalism and the nationalism of the major powers, and explaining why these issues kept the crisis on the boil up to 1878.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870-1914*****B: The Balkans, 1890-1914**

Examine the extent to which the Bosnian Crisis of 1908-1909 was a turning point in rivalry and conflict in the Balkans.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Apart from the Bulgarian Crisis of 1885, events in the Balkans had been reasonably quiet since the Treaty of Berlin of 1878. The Austro-Russian agreement of 1897 to maintain the status-quo had put the situation in the Balkans on ice for a further decade, although the decline in Austro-Serb relations, especially following the change of leadership in Serbia in 1903, looked ominous. The Bosnian Crisis itself was triggered by the Young Turk movement, aiming to overthrow the reactionary regime of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, achieve a more liberal and efficient regime and restore Bosnia to full Turkish rule. This was a turning point in itself – all previous settlements had been based on the assumption that Turkey was weak. Were Turkey to become strong again – and liberal – new problems would arise. The Austrians decided that the time had come to occupy the province. Negotiations were held between Austria-Hungary and Russia, anxious to secure their own positions, but chances of a conference were pre-empted by Austria's annexation. Faced with a German ultimatum, Russia and Serbia finally backed down, uncertain of support from Britain – Britain had no desire to let Russia control the Straits.

As a turning point, the crisis caused diplomatic turmoil, ending Austro-Russian co-operation, with serious implications for the future, confirming Austria-Hungary's over-confidence with German support, and Germany, feeling the pressure of 'encirclement', no longer a moderating influence. Russia and Serbia were left embittered and humiliated, blaming the crisis on Iswolsky's unorthodox diplomacy. The annexation of Bosnia would provide a forewarning of the July crisis in 1914 in all its essentials, provoking an over-reaction which

would recall the bitterness of 1908. On the other hand, war was avoided in 1908, and there was no increased support for Russia from Britain and France, despite their entente. The crisis can be seen as just a single incident in the general slide to war at this time, resulting largely from Iswolsky's bad handling.

Better answers should link events in Bosnia to the international context, emphasising that Balkan nationalism cannot be separated from the increasing confrontation and ultimate conflict between the two competing alliances. In assessing the significance of the crisis, candidates might explain that individual countries reacted differently to these events, and sought different solutions.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917 - 1929*****A: Lenin and the consolidation of the Bolshevik State 1917-1924**

Examine the extent to which the New Economic Policy fulfilled Lenin's description of it as a "necessary retreat which saved the revolution", by the time of his death in 1924.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will focus upon the content and effectiveness of NEP both in terms of its practical effects and its ideology.

There will be an examination of why it was introduced in 1921. War Communism, which had ruthlessly militarised industry and introduced requisitioning of grain from the peasantry, was proving only partially effective between 1918 and 1921 – and more importantly, was alienating many Russians, including some potential supporters of the Bolsheviks.. Although some theoreticians welcomed its impact – for example Bukharin saw the collapse of the economy and the reversion to barter as a sign that capitalism was on the way out in favour of a moneyless economy – the reality was that the economy was collapsing, although the Red Army was fed and did win the Civil War. There were opposition groups within the Party – for example the Workers' Opposition – opposed to the centralising tendencies of the Party – but also widespread resentment especially from the peasants.

Disturbances, notably the Tambov Revolt, focused Lenin's mind on the need for change. He had decided on NEP even before the notorious Kronstadt Revolt in the spring of 1921, which "lit up reality like lightning". Hence the introduction of NEP at the Tenth Party Congress in 1921. NEP allowed considerable concessions: private trading was allowed, except for the "commanding heights of the economy" such as the railways. Requisitioning was replaced by a tax in kind and then a money tax. Significantly, these economic concessions were accompanied by a political clampdown which saw the banning of factions and open debate

within the Party, and this was soon followed by the elimination of the remnants of other political groups like the Mensheviks.

NEP was unpopular with many hardline Communists who saw it as a compromise with capitalism. Lenin was not consistent in his views. Sometimes he gave an ideological justification to NEP, equating it with state capitalism, and arguing that it was a necessary halfway house on the way to socialism. At other times he was far more pragmatic, as in the quotation, declaring that it was a necessary step to save the revolution – otherwise there was a serious possibility of the Communist regime being overturned from within. The clampdown on factionalism and Lenin's authority prevented open debate about it until after his death.

NEP began to have a positive economic effect: production began to rise again towards pre-war levels, although this may also have been due to the fact that the Civil War was over and there was more stability. There were still blips: agriculture and industry recovered at different rates, as typified by the "scissors crisis". Nevertheless, most commentators would argue that if not necessarily saving the revolution, it went a long way towards contributing towards stability. The key feature though was "retreat". Despite Lenin's argument, and the fact that Bukharin was won over, many Communists disliked NEP and the emergence of a new "class system" with Nepmen and kulaks doing well.

Candidates must judge for themselves whether NEP was the critical factor in preserving Communist control and providing economic stability up to Lenin's death in 1924.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia 1917-1929*****B: Stalin's rise to power 1922-1929**

Explain the main reasons why Trotsky had lost most of his influence in the USSR to Stalin by 1929.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Trotsky was an extremely influential figure in the period 1917-21, having played a leading part in the October Revolution and organising and commanding the Red Army during the Civil War. He was Lenin's right hand man, despite having only joined the Bolsheviks in 1917. He seemed an obvious contender for power when Lenin died, but he also had disadvantages. He was regarded with suspicion by some old Bolsheviks, and he was also regarded as too clever by some. He himself felt that anti-semitic feeling might work against him. Most importantly, he made no attempt to build up a power base in the Party, unlike Stalin, who was to become his great rival. He never even had a secure base in the Army, which felt that he did not champion its interests after the Civil War. His oratory could not overcome these difficulties. Crucially, Trotsky also made serious errors of judgement and underestimated the opposition to himself. He was also inhibited in the early 1920s from promoting his ideas by Lenin's ban on factionalism. Trotsky adapted to NEP although he disliked it.

After Lenin's death, Trotsky, himself criticised by Lenin, did not make effective use of Lenin's Testament in which Lenin condemned Stalin, because Trotsky did not want to make Party quarrels public. He made his own enemies by criticising the Government particularly in its handling of the economy and led the 'Platform of 46' opposition group. His views on permanent revolution appeared to many to make less sense than Stalin's 'Socialism in one country'. Even more important, Trotsky was in no position to challenge Stalin, whose power as General Secretary was already considerable. Going back on previous disagreements,

Trotsky formed an alliance with Zinoviev and Kamenev, but it seemed to many like opportunism, whilst he certainly underestimated Stalin, whom he also criticised for failing to support the Chinese Communists.

Trotsky was successively manoeuvred out of his posts, and his final bid for influence at the 1927 Party Conference failed. He was expelled from the Party, sent into internal exile in 1928, and left Russia for good in 1929. He was largely written out of Soviet history, although abroad, he remained a bogeyman and an opponent of Stalinism – but effectively his influence in Russia was dead well before 1929. His major achievements had been in the 1917-21 period, and thereafter he was engaged in what seemed to be increasingly unimportant theoretical arguments and out of touch with the realities of power, despite his own reputation as a left-wing hardliner, the supporter of an all-out approach to achieving socialism.

Answers will probably also focus on Stalin's strengths, to explain why he rather than Trotsky triumphed in the struggle for the leadership. Stalin was helped considerably by his role as General Secretary of the Party, which gave him great influence and enabled him to manipulate support in the debates of the 1920s. Having survived Lenin's criticism of himself in the Testament, Stalin showed considerable skill in presenting himself as the heir of Lenin and a man of the centre, avoiding the factionalist quarrels and changing alliances of rivals like Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev. His call for Socialism in One Country struck a chord with many, and he proved an able debater in the arguments over NEP and the way ahead in the later 1920s, the mercurial Trotsky was no match for him.

Answers may well balance Stalin's perceived strengths against Trotsky's weaknesses, or they may focus on Trotsky's qualities. Either approach is acceptable.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative G : Germany, c1925-1938*****A: The Weimar Republic c1925-1933**

How important was the part played by economic crisis in the breakdown of parliamentary government in Germany in the years 1930 to 1933?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will be expected to focus on the impact of the economic crisis of 1930+ on German politics and in particular its part in the breakdown of parliamentary government leading to Hitler's appointment as Chancellor and his anti-democratic measures of 1933.

Relevant material on the impact of the economic crisis on government will include:

- the break up of Müller's coalition of SDP, DDP, Centre Party and DVP in 1930 (the last Weimar government to have a majority in the Reichstag), over unemployment benefits.
- the appointment of Brüning as Chancellor, and his use (with Hindenburg's permission) of article 48 (emergency decree, undermining the power of the Reichstag and democratic government).
- difficulties in forming stable governments because divergent opinions on how to deal with the crisis, leading to the continued and increased use of decrees by Papen and Schleicher in 1932, 5 major national elections, including 2 dissolutions of the Reichstag for opposition in 1932. This all worked to increase German disillusionment with a failing democratic system.
- the growth of non-democratic groups (especially Nazis) in the Reichstag. The Nazis increased their share of the national vote from 2.6% in May 1928 to 18.3% in September 1930, 37.3% in July 1932 and 33.1% in November 1932, apparently winning votes from those affected by the crisis. Their representation increased from 51 Reichstag seats in

1928 to 230 in July and 196 in November 1932, the later fall corresponding to a slight improvement in the economy.

- the loss of middle class confidence in Weimar (there was a swing of industrial and business communities to the Nazis, so injecting funds and influence) and the desperation of the unemployed, some of whom turned to communism and the KPD (who won 17% of the vote in 1932 and increased their reichstag seats from 54 in 1928 to 100 in November 1932). There were 6 million (a third of the German workforce) unemployed by 1932 and extremist propaganda could flourish more easily in the circumstances of crisis.
- Hitler's promotion to the Chancellorship in 1933 through intrigue with Papen against his rival Schleicher was made possible because of the increase in Nazi votes and the desperation of Hindenburg for stable government in the face of mounting unemployment.
- the crisis helps account for the willingness of Hindenburg and the right to allow Hitler free reign with the Enabling Act and a ban on other political parties. They believed that Hitler could offer the "strong" government needed as an answer to Germany's economic problems.

Candidates should be aware that although it was not until 1933 that Weimar democracy was officially at an end, the concept of democratic government had been gradually undermined since 1930 as the leaders of government – Hindenburg and chancellors from Brüning onwards, developed a system of authoritarian government in defiance of the Reichstag.

For a balanced answer, candidates will also need to examine other factors leading to the breakdown of parliamentary government in Germany.

- the long-term problems of a Republic that was launched in a limited revolution and was beset by difficulties from both right and left from its inception 1918-1919. The "legitimacy" of the Republic was always a fundamental problem and the lack of tradition of democratic government and weak liberalism made its acceptance difficult.
- the reliance on the army stemming from the Ebert-Groener Pact and the need to restore order 1918-1919 helped perpetuate long term authoritarian tradition.
- the preservation of the right wing elites (especially the civil service and judiciary) in government and the election of Hindenburg as President in 1925 reinforced anti-democratic tendencies.
- the imperfect constitution which left the President with considerable powers (especially article 48) and involved a system of proportional representation.
- the legacy of Versailles, the loss of territory and reparations which created an underlying political hostility to the Republic as well as an additional economic burden.
- the existence of alternative anti-parliamentary political groupings such as Nazism and Communism.
- Nazi propaganda, the leadership of Hitler and the appeal of Nazism, which, with its nationalist (right wing) message, might have succeeded in destroying parliamentary government even without economic crisis.

Answers may conclude that the economic events of 1930+ were only a catalyst which precipitated political change or, alternatively, that without the economic collapse of 1929/30 the Republic was heading for stability and survival.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative G: Germany, c1925-1938*****B: The Nazi consolidation of power 1930-1938**

How important were the weaknesses of the opposition in enabling Hitler's successful consolidation of power in the period January 1933 to August 1934?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will be expected to focus on the apparent ease with which Hitler consolidated his power 1933-1934, balancing the weaknesses of his opponents against the strength of Hitler's own position and support. In this way, the importance of the weaknesses of the opposition should be clearly established.

The weaknesses of the opposition might include:

- the left and right were divided and within the left there was division between the KPD and SPD. Parties were in any case swiftly placed in a position of ineptitude by Hitler's bans (against KPD in February and all parties, July 1933).
- the right wing elites who might have been expected to oppose Hitler and his violent methods were attracted to authoritarianism, hostile to Weimar democracy, and influenced by their German tradition of loyalty. Since Hitler used mainly "legal methods" their respect for legality made them less inclined to resist. They were partly appeased by the destruction of the SA in 1934.
- workers, weakened by unemployment were not in a position to strike or oppose anti-communist and anti-union legislation.
- opportunities for advancement by co-operation, a desire for a "quiet life", fear engendered by an atmosphere of violence and the intimidatory effect of the massacre of the Night of the Long Knives meant few were willing to risk joining opposition forces.

- any anticipated opposition was silenced before it could take action e.g. the bans on political parties, the stifling of the trade unions (May 1933) and opposition within the party silenced by action against the SA in June 1934.
- those who might have opposed left it too late because of their fatal underestimation of Hitler's ambition. There were only 3 Nazis in the cabinet when Hitler became Chancellor, and the "right" felt they could use and then discard him, whereas the left did not believe Nazism could last. Most regarded the terror and intimidation as only temporary and Hitler as yet another "passing" Chancellor.

The strength of Hitler's position and support might include:

- genuine support from the conservative right (especially large landowners, business men and industrialists) who saw Nazism as a safeguard from Communism and Socialism; support from the middle classes, (traditional middle class professionals and newer businessmen), disillusioned by the policies of the Weimar Republic and (particularly in the case of the latter) desperate after the economic crisis of 1929; support from numbers of the working class, through personal appeal and the Nazi's social programme with promises of a better future; the popularity (cult) of Hitler; Hitler's own leadership qualities (the Führerprinzip; Hitler's ability as a speaker; his emotional appeal).
- fortunate (or possibly contrived) circumstances – Van der Lubbe's attempt to burn down the Reichstag building (27 February 1933), could be turned to Nazi advantage increasing Hindenburg's willingness to grant the emergency decree, "For the protection of People and State" (February 28) which suspended constitutional civil rights (and could be used against Nazi opponents) and was to remain in force throughout the Third Reich. The death of Hindenburg (August 1934) permitted Hitler's assumption of the Presidency, (which made it impossible to remove Hitler legally) and an army oath of allegiance.
- the power of the Enabling Act (March 23 1933) which gave the Cabinet the right to issue decrees and so allowed Hitler to create a centralised one party state.
- Hitler's rapid moves to consolidate power and weaken opponents. His strategy after January 1933, to seize control at the local level (the SA led the takeover of town halls police headquarters and newspaper offices) followed by the removal of trade unions and opposition parties worked. The abolition of independent state governments, the restructuring of government and the purge of civil service, control over the police and civil service and control of the media all took place before any concerted opposition could evolve.
- the apparent use of legality giving an air of respectability, reinforced by Hitler's stress on moral values, traditions and Christianity.
- control of a terror apparatus including the SS and Gestapo which could be used as necessary and whose power was shown in the Night of the Long Knives.
- timely concessions e.g. to win Centre support for the Enabling Act, to win over the Catholic Church (Concordat July), or to gain the support of the army through the curbing of the SA, June 1934.

Candidates will need to assess the importance of both sets of factors in order to reach a balanced assessment of the part played by the weak opposition. They may conclude that it was Hitler's methods with their emphasis on legality which enabled him to consolidate his power with relatively little opposition. The seemingly legal steps he took conciliated the elite while enabling him to repress his potential opponents. Some might also consider the part of propaganda and the genuine support within Germany for Nazi policies (or promises), particularly the economic programme.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa*****A: Britain and Kenyan Independence, 1953 to 1964**

How important was the part played by the changing attitudes of British politicians to the achievement of Kenyan independence by 1963?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Throughout the period the Conservative Party was in power and the attitude of politicians was largely opposed to decolonisation. There was a traditional conservatism towards the Empire perhaps best exemplified through the attitude of Winston Churchill. The attitudes of British politicians towards Kenyan independence before the “Wind of Change” speech (1960) may be explored by examining Britain’s response to Mau Mau. The terrorism was met with a British military response: a State of Emergency was declared and thousands of suspects rounded up. Candidates may consider the Mau Mau as a catalyst which began the process of changing attitudes. From 1954 constitutional changes were introduced. The most significant of them was the Lyttleton Constitution. Policy moved towards multi-racialism rather than decolonisation and this could be illustrated through the Lyttleton Constitution. Attitudes changed and the role of the Mau Mau played in this could be explored to some effect in order to establish some balance in the answer.

A key turning point may be regarded as the Suez Canal crisis (1956). This revealed Britain’s colonial and international weakness more clearly than any other contemporary event. Eden resigned and Macmillan became Prime Minister. In terms of colonial policy Macmillan was a political rather than a traditional Conservative. He saw the Empire, and Kenya, within the wider context of Britain’s national interests. A key issue was the question of the relevancy of retaining control over Kenya for Britain. Macmillan was interested in developing closer ties with the USA, a country opposed to colonisation. Increasingly he came to see Britain’s role as part of Europe, particularly after the creation of the EEC in 1957 and the fact that Britain

had not joined. There was the issue of terrorism which the Mau Mau could reinstate at any point and the economics and commercial value to Britain of Kenya. Macmillan was also sensitive to the growth of nationalism across Africa and this is most clearly illustrated through his 'Winds of Change' speech (1960).

Within Kenya, nationalist politicians replaced the terrorist stance of the Mau Mau. Idinga is an example of the more mature political leader able to argue in favour of decolonisation. Kenya was able to show that it was politically ready to become independent and that the interests of non-Black Kenyans would be protected. This was clear through the Lancaster Conferences.

A further indicator of changing political attitudes lay in the appointment of new men who were willing and able to oversee the transition to independence e.g. Iain McCleod.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa***B: France and Algerian Independence, 1954 to 1962**

Explain the main reasons why Algeria's struggle for independence proved successful, between 1954 and 1962.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers may explore the role and development of the primary Algerian Nationalist movement, the FLN. Pre-1956, there were few members and the FLN was marginalized with relatively little popular backing. From 1956 it became a much more organised and effective nationalist movement with both a military and political wing. Its membership grew and its tactics, based on provocation through terror, proved highly effective.

FLN tactics forced the French to increase their military presence in Algeria. They also served to increase popular support for the FLN in response to acts of aggression by the French army against the civilian population.

The French army played a neutral role in the move towards independence. The army was ultra right wing and was not willing to contemplate defeat. The recent withdrawals from Indo-China (1954) and Suez (1956) were still painful for the military leaders. Increasingly, the military widened the gap between its own self-interests in Algeria and French politicians seeking a political solution. The army developed a form of state terrorism in response to the FLN. In effect, innocent Algerians were frequently subjected to official attacks and brutality in the name of the French state and such attacks were justified as being necessary to sift out terrorists. In increasingly large numbers, Algerian Muslims turned against the French authorities and became committed nationalists.

Another outcome of FLN tactics was to generate political pressure on the French government through French public opinion. As more young French troops were killed or injured, public opinion increasingly questioned the validity of France's presence in Algeria. Perhaps the most significant factor contributing to decolonisation was the role of de Gaulle.

The Algerian question was damaging the stability of the French state and it was undermining the greater priority identified by de Gaulle regarding France's role in the development of Western Europe. De Gaulle wanted to heighten French influence in Western Europe, particularly after the formation of the EEC in 1957. Algeria was a major distraction to this. De Gaulle was willing to sacrifice French colonisation and take a stand against the colonies in order to achieve the greater good of increased French international influence. A further factor was the lack of political influence that the white settler group in Algeria, the colons, had over French policy. The position of the colons was weakened when they allied with extremist factions within the French army with a view to overthrowing de Gaulle and undermining political stability in France, in order to influence French imperial policy.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924*****A: The accession to power of the Bolsheviks and Lenin's regime**

Explain the main reasons why Lenin decided to introduce the New Economic Policy in 1921.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The answers will need to show an understanding of the NEP introduced by Lenin and the politburo. The better answers may see NEP as a package of reforms rather than one policy. The key features were abolition of grain requisitioning and the introduction of tax for grain collection; allowing some private enterprise and private profit; the restoration of markets and money; government commitment to opening up overseas trade. Although the government relaxed some centralised control, it did not hand over “the commanding heights”, however.

The key reason for the NEP, as with all Lenin's economic decisions 1917-24, was the need to provide food in the face of starvation. Starvation was the product of the failings of War Communism. Productivity in agriculture and industry had slumped, despite the terror used to sustain it. The country suffered from inefficient economic systems and a disastrous 1921 harvest. Even Pravda reported one in five was starving.

Starvation led to discontent from the peasants and the workers. The answers will explore manifestations of this discontent, particularly the Kronstadt Revolt. They are likely to link this to the need to introduce NEP as the event “that lit up reality like a lightning flash” (Lenin). The NEP was proclaimed at the March 1921 10th Party Congress.

Answers may well consider longer term factors, such as the appalling economic inheritance (1917) that meant the Bolsheviks constantly faced hugely difficult circumstances; the end of the disruptive civil war and the effects of the blockade in that war.

Balanced answers are likely to consider the ideological explanation Lenin gave for his reversal of policy in 1921, and compare this with the practical necessity of such a change. Although the NEP was approved unanimously at the party Congress, it did cause bitter debate within the Bolshevik Party. Candidates may conclude that Lenin may well have been a theorist, but was more importantly a political realist. The NEP could be considered an important ideological compromise that was essential to ensure survival.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924*****B: The establishment of the Weimar Republic**

Examine the extent to which defeat in World War 1 explains the political instability in Germany in the years 1918 to 1921.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers would be expected to consider and explain: the inheritance of the German Revolution October/November 1918; the challenges from the left and right wings, especially the Spartacists and Kapp rebellion but also the political assassinations; the destabilising succession of six coalition governments 1919-21 each led by a new Chancellor; the significance of the government's reliance on the Freikorps rather than the police or the army.

Answers will need to consider how far the instability was prompted by the actual military defeat and subsequent peace negotiations (the "stab in the back" myth deliberately manufactured by Ludendorff). This might involve looking at the sense of betrayal, the expectations of US moderation suggested by the tone of the "14 Points", the impact of demobilisation, the treatment of the German delegation and the actual terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The word "defeat" can be interpreted as widely as candidates consider relevant. It is not limited to the military defeat.

Candidates might look more broadly at the circumstances of defeat in Germany after a long war and the breakdown of cross-party support for the war from 1917. There was deliberate misinformation of the population about the war so they were not prepared for defeat; a political vacuum with the collapse of the Kaiser's government, lack of clarity about the role of the Reichstag and the Ebert-Groener Pact; soviets and bread riots as the country starved,

and some may argue that the end of the war turmoil was more a cause of instability than the actual defeat.

The answer needs to balance defeat against the relative importance of other factors that explain the instability. Other factors **might** include influence of Communist revolution in USSR which may be linked to the struggle between government and workers as in the Ruhr 1920; dissatisfaction/unfamiliarity with the new socialist government; the weaknesses in the constitution of the new Weimar Republic, especially the Presidency and Proportional Representation.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924*****C: ‘Mutilated Victory’: Italy and the First World War, 1915-1920**

Examine the extent to which the ‘mutilated victory’ explains the emergence of fascism as a political force in Italy in 1919.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will need to show a clear understanding of the territorial terms of the secret Treaty of London (April 1915) that preceded the Italian declaration of war on Austria (May 1915), and will need to compare those terms with the final Treaty of St. Germain. Many Italians claimed they had been badly treated in the ‘mutilated victory’, and Orlando walked out of the negotiations. The modern view is that they were treated fairly, although they did not get Dalmatia, part of the Italian Irredenta, which was given to the new state of Yugoslavia under the theory of national self-determination. The Fascists could, and did, play on this feeling of national grievance.

Answers would be expected to consider the events in Italia Irredenta linking to the emergence of Fascism. The nationalist poet, D’Annunzio, seized Fiume and held it for a year as it had not been given to Italy in the peace settlement. The seizure is linked to the emergence of Fascism, especially in terms of ideology and symbols. D’Annunzio made heroic speeches, developed recognisable salutes and uniforms, and spoke of “Mare Nostrum”*.

* Mare nostrum = “Our sea”

Other factors linked to the war include Mussolini’s appeal to the war generation. This was particularly effective among the young middle-class volunteers and conscripted junior officers, rather than among the peasant infantrymen. These men were disgusted by the normality and the profiteering on the Home Front and compared it to the “community” of the trenches. Fascism appealed to these young men who believed they had fought in the war to

make Italy “great, free, strong” (Turati). Mussolini claimed he would represent and empower the wartime class (a trenchocracy) whose struggle and sacrifice entitled them to reshape Italy as, in his own words, “anti-Marxist and national socialism”.

Further factors might include other post war political, social and economic crises in Italy, e.g. the weakness of the Liberal government, socialism, peasant unrest, unemployment and economic distress. Italian society had been divided before the War, but by 1919 was much more divided. The Liberal government was under attack for the right and left wings. Socialists (the PSI, the Italian Socialist Party) inspired by the Revolution in Russia organised a wave of strikes for two years, the Biennio Rosso, with factory and land occupations. They also were successful in local elections, and their newspaper “Avanti” was widely read. The threat from the Socialists drove many to back the Fascists. Some candidates may well lay great stress on the apparent threat from the left as a key explanation for the emergence of Fascism as a political force, arguing Fascism grew into a mass movement in the north and centre of Italy where socialism was strongest, riding on middle-class and patriotic fears.

Another relevant line of investigation could be the role of Mussolini himself. Mussolini changed from his earlier Socialist identity to Fascism. He was able to draw support from the elites, especially the petty bourgeoisie, the industrial and agricultural elites, and the King and the Pope. Fascism also had organisation through the Ras.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870-1950*****A: Population change in Britain, 1870-1945**

Explain the extent to which changes in death rates affected population growth between 1870 and 1945.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Improvements in public health meant death rates fell and more people survived childhood and therefore more people lived longer. Changes in public health legislation also helped to reduce death rates and changes in patterns of marriage reduced perinatal death rates. Some responses may follow Rubenstein in drawing attention to the impact of London where death rates remained high until the end of the nineteenth century. The extension of school medical services will be seen as addressing some of the needs of the poorest and therefore to have had a significant impact upon childhood mortality. The wider availability of sulphamide drugs in the 1930s was a key factor in reducing deaths from scarlet fever and other childhood diseases. In this period, candidates may argue that the growing use of contraception was as important as declining death rates. Better answers will attempt to say whether marriage patterns or public health were as or more significant in affecting population change than death rates. The period concerned covers 1870 to 1945 and therefore there should be complete, if uneven, coverage of the whole period amongst the strongest answers.

Candidates **may** refer to the following; the Public Health Act (1875), the Adulteration of Food Act, the provision of School Meals (1906), the creation of pensions and sickness insurance (1909 and 1911), the continuing shortage of sanitary housing hence prevalence of TB and the limited impact of Addison, Chamberlain and Greenwood Acts to rectify this. Candidates may also point to the declining income (in real terms) of middle-class families leading to a growing use of contraception especially where the potential cost of private

education was a factor. This is also true in the case of the upper classes, especially post-1918. Candidates may refer to the work of Marie Stopes, and others, providing publicly available advice on contraception but this should be balanced by its continued association with prostitution especially amongst the working classes and the opposition of various churches. A higher proportion of women married after 1918 but marriages eventuated in fewer children than pre-1914 and more of the children survived.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870-1950*****B: The Cotton Industry in Britain, 1870-1950**

How important was foreign competition as a reason for the decline of the cotton industry in the years 1870 to 1950?

(Reference to the periods 1914-18 and 1939-45 is **not** expected.)

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates are likely to argue that foreign competition was important because:

- the introduction of the Toyoda automatic loom by Japanese manufacturers in 1924. The impact of Japanese competition may be quantified by estimates of approximately two-thirds of lost British sales going to Japanese manufacturers.
- detail may be provided on the rate at which the £ returned to the Gold Standard in 1925 (most commentators agree it was overvalued by 10%).
- general descriptions of the loss of markets such as India due to World War One may also appear with reference to the increase in duty on imported British cotton during WW1 which helped the Government of India to raise the money necessary to fund military expenditure.
- renewed competition emerging by 1950 from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong.
- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany had introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914.
- Protective tariffs operated by the USA.

Counter arguments against foreign competition's importance may include:

- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton.
- the refusal of the weavers to adopt the “more looms” system in 1931.
- the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936.
- Oldham was a centre of industrial militancy pre-1914 but the first general cotton strikes came in the 1920s.
- the growth of alternative fabrics such as Rayon in the 1930s.
- Britain's return to the Gold Standard, 1925-31.
- The lack of innovation in British output so changing consumer trends were not catered for.
- Britain was a low-wage, high output economy – Woodward is one historian who points to the bitter irony that cotton workers could only afford the very same foreign imports that were putting them out of jobs.
- The decisions made by mill owners to maintain dividends (and therefore their own incomes) instead of increasing investments in new technology by restricting dividends.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919-1941*****A: America, 1919-1929**

How important was anti-communism in the development of the 'Red Scare' of 1919-1920?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Anti communism was arguably the most important factor due to the impact of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia. However, there were other contributable factors to the Red Scare such as the legacy of World War I, the career ambitions of A Mitchell Palmer and the impact of increasing immigration.

Candidates should explain 'the Red Scare' i.e. fear of communism undermining American democracy. Candidates may include the wartime spirit of Americanism that was left over from World War One. Hatred of Bolshevik and any form of communism. The strikes of 1919, e.g. in Seattle which led people to think that the USA was on the brink of anarchy. Mail bombs were sent out in April 1919 damaging homes which all led to a fear of imminent revolution. The public were scared by these events. Politicians added to the mounting frenzy by refusing to sit with a socialist in the House of Representatives, Victor Berger of Milwaukee. The justice department under Edgar J Hoover started up a Centre for Subversives, a division of the FBI. These incidents contributed to a climate of fear. Hundreds of aliens and communists/Russians were arrested and deported (red raids). Many were innocent. These incidents all led to the development and continuance of the 'Red Scare'.

One of the most important factors was the behaviour of A Mitchell Palmer who predicted a revolution that never materialised. His political ambitions led to red raids. He thought by

endorsing the red scare he would be seen as a patriotic leader. There was a bomb in September 1920 but by this time people realised it was an isolated incident and not part of a vast conspiracy to overthrow the government of the USA. Also the spirit of normalcy was beginning to take shape. This was the return to Republican values of business and commerce. This led to the reduction in 'red scare' incidents.

The rise of immigrants from Eastern Europe and the Bolshevik revolution created a climate of fear. They spoke different languages, had different religions and values. Nativists were worried that they would undermine WASP culture.

Therefore anti communism was a catalyst, which fed on the fears that there were too many immigrants from Eastern Europe entering the country. This eventually led to the immigration law of 1924, which favoured Western Europeans.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919-1941*****B: The New Deal, 1933-1941**

With what success did the New Deal tackle the problem of unemployment?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates will need to cover a range of policies and acts across the New Deal i.e. the first and second New Deals. The government favoured work relief not the dole. Lots of different measures and schemes were set up but with variable success; some were only short-term stopgap ones anyway. However, until the economy as a whole recovered and consumers started to spend unemployment was always an issue that both state and federal governments found very difficult to solve. Even tax cuts did not stimulate enough spending so the demand for products and services just did not grow sufficiently to put people back to work.

NIRA – National Industrial Recovery Act, which provided for a system of industrial self-regulation under federal supervision and for a \$3.3 billion public works programme.

CCC – Civilian Conservation Corps designed to give work relief to young men, 18-25.

CWA – Civil Works Administration provided jobs and wages for those able to work. It spent \$900 million – some on useful projects such as highway repairs but some was on ‘make work’. It helped people over the winter of 1933-34.

FERA – Federal Emergency Relief Administration provided grants to develop work programs for education, student aid, rural rehabilitation, and transient relief.

NRA – National Recovery Administration was to limit the workweek to 30 hours to help unemployment, which was still a major problem. It was eventually deemed a failure because it was complicated with various codes but it did set new standards in collective bargaining, forty-hour week and child labour.

The Second New Deal tried to deal with problems left over from the first. Roosevelt introduced the Social Security Act in 1935. This was to provide unemployment relief

amongst other things. The principle was that unemployables would remain a state responsibility while the national government would provide work relief for the able bodied.

WPA – Works Progress Administration was to provide this work relief.

There were also various measures to deal with farming to try to stop unemployment such as the AAA.

There was a recession in 1937 that was caused by cutbacks in federal spending and so once more unemployment rose. Therefore unemployment was not permanently solved. It was too dependent on government spending at this point in time and not on private enterprise.

The New Deal failed in its fundamental purpose to put people back to work. As late as 1939 over 10 million men and women were jobless i.e. 19%. In 1941 as a result of mobilisation for war, unemployment dropped to 10% because of massive government spending.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066-1087***A: The Introduction of Norman Military Feudalism, 1066-1087**

Was the need for an army the most important reason why William introduced a system of military feudalism into England? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should focus on the importance of William's military needs but there are other aspects to consider. These include the need to exercise royal patronage and the use of the system as a method of control and government.

At the highest levels answers should will show understanding of the interaction of the various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned well-supported conclusion. They should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples and would be expected to refer to chronicles where necessary.

- **Military factors**

The nature of the conquest meant that William needed an army, but could not afford to finance and supply a purely royal force that was large enough (estimates range from 4000-6000 men) for his needs. Military quotas based on the land holding patterns of his tenants in chief (both ecclesiastical and lay) were at the heart of the system. The quotas appear to be arbitrary at this stage.

The apparent timing of its introduction suggests that the need became paramount as threats of rebellion and foreign invasion grew. Orderic Vitalis notes the change within the first phase of conquest from Hastings to c1071. At first William was prepared to use influential Englishmen but after the fall of Edwin and Morcar, more land was distributed to provide military protection, particularly in the north.

The system incorporated castles held by appointed castellans and these were used as a method of extending the conquest, both through pacification and colonisation (Holderness, the Penine crossings, North Wales), as defence against negative rebellion (York, Durham) and to guard against invasion (Sussex rapes).

- Other factors

Land was given in return for service and this was the reward he had promised his followers. The main beneficiaries were the leading Norman families who had supported William in 1066 with military resources and more importantly in some ways, ships. These included Odo, Robert of Mortain (his half brothers) fitzOsbern, fitzGilbert – a small group of less than 50 men held 37% of England. This was an important aspect of the granting of royal patronage in return for much-needed support both before and after the conquest.

The system also acted as a form of government and was familiar to William from Normandy. It brought in revenue in the form of incidents (wardship, relief) and Aids. Scutage was later to be an important aspect. In addition, the feudal courts of manor and honour were important to allow the system to function and the control of his great vassals was an important aspect of ducal and royal power – attendance at the Curia Regis underlined this.

Overall, it set up a structured society that served royal interests – the Domesday Book underlines the importance of both the military and financial functions, and the Oath of Salisbury when all important rear vassals did homage to the king (1086) demonstrates its use as a method of ensuring control. Military feudalism as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (1086) notes increased the power of the monarchy; every vassal was a link in the chain that led to the king.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066-1087***B: Developments in Monasticism, 1066-1135**

Examine the extent to which the introduction of new Orders brought about a period of monastic revival in England between 1066 and 1135.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates would need some familiarity with the nature of English monasticism before the conquest but it is not envisaged that real depth of knowledge would be required pre-1066. Answers should consider the nature of the change as well as the agents of that change and place England within the context of the wider European reform movement. At the highest levels, answers should show understanding of the interaction of various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned, well-balanced conclusion. The range of relevant factors will include the effects of Normanisation, of increased patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries as well as the effects of the new Orders. A range of well-chosen factual examples should support answers.

During this period the number of religious houses increased significantly (houses from 60 to c250-300).

- Anglo Saxon monasteries had been independent and followed their own customs though they still subscribed to the Rule of St. Benedict and were subject to outside reforming movements. From 1066-1135 monasteries were organised into Orders which took direction from the Mother house and followed a common Rule in every detail. They were not isolated from religious trends in western Christendom, followed ideas relating to ecclesiastical reform, were responsible for developments in historical writing, hagiography and architecture, and brought about a degree of social and economic change, particularly in the north.

- The forerunner was Cluny (Lewes 1077) and by 1135 there were 24 dependencies. The first generation of incomers gave grants of land to Norman houses rather than English ones and independent Benedictine houses were established after the conquest (Battle, Chester, Shrewsbury, Colchester). The second generation saw themselves more in the light of Anglo-Normans and the impact of Cluny was felt more forcefully. The major period of expansion was 1079-1100 (Much Wenlock, Bermondsey, Daventry, Pontefract, Northampton). These had no real 'English' dimension and were a form familiar to Normans – loosely organised and playing no part in public life, though supporting, for the most part, close co-operation between Church and monarchy. The conqueror's daughter, Adela of Blois became a Cluniac nun in widowhood, persuaded Henry I to found Reading and had her son Henry future bishop of Winchester, enter the Order. Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny visited Peterborough with a view to bringing it under his rule. This was not enthusiastically accepted by the monks there who saw his reforming severity as religious persecution.
- By 1153 there were 50 Cistercian houses in England. These were the aristocracy; their leaders came from noble families and their patrons were magnates. Although monastic virtues may have been attractive only to the nobility (the peasants already lived in poverty and owed obedience to their lords) the Cistercians did recruit 'conversi' – lay brothers – whose labour on the 'desert sites' they favoured increased agricultural prosperity in the north and later in Wales.
- There were 60 houses of Augustinian canons by the reign of Henry I. Around 1095 the influence of Gregorian reform had led to the creation of St. Botolph's at Colchester and this order of canons was to benefit from the patronage of Henry I and particularly his queen, Matilda. They fulfilled parochial functions and pastoral work in a wider context than the monasteries (St. Bartholomew's – care of the sick). Instead of withdrawing to huge estates like Rievaulx, they brought religious life to the laity.
- There were changes in the design and layout of monastic churches. Originally, according to the Regularis Concordia the three distinct areas of the church had equal architectural and religious status. This can be seen at Winchester, which retained its dedication to the native Swithun and continued the Anglo-Saxon liturgical calendar and the English custom of the west end being the place of the king's crown wearing. After 1070 monastic churches followed the Decreta of Lanfranc, where the design concentrated worship in the east end, the choir and the transept (Christ Church Canterbury, Rochester, Evesham, St. Albans, Durham). The Cluniacs contributed lavish design and an Anglo-Norman style had developed by the 12th century with rounded arches showing incised patterns.
- In the first generation after the conquest, there was spoilation of English houses, removal of native ecclesiastical leaders, a tightening of discipline with Lanfranc's reforms and the introduction of some new liturgical practices. This led to some radical tension and culture clash but was gradually replaced by the benefits of being brought into the mainstream of European monasticism. English elements were still retained.
- This was not all one way and there was cultural interchange on an increased scale. The effect of an Italian archbishop from Normandy, Norman abbots on the wake of the conquest and the impact of Bernard Clairvaux can be balanced against the role of Englishman Stephen Harding in the constitution of Clairvaux – the Carta Caritatis and Bernard's secretary William returning to plant Cistercian monasticism in the north. The

religious vocation was no longer limited to a choice between the solitary existence of a hermit and the somewhat aristocratic ambience of a Benedictine monastery. Now also, there was a much wider range of ideals and practices fusing the eremitical spirit of primitive monasticism with the concept of a community.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483-c1529***A: Pretenders and Protest in the Reign of Henry VII**

How important was foreign support in enabling Simnel and Warbeck to challenge Henry VII's throne?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will be expected to evaluate the importance, or otherwise, of foreign support in enabling Simnel and Warbeck to challenge Henry VII's throne. Many answers may suggest that neither pretender would have been much of a threat without the support of foreign rulers who wished to exploit Henry VII's insecurity. Other answers may assess a range of other factors as being more significant – such as the inherent weakness of Henry's position as a usurper.

Key events and developments might include the role of Margaret of Burgundy in the careers of both Simnel and Warbeck and their respective bids for Henry VII's throne. Margaret, as the sister of both Edward IV and Richard II, resented the usurpation of Henry Tudor in 1485 and was prepared to back attempts to remove him as king. Simnel's career flourished partly because of Margaret's support; and also of that of Maximilian who recognised the pretender and provided him with 2,000 German mercenaries to help in his invasion of England.

Also, the support of the Irish nobility, and the Earl of Kildare in particular, could be seen as vital to the pretender's invasion of England in 1487. This was in spite of the fact that the real Earl of Warwick (whom Simnel claimed to be) was in Henry's custody in the Tower and was paraded in public to prove the pretender's claim to the throne was false. In the event Simnel and his supporters went down to defeat at Stoke in 1487.

The imposture of Warbeck as Richard, Duke of York, one of the princes in the Tower between 1491 and 1499, also owed much to foreign support.

Margaret of Burgundy recognised Warbeck as her nephew and Charles VIII, King of France, supported the pretender's claim, especially as Henry VII's intervention in Brittany had annoyed him.

Much of Henry's foreign policy between 1491 and 1499 was concerned to divert the threat represented by Warbeck. This could be used to demonstrate the importance of foreign support for the pretenders. For example:

- The Treaty of Etaples (1492) cut off French support for Warbeck but the pretender moved to Flanders where he was welcomed by Margaret. This so worried Henry that a trade ban was placed on Flanders even though it threatened England's vital cloth trade (1493). This ban lasted until 1496.
- In 1494 the Holy Roman Emperor, Maximilian, recognised Warbeck as King Richard IV of England and promised him help in recovering his crown. But the emperor lacked the money to fit out an effective invasion force and Charles VIII's decision to invade Italy in 1494 took some pressure off Henry VII.
- In 1495 Warbeck attempted to invade England (at Deal in Kent) but he was repulsed and sailed on with his small force to Ireland where he unsuccessfully besieged Waterford and then sailed to Scotland.
- The pro-French James IV was happy to welcome the pretender and married him to his cousin Katherine Gordon. In 1496 a Scottish force raided northern England but no support there was forthcoming for Warbeck.
- By 1497 James IV had lost interest in the pretender and Warbeck decided to try his luck in Ireland in July but it remained loyal to Henry VII.
Warbeck then tried to exploit the Cornish rebellion, landing in the West Country and besieging Exeter, but failed and soon afterwards surrendered to Henry's mercy. After a later attempt to escape from Henry's court, Warbeck was placed in the Tower and later hanged in 1499 after being accused with the Earl of Warwick of plotting against Henry VII.
- Much Spanish pressure was brought to bear on Henry VII to ensure that Warbeck was disposed of so that the proposed marriage of Catherine of Aragon to Henry's heir Arthur would be secure.

Answers should not be expected to be comprehensive; a narrower range of examples, analysed with depth and purpose, would merit more reward than an exhaustive list. The key requirement is an argued assessment of the key issue "importance", supported by precisely selected material.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483-c1529*****B: The Career of Thomas Wolsey**

Examine the extent to which Wolsey's domestic reforms increased the power of the Crown.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should focus clearly on the extent to which Wolsey's domestic reforms in fact extended the power of the Crown, directly and deliberately or "by accident".

In order to assess Wolsey's success in extending the power of the Crown some attention would need to be given to those constraints under which he operated and which often acted as obstacles in his way, such as opposition from political opponents, the need to retain Henry VIII's support and also the demands of running the day-to-day foreign policy of the country. These pressures resulted in the Eltham Ordinances of 1519 and 1526 for the reform of the royal court, whereby Wolsey tried to diminish the power and influence of political rivals rather than with any intention of extending the Crown's powers.

Key events and developments could include:-

- Legal reforms – in 1516 Wolsey put forward a plan to ensure that the legal system worked more efficiently, as well as providing justice on behalf of the Crown that was both fair and cheap. In future the Star Chamber was to combine the power of both the council and other statutory bodies and tribunals from the reign of Henry VII. After 1516 its caseload rose considerably. Also, in future Star Chamber was used to deal with the abuses of the powerful and thus to strengthen crown power. After 1519 overflow courts had to be established such as the forerunner of the court of Requests. These courts were effective in providing justice and thus the role of the crown's in settling its subjects' grievances.

- **Economic reforms:-**
Wolsey was concerned to tackle what was seen as the evil of enclosures. He insisted that the laws of 1489 and 1515 against engrossing and enclosing should be obeyed. In 1517 he launched the enclosure commission to look into the extent of enclosure and those who had been affected by it. As a result, cases were launched against 260 landlords and corporations. This further enraged the propertied classes against Wolsey and this surfaced in the Parliament of 1523 when the Cardinal agreed to abandon his enclosure policy in return for a large subsidy to pay for the war against France. Also Wolsey attracted the resentment of traders who were accused of charging excessive prices such as the London butchers and grain dealers.
- **Financial reforms:-**
In the area of tax reform Wolsey has been credited as the inventor of the parliamentary subsidy based on the accurate valuations of taxpayers' wealth. It was used in 1513-15 and again in 1523 to pay for the war against France. However, in raising money to pay for the wars Wolsey made himself increasingly unpopular. In 1523 he demanded £800,000 in extra taxes from parliament on top of the loans he had already extracted from the propertied classes.
- **Parliament:-**
In 1525 Wolsey tried to raise extra parliamentary taxation with the so-called Amicable Grant that failed. It led to near rebellion, especially in London and East Anglia, and Wolsey had to back down. By 1525 the propertied classes were tired of taxation and Wolsey and his master had to back off. Many will argue that this was an area of activity where Wolsey failed to increase the financial power of the crown.
- **Dealing with the regions:-**
Another area where Wolsey tried with some success to extend the power of the crown was in the royal control of the more outlying regions of the kingdom while at the same time extending conciliar jurisdiction. In 1525 a Council in the Marches of Wales was established under the nominal authority of the Princess Mary and in the same year a new Council of the North was established under Henry's illegitimate son, the Duke of Richmond.
- **Ecclesiastical reforms:-** in 1519 Wolsey announced plans to reform the clergy. Also the Cardinal was well aware of the New Learning and of its impact. Also by 1518 Wolsey was in charge of the church when he made papal legate, an office in which he was confirmed for life in 1524. In practice little was done either to reform the regular or the secular clergy. Wolsey proposed 13 new bishoprics but this came to nothing. However, the dissolution of some 30 religious houses to pay for Wolsey's colleges at Ipswich and Oxford provided a precedent for Cromwell to use later in the dissolution of the monasteries. Wolsey himself derived a massive income through the church from his office as legate and also his holding of multiple benefices such as the archbishopric of York and the abbacy of St. Albans, England's richest monastery. In the eyes of many Wolsey did not enhance his status as an ecclesiastical reformer. In terms of the church Wolsey did not wish to extend the power of the crown but he provided precedents for Henry and Cromwell in the 1530s.

As usual, we should not expect answers to be comprehensive, or to provide even coverage of a range of factors. The key requirement is an argued assessment of the extent to which

Wolsey's policies increased the power of the Crown, supported by selected specific evidence. One of the features of high-quality answers will be the ability to differentiate between factors of more or greater significance.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603-c1640*****A: The Nature of Puritanism and its Threat to the Crown, 1603-1625**

With what success did James I make Puritans conform during his reign?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates are likely to argue that, for the most part, James was successful in making Puritans ‘conform’ during his reign. Despite concerns, especially post 1618, there was no Puritan rebellion. However, good candidates should question the level of ‘success’, ‘conformity’ and the extent of compulsion (‘make’) compared to other methods.

In most essays there is likely to be a discussion based on the central ‘Puritan events’ of James’ reign, such as the Millenary Petition (1603), Hampton Court Conference (1604), Bancroft’s Canons (1604), the role of Abbot (1611 onwards), the Book of Sports (1618), the Synod of Dort (1619), the consequences of the Thirty Years War in the 1621 and 1624 Parliaments and, in a wider sense, through the Direction to Preachers (1622). The better candidates will use these ‘events’ as illustrative material in relation to the specific ideas of the question and the problems created by the nature of Puritanism. Good candidates will attempt some formulation of what Puritanism was, but in doing so will make a distinction about the theoretical threat posed by its very nature and the essentially inherent conservatism of English Puritanism. Candidates also need to consider James’ success in dealing with the Puritans through enforced conformity or other methods.

The Millenary Petition indicated the potential threat of Puritanism as well as illustrating the puritans’ conservative political nature, and desire to work through James as Supreme Governor to bring about a further reformation. His response to it was shaped by his Scottish presbyterian background and his need to stress authority but, as the Hampton Court Conference was to indicate, he had some sympathy with Puritan ideas. The Conference, and

the resulting Canons, could be used to show that James was willing to make the distinction between the majority of essentially ‘politically’ moderate Puritans, whom he was willing to accept surface conformity from, and the more radical, who were a minority and who would be ‘harried from the land’. Some candidates might refer to James’ staging of the ‘no bishop, no king’ incident at the Hampton Court Conference and the importance of Canon 36, which reinforced the Thirty-Nine Articles and was designed to isolate the radical Puritans. The fact that only about 1% of ministers were in reality ‘silenced’ by Bancroft’s Canons does indicate again that most Puritans wanted to conform, at least outwardly, but also that James and the church authorities allowed them the scope to do so, rather than pushing them into opposition and more radical positions. Better candidates may however suggest that many Puritans solved James’ problem for him by isolating themselves in Holland or America after the imposition of the Canons. After the ‘Jacobean anomaly’ (Tyacke), Bancroft, James had drawn his line, and the greater leniency of Abbot reinforced the scope for most Puritans to remain within an essentially Calvinist State Church. Finally, in the period 1611-18, James’ manipulation of the ‘political discourse’ open to Puritans through the publication of the Authorised Bible may be used.

Some candidates may also make a distinction between the Puritan response post 1618, compared with their attitude before, because of James’ peaceful foreign policy and pursuit of the Spanish Match. His support for the Book of Sports, and apparent shift to Arminianism, despite what his delegates had stated at Dort, made Puritanism more of a broad political protest movement. Their concerns were echoed by jingositic MPs in the 1621 and 1624 Parliaments. Even Abbot saw the Thirty Years War as the battle of Armageddon. Reference to the use of the 1622 Direction to Preachers could illustrate the compulsion James used, as well as indicating the increased pressure he was under. Candidates may also consider how James remained in control, looking at the remaining distinctions between most of the population and Puritans, and the fact that there was no Puritan rising during his reign.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603-c1640*****B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603-1641**

How important were the personalities of the two monarchs in explaining the changing relationship between the Stuart monarchs and Scotland in the period 1603-1640?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Exhaustive coverage of the period 1603-40 is clearly not expected. Good answers will compare the roles of the two monarchs, James and Charles, looking at James' comparative success as against the rebellion that Charles faced in the period 1637-40. They should select evidence from the given period in support of their argument.

Good candidates are likely to adopt a thematic approach comparing the policies of James and Charles on, for example, objectives, the use of the Privy Council, communication and their understanding of Scotland. James was more attuned to Scotland, although some may argue that even he was losing touch post 1618 or that absentee kingship within a multiple-kingdom context that was structurally flawed.

Answers will need to compare religious policies. This illustrated the differences in the personalities of the two monarchs as well as being indicative of their different aims and approaches to their Scottish kingdom. Candidates may consider James' gradual aim to make the English and Scottish churches 'congruent' and comment on his policies towards episcopacy, his position as Supreme Governor and the Five Articles. In comparison Charles' attempt to impose Laudianism led to rebellion and candidates may comment on what it was about this policy that provoked such a response.

Better candidates may comment on religious policy as the key reflection of the monarchs' wider approach to ruling, perception of their prerogative and character. James, as an essentially pragmatic and skilled political operator, recognised that a gradual policy in bringing his kingdoms in alignment was necessary. He also understood that communication, compromise and consensus was the key to ruling within the ambiguities inherent in a multiple kingdom context with an unwritten constitution. Charles' stress on his prerogative and his strength of belief in Laudianism were a reflection of the flaws in his insecure character. He tried to impose his will on his three kingdoms, from his ordered London court outwards, without effective communication or willingness to compromise. In this way he changed the relationship between the Stuart monarchy and Scotland more fundamentally than anything James did. In so doing Charles also provoked a changed relationship with his other two kingdoms post 1640.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714-1802*****A: The Nature, Extent and Threat of Jacobitism, 1714-1746**

Examine the extent to which weak leadership was the main reason for the failure of the Jacobite Rebellions of both 1715 and 1745.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates are expected to examine the weaknesses of Jacobite leadership during both rebellions, and then to contrast these with other factors contributing to the defeat of the Jacobite cause. In 1715, the Earl of Mar's forces outnumbered government troops in Scotland, but he was unable to take advantage of this, largely because of his indecisiveness after the inconclusive battle of Sherrifmuir. Other Jacobite commanders, such as Forster and Derwentwater, can be similarly criticised.

In 1745, the Young Pretender can be criticised on various fronts. Arguably he failed to make adequate efforts to ensure French support, or support from English Jacobites. He demonstrated indecisive leadership, most notably with the decision to withdraw after reaching Derby. During his advance he failed to win the support of the English propertied classes, and during his retreat failed to maintain necessary discipline amongst his own men. On the other hand, his personality won substantial support within Scotland, he did maintain good discipline during the advance into England, and had made some attempts to win English support.

In contrast to these leadership weaknesses, candidates should refer to other factors. In 1715, the cause was damaged by the lack of the promised French support, the lack of substantial support outside Scotland and parts of Northern England, and the strong links forged between the Whig government and the Hanoverian regime. In 1745, the British army was much superior, and French support was once again unforthcoming (though bad weather had

interfered with plans for a landing in the spring of 1744). The Old Pretender had become a remote figure in Rome, whilst George II firmly resisted any suggestions that he should flee to Hanover.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714-1802***B: The British in India, c1757-c1802**

Was military superiority the main reason for the expansion of British influence in India in the period c1757 to c1785? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates should focus their attention on the military aspects of the expansion of British influence, notably through the activities of Clive and Hastings, and the opportunities presented by the outbreak of the Seven Years' War. They should then balance this with reference to other factors, which are likely to include:

- the importance of trade and the developing role of the East India Company
- the opportunities supplied by the petty rivalries between, and ambitions, of native Indian princes, rivalries which were to be exploited by EIC officials such as Clive
- the role of British governments of this period in supporting and confirming initiatives made by the EIC and its officials.

Candidates may well approach the question through examination of the relevant steps taken by Clive and Hastings. Clive combined military ability with diplomatic skill to ensure British control of Bengal by the end of the Seven Years' War. On subsequent visits to India Clive was to further expand British influence, notably securing control of Bengali finances for the East India Company. Widely criticised for concentrating on his personal wealth, and certainly neglecting the interests of the natives, there were many issues unresolved on his departure.

Hastings was more interested in restoring stability in Bengal through administrative and financial reform than in expanding British power and influence, though the latter undoubtedly

occurred. The Regulating Act of 1772 enhanced Hastings' status as Governor-General of Bengal, but limited his independence of British government control. In the Mahratta Wars of 1777-82, Hastings asserted British rights against possible French Expansion, but was less successful in dealing with the invasion of the Carnatic 1780-83, and was involved in a financial scandal with the Begums of Oudh (1782).

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815-1841*****A: Government Response to Poverty**

How effective was the Poor Law Amendment Act in meeting the needs of the poor, in the years 1834 to 1841?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will be expected to focus on the terms and implementation of the Poor Law Amendment Act to 1841 and should examine the extent to which the operation of the Act fulfilled the “needs of the poor”. Candidates will need to identify what they understand the “needs of the poor” in these years to have been. They should appreciate that the term “poor” covered a wide range of different groups, but that most of the working (or labouring) classes lived in constant fear of poverty and their need was for action that would lessen this threat and alleviate suffering if poverty struck. Since the Act was never intended to address the reasons for poverty, that need was clearly not met. It is the way in which the Act changed the means of dealing with pauperism that must be examined.

Be wary of candidates who offer a general appraisal of the Act, with no specific focus on “meeting the needs of the poor”. Most candidates will probably argue that the Act failed to meet the needs of the poor, and some may point out that its intentions were more to do with meeting the needs of the ratepayers or middle classes. However, an effective answer must address the main issue of the question.

Relevant material on the effectiveness of the Act in meeting the needs of the poor might include:

- the State did not abandon its traditional acceptance of responsibility towards the poor and the Act established a clear and uniform system of relief for the destitute;

- the Act offered a refuge for the elderly, widows and orphans;
- the implementation of the Act was kinder than its terms, allowing for the continuation of a good deal of outdoor relief, particularly in the north where there was often short-term unemployment in trade depressions;
- the Commissioners argued that the Act was not intended to introduce a system of deliberate “cruelty” in the workhouses, but that the new regulated system protected paupers against some of the abuses of the Old Poor Law, e.g. paupers received adequate food, and specified and acceptable rules and punishments. (There is some support for this claim among modern historians.)

More dubious claims that might be considered are that:

- the Act discouraged the poor from having more children and so was beneficial to the health of poor women;
- the Act discouraged idleness and encouraged the poor to rely on self-help, helping them to meet their own needs.

These points are far from convincing, but candidates might argue that, in these respects, the Act met the needs of the poor “as defined by the middle class”, who saw a link between poverty and morality and believed laziness to be the cause of most of the poverty they saw around them.

Relevant material on the ineffectiveness of the Act in meeting the needs of the poor might include:

- by adding an additional stigma to the means by which the poor could gain relief, it made life even harder for those living on the edge of the poverty line, who would sometimes starve rather than enter a workhouse;
- the Act itself made no allowances for short-term poverty, which was increasingly problematic in industrial areas;
- the terms of the Act splitting couples and families and enforcing petty rules, and that regulations were resented and paupers were treated as though poverty was a crime for which they were being punished;
- some workhouses were inhumane places (although it may be the case that the worst received the most publicity) and even if there was no physical cruelty, there might be psychological damage, denying dignity and individuality;
- once a pauper entered a workhouse, it was hard for him to get out again;
- because different areas had varying levels of poverty and wealth, the poor were not catered for uniformly, or effectively, as the Act envisaged;
- the traditional distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor was blurred and hard working people were thrown together with some of the lowest members of society in the workhouses.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815-1841*****B: Religion and Politics in England and Ireland c1820-c1841**

With what success did governments address Roman Catholic grievances in England and Ireland in the period c1820-c1841?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The government addressed grievances in the 1829 Catholic Emancipation Act. This meant:

- the removal of civil disabilities.
- Catholics permitted to sit in Parliament.
- note that even before 1820, Roman Catholics already enjoyed most civil rights such as the right to own property and practise their own religion.
- the middle class Irish Catholics had access to Westminster after 1829.
- it was possible to establish Catholic schools such as Downside.

Those arguing that grievances were not met are likely to draw upon this body of evidence:

- the refusal of government to address the issue of Catholic Emancipation before 1829 even when Canning wanted to do so, and the defeat of the emancipation bill in the Lords in 1821.
- the continued restrictions on Catholics from holding specified offices, e.g. Prime Minister given its role in ecclesiastical patronage, even after 1829.
- the Church of Ireland still retained its status as the established church and therefore it was still entitled to receive tithes from Catholics.
- the continued ban on Jesuits.
- whilst Catholics were allowed to worship in their own churches, they were not allowed to conduct processions or other religious ceremonies in public.

- most Catholic churches were built on the edge of towns due to the hostility of the established Church.
- the Test Acts still prevented Catholics from being admitted to Oxford or Cambridge.
- the Irish Land Question remained unresolved.
- the Pope was not allowed to appoint Bishops in England.
- Popular anti-Catholicism remained a potent force as Russell's agitation against the "papal aggression" of 1852-1852 showed.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895-1921*****A: The Nature and Impact of New Liberalism, 1906-1915**

How important were the contributions of David Lloyd George and Winston Churchill to welfare reform in the years 1906 to 1915?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should focus on the contributions of both Lloyd George and Churchill and their importance in the work of the Liberal governments from 1906 to 1915. Initially the Liberal government of Campbell-Bannerman had no overall programme of reform and the early welfare legislation, such as the Merchant Shipping Act and Workmen's Compensation Act continued late nineteenth century trends. However, the government responded (as the Conservatives had not done) to the concerns about the health, diet and to some extent living conditions of the nation and particularly those of the working classes (e.g. condition of recruits in the Boer War, 1904 government enquiry on *Physical Deterioration*). Reform was aimed mainly then at the young with the 'Children's Charter', and the introduction of school meals and medical inspection. In some ways these were reactive measures, but supported by the ideology of New Liberalism (breaking away from Gladstonian Liberalism) in accepting an increased role for the state in dealing with social deprivation. Two prominent Liberals supporting such measures to alleviate poverty were the relatively young M.P.s Lloyd George and Churchill. Their opportunity came under Asquith with Lloyd George at the Treasury and Churchill at the Board of Trade. Between them they were the driving forces for introducing the most significant of the Liberal welfare reforms. Lloyd George was responsible for the most important of all, Old Age Pensions and National Insurance, but provisions of his 'People's Budget' were also relevant, not least in the objective to raise revenue to support the non-contributory pension scheme. (National Insurance had employer and employee contributions as well as those from the state.) Churchill was responsible for limiting the

hours of miners in 1908, the first time a government had legislated in this respect for men (as opposed to women and children). He adopted a similar approach to shop assistants (mainly through half-day closing). Perhaps more importantly for welfare he introduced the Trade Boards to determine minimum wages in the sweated workshops, and the Labour Exchanges. Churchill's role in promoting welfare reform essentially came to an end when he went to the Admiralty, though Lloyd George's influence lasted through to the First World War. However, further welfare provisions (e.g. improved health and maternity care), which were enacted partly under the auspices of DORA came largely after 1915. Better answers may question the extent of reform, e.g. conditions for receipt of a pension limiting the number eligible, National Insurance payments beginning only in 1913, housing largely ignored, the Poor Law retained. However, social service spending doubled over the period. Undoubtedly Lloyd George and Churchill were the main instigators of important and original (for Britain) welfare measures in the central crucial period of 1908-11.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895-1921*****B: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland c1895-1921**

Explain the most important reasons why the Ulster Unionists were able to prevent the Third Irish Home Rule Bill from becoming law between 1912 and 1914.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Any background introductory material on the religious, political (and economic) divisions in Ireland, and the failure of the First and Second Home Rule Bills, should be brief. Of greater relevance before 1912 was the outcome of the 1910 Elections which meant that the Liberal government was dependent on Irish Nationalist support for a Commons majority over the Conservative/Unionist Opposition. The price extracted by Redmond was a Home Rule Bill, once the powers of the Lords had been reduced to delaying relevant legislation under the 1911 Parliament Act. Faced with the prospect of Home Rule for the whole of Ireland, the majority of Protestants, notably in Ulster, became determined to resist, and by force if necessary. The focus of answers should therefore be an explanation of the most important reasons for Ulster Unionist resistance which can include the sense of unionism which had intensified since the late nineteenth century to maintain the union with Britain, loyalty to the monarchy and British institutions; and especially perceived threats to political and especially religious freedoms under Catholic hegemony ('Rome Rule'), loss of Protestant supremacy in Ireland, and threats to the economic and land ownership status quo. Focus also should be on the most important ways in which Home Rule was resisted, which can include the leadership of Carson and Craig, emergence of stronger opposition in Ulster itself as the Home Rule Bill progressed under the new constitutional arrangements during 1912-14, the Solemn League and Covenant, formation and arming of the Ulster Volunteers, support from Bonar Law and the Conservative Opposition in the Commons as well as the Lords, failure of Asquith's 'Six Years Exclusion' proposal (and other attempts at compromise), the Curragh Mutiny and the

Larne gun running. In reply the formation of the Irish volunteers and their arming made the prospect of civil war in Ireland very likely in autumn 1914 with the Home Rule Bill about to become law. The situation had come about principally because of the Unionists' refusal to contemplate Home Rule of any kind. In the end in 1914, it was not ultimately Unionist opposition which prevented implementation of Home Rule, but postponement due to the outbreak of the First World War.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750-1830*****A: Britain's Economy in 1750**

Examine the view that Britain, in 1750, had much potential for wealth creation but lacked the infrastructure to develop it.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

This question focuses on two of the key elements outlined in the specification 'potential for wealth creation' and the 'infrastructure existing in 1750'. It would be expected that candidates would look at both potential in agriculture and manufacture and consider the limitations of, for example, the transport network and banking system. The overall conclusion is likely to be that despite the limitations of the latter in 1750 the potential for wealth creation meant that the infrastructure could be developed.

The potential for wealth creation was great in 1750. This can be demonstrated both by the investment which was occurring in agricultural improvements and in industry. Major landowners, and those who wished to acquire status were investing in land, through purchase, engrossment and improvement. This can be seen clearly in new methods, not only in crop rotation but also in improvements in land through drainage and the use of a variety of fertilisers. Large landholdings enabled more profit related enterprise. Tenants faced higher rents to encourage innovation. Crop yields and output – weight of animals grew. Much of the output of proto-industry, tin toys, small arms, hosiery and cloth was destined for the export market where foreign currency could be earned. Where such goods were sold on the regional market they were also sold at a higher value. The producers who benefited from increased production were able to create further wealth by their investment in great houses and the purchase of luxury goods. The growth of the urban middle classes is also evidence of this. However, it should be remembered that England had a considerable minority of its population who consumed more than they produced. Gregory King placed the number who

detracted from the wealth of the population at about 33% in his survey in 1688. The poor consumed a considerable amount of the wealth of the country through the redistributive affect of the Poor Law.

The infrastructure in terms of the road network was very patchy in 1750. The roads immediately around London and the major centres of commerce were relatively well developed. Transport was organised very much on a regional basis. Water transport was favoured for long distance haulage of bulky goods. Whilst the major investment and development of turnpikes occurred after 1750, the evidence from the West Riding suggests that there was a clear need roads were turnpiked as early as the 1740s – this was the result of investment by the cloth merchants of Wakefield and Leeds. Similar developments can be attributed to Wedgwood and to Wilkinson. It is clear that where the need existed, merchants and producers were prepared to invest for development. The banking system was far less advanced. Much investment was undertaken by local attorneys acting as intermediaries. Nevertheless the period prior to 1750 did witness an increase in the levels of capital formation, perhaps to the point of 10% of national income identified by Rostow as necessary for ‘take off’. This investment can be seen in farming and in transport and textiles. The majority of capital was ‘working’ or ‘circulating’ capital, which was managed mainly by the merchants, the Bank of England, London private banks and the country banks. Whilst a number of ventures failed to develop it is difficult to argue that expansion was retarded by the limitations of the system of credit.

It could be argued that as wealth creation developed, the infrastructure developed to support it.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic History, 1750-1830*****B: The Standard of Living of the Working Classes, 1780-1830**

Examine the view that the standard of living of the working classes between 1780 and 1830 was more affected by changes to living conditions than by working practices.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

This question focuses on two key elements of the standard of living – working conditions and living conditions. In many respects these two areas are dependent on a qualitative analysis of the material. Nevertheless, quantitative data is necessary as living conditions were dependent on both wages and prices. Answers to the question should attempt some distinction between those living and working in the towns and those in the countryside. Overall, candidates are likely to argue that the two are inextricably linked but that over the period for urban dwellers working conditions improved whereas living conditions deteriorated, in the countryside both seem to have deteriorated.

Living conditions

Recently discussion has focused on qualitative rather than quantitative data and has demonstrated that living conditions in towns deteriorated due to overcrowding and poor sanitation. In the countryside, enclosure of the common fields, and, later, the restrictions on poor relief meant a negative material change in the lives of the working classes. However, people in the countryside were spared the worst excesses of a lack of sanitation experienced in urban areas. Evidence from Chadwick's report demonstrates a very clear distinction in the life expectancy of a labourer living in Manchester compared to a labourer living in Rutland. The difference of approximately 20 years may be the result of much higher infant and child mortality in urban areas but it is not the whole explanation. Urban dwellers may have had much higher wages than agricultural labourers, but both were subject to erratic employment

and under employment. The urban dwellers had to buy all of their food, whereas agricultural labourers, prior to enclosure, were able to grow some and to supplement their diet by poaching etc. Food in towns was often sold by employers through a token system; not only were prices high but also the food was frequently adulterated. As the percentage of people living in urban areas grew so the overcrowding and the quality of life became more desperate.

Working conditions

Pressure to reform the Poor Laws came from a deterioration in terms of employment in the countryside, which were a result of enclosure and the disappearance of the common lands. Seasonal and underemployment were increasingly the lot of the majority of agricultural labourers. Machinery such as the threshing machine may have increased production, but it deprived agricultural workers of employment, which had a negative affect on their working conditions. The development of technology in the mills and factories may have improved working conditions as the machinery became both safer and more sophisticated. However, at the start of the period working conditions both in the home and the factory were poor, mainly due to the increasing emphasis on profit, which permeated both domestic and industrial manufacture. Mortality was high in domestic manufacture where the living and working space were one and the same. Conditions in the early mills were deplorable, the hot damp atmosphere led to lung conditions and the long working hours and the age of the child apprentices compounded the dangers of unguarded machinery.

Candidates should be aware that the evidence on which any analysis on this topic is based is very sketchy. Consumption is based on commodities, which were subject to customs duties. Wage data is very limited as is material related to unemployment and external observers rather than those actually experiencing the conditions offer most descriptions of living and working conditions. Historians who comment on this period tend to have a strong political agenda about the benefits, or otherwise of capitalism.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832-1848*****A: The Significance of the 1832 Reform Act**

Examine the extent to which the 1832 Reform Act changed Parliament in the years 1832-1848.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

This question focuses on the changes to Parliament as a result of the 1832 Reform Act. Answers may consider all three constituents of Parliament, namely the Monarchy, the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The composition of Parliament, the legislation passed and the relative powers of the three constituent parts of the parliament are all areas for consideration.

To demonstrate balance, answers will need to consider evidence both that the 1832 Reform Act changed parliament, and also that it left it the same. Higher level answers are likely to make reference to more than just the House of Commons to demonstrate wide range.

Evidence parliament changed:

- The **monarch** was no longer able to choose the Prime Minister who would then win an election. Instead the winner of the election became Prime Minister. William IV had been forced to ask Grey to form a government in May 1832 when it became clear his proposed PM, Wellington, could not command a majority. Queen Victoria was therefore forced to accept Peel as PM in 1841 when she wanted Melbourne.
- **The House of Lords** had suffered a serious defeat, and been forced to accept reform. The Tory majority had faced a choice between the loss of their power for good, or acceptance of a bill that was destructive to their interests. It would now be sixty years

before the Lords once again challenged the Commons. The loss of rotten boroughs and some pocket borough undermined aristocratic control of the Commons.

- **The House of Commons** composition became more reflective of the middle classes enfranchised in 1832. The Tory dominance of the previous 50 years was broken – whilst the party had governed for all but three of these years, they now governed only twice in the period 1832-1848 (Peel 1834-1835 and 1841-1846). The Whigs won decisive victories in 1832, 1835 and 1837.
- An **age of reform** can be identified as the Whigs especially adopted the view that government could act to improve society and the economy. The 1833 Factory Act and the 1835 Municipal Corporation Act are the best known of these reforms, but reference may also be seen to the Abolition of Slavery (1833), the compulsory Registration of Births and Deaths (1835), The Mines Act (1842) etc.
- **Legislation** was also introduced that directly benefited the new electorate. The 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act reduced the burden of poor relief from the middle-classes, whilst the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act transferred local power to the middle-classes. The repeal of the Corn Laws is the key example – here decisively Peel acted against the interests of the aristocracy, splitting his party as a result. Even the 1833 Factory Act was too lenient and poorly policed to harm the middle-class owners.

Against this should be offered evidence of the limitations of the changes to Parliament.

- The **monarch** was not wholly neutered, as the extension of Melbourne's primacy from 1839 through to 1841 makes clear. The 'Bedchamber crisis' saw Peel excluded from power for a further two years.
- The **House of Lords** lived to fight another day. They continued to provide Prime Ministers (Earl Grey and Viscount Melbourne) and the majority of Government Ministers. They had not lost their veto (and would not do so until 1911). Furthermore the **British Landed Elite** were also still dominant. Lord John Russell was also PM in this period, about 60-70 pocket boroughs continued to exist according to Professor Gash (indeed Gladstone was elected to the first reformed parliament as MP for Newark, a borough in the Duke of Newcastle's pocket).
- The **House of Commons** maintained its traditional conservative outlook. In the 1841 election, 71% of MPs returned were BLE, whilst the **new middle-class electorate** were more concerned with excluding the lower classes from political power than seeking to wrest power from the BLE. The House of Commons rejected the Chartist petitions of 1839 and 1842, and refused to accept the 1848 petition. Macauley spoke out as elegantly against the 2nd petition as he had spoken in favour of reform in 1832.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832-1848***B: Chartism, 1838-1848**

Examine the relative importance of William Lovett in comparison to Fergus O'Connor in the development of Chartism in the period 1838-1848.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should consider the role that the two key Chartist leaders played in the development of the movement over the period. This may be done by assessing the contributions of Lovett and O'Connor separately, but for the higher levels it is important to assess the **relative** importance. This requires answers to either offer an extended conclusion, or perhaps to structure an answer around a series of themes, drawing direct comparisons throughout the answer. Reference will clearly be made to 'physical force', Chartism and O'Connor, compared to 'moral force', Chartism and Lovett. However, answers should cover the whole of the period 1838-1848 and cover their roles in producing the Charter, uniting the movement, the events of 1839 and 1842, as well as their very different positions by 1848.

Charter – Lovett's London Working Men's Association, founded in 1836, drew up the first Charter and it was Lovett that gave it the radical language and distinctly political appeal. O'Connor was not as significant, though he did maintain focus on the Charter in the 1840s when the movement seemed to be imploding.

Personality – Lovett was capable of violent language, and having worked with radicals like Francis Place he understood how to move a crowd. O'Connor however, was the more dynamic figure, rousing crowds with a violent form of rhetoric influenced by Anti-Poor Law speakers he had shared a platform with (e.g. J. R. Stephens). He also staged great spectacles, like his procession on his release from prison in 1841 when he was pulled in a carriage in the

shape of a conch by six stallions. He also had access to a parliamentary platform for Chartism, as an MP for some of the period.

Strategy – though there is perhaps not as much difference between the two figures as is sometimes argued, (in 1842 *The Northern Star* warned against the use of violence), after 1841 Lovett's 'new move' Chartism stressed that power was unlikely to be won through violence, and even if it was, it would not be exercised beneficially unless the intelligence and morality of the people were improved. O'Connor preferred to use a strategy of intimidation, often acting to prevent violence, as in January 1840 and April 1848. Ultimately however, the physical force tag is valid. O'Connor's land scheme also attracted publicity and support, certainly in the years up to 1848.

Unity – O'Connor called on people to choose between the National Charter Association and Lovett's National Association for promoting the Political and Social Improvement of the People. Also viewed with distrust the Complete Suffrage Union as a middle-class takeover of popular radicalism. Lovett supported the CSU, but even his supporters in London backed O'Connor.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929-1951***A: The Making of the Welfare State 1942-1951**

With what success did government action promote social reform in the years 1942 to 1945?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will be expected to explain a range of issues involving “social reform”, including some identification of groups and individuals supporting the idea of the ‘welfare state’, and a range of their reasons and motives for doing so. Answers should also focus on the whole period between 1942, when the Beveridge Plan was formulated, and 1945, when the “Labour landslide” took place. Some answers will differentiate effectively between the war years, when the Churchill coalition was planning for the future, and “1945”, when the Labour Party was pushing its own agenda and the newly-elected Attlee Government was attempting to fulfil its promises in the face of practical difficulties and some political opposition. Successful answers will focus on assessing and evaluating the degree to which social reform was already planned, prepared for and implemented by 1945.

There may also be answers which make effective use of ‘long-term’ factors going back before 1942 to contrast the attitudes of the ‘Hungry Thirties’ with changed views emerging during and because of the war. But this must be carefully applied to the question – as usual, description of the “background” for its own sake will be of little value. (Nor is coverage pre-1942 a requirement. Many excellent answers will concentrate exclusively on the key years 1942-45).

The idea of ‘social reform’ (which some will see as synonymous with ‘welfare state’) can be defined in various ways – many answers may focus above all on the idea of a national health service and perhaps discuss opposition from the medical profession as evidence that opinion

was not entirely “united”. Other answers will take a wider view, looking at the 1944 Education Act, national insurance and perhaps even plans for family allowances. One implication of the question is the issue of how united public opinion was by 1945 in favour of social reform. The Beveridge Plan and the welfare state in general was indeed widely popular and supported by many leading newspapers – but there was less than unity. There were many in the Conservative Party and its anti-socialist supporters who were hostile or at best lukewarm. Suspicions about such attitudes certainly helped to swell the ranks of those who voted the Conservatives out in the 1945 election.

Some answers may also differentiate between various individuals in the Labour Party – particularly how the personality of Aneurin Bevan aroused controversy and was not in tune with others in the Labour leadership. But it is important that answers should observe the key dates and not stray into excessive descriptive material beyond 1945.

“Government action” includes a range of issues. National unity in the “People’s War” was a key theme of Britain’s war effort. From 1940 onwards, there was a sustained government propaganda campaign to rally the nation and to promote the idea of fighting for a better future. (Low’s cartoons are a vivid example of this; as were many feature films and the public statements by leaders such as Churchill and Beaverbrook.) The arrival in government of several Labour politicians such as Bevin, Morrison and Attlee was also a key factor. This provided the setting for the Beveridge Plan (candidates should know Beveridge was a Liberal!) and a general readiness to accept more direct state intervention. The Butler Education Act of 1944 could be used to show how the wartime coalition was already making significant steps towards social reform long before the Attlee government came to power.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929-1951***B: Winston Churchill in opposition and government, 1929-1945**

How important was the personal contribution of Winston Churchill to the wartime coalition government in its defence of Britain between May 1940 and December 1941?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 L2: 5-9 L3: 10-14 L4: 15-17 L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers would be expected to provide a range of evidence, and to place Churchill in the context of the whole period between Churchill's arrival in power in the crisis of May 1940 and December 1941 when Pearl Harbour meant that Britain was no longer "alone" but fighting as the ally of the USA. Answers should also be able to explain the nature of (and key personalities other than Churchill within) the "wartime coalition government". A descriptive narrative account of Churchill's actions would be of only limited value. The framing of the question as "How important?" allows for many effective answers to be framed around Churchill as a central figure, arguing that he was all-important co-ordinator of government and strategy – but some answers may score equally well by differentiating between Churchill's "contribution" and others; or by analysing Churchill's mistakes and separating reality from legend. Some answers, usually good ones, will also focus on the changing situations of the war effort during 1940-41, differentiating between times of desperate survival at first with "Britain alone" against Nazi Germany's dominance of a European war; turning-points such as the Battle of Britain; mobilising the Home Front; economic preparations and 'Lend-Lease'; and Britain's role as the ally of the Soviet Union from June 1941 and later the United States. In this regard, of course, a key to Churchill's contribution was his personal relationship with FDR.

Churchill had many roles during the war. Some were directly managerial and decision-making – handling the war cabinet, directing military and strategic operations. Others were

psychological and propagandistic – using the radio to keep up morale and to exploit myths like Dunkirk or The Few. Others were diplomatic and international – relations with Roosevelt and Stalin. As noted above, there are many opportunities here for differentiation between success and failure, or between myth and reality. Many answers may note the disparity between Churchill’s legendary reputation and the fact there was a lot of grumbling and dissent underneath. There may also be scope for answers to deal with the consolidation of Churchill’s political position against doubters within the Tory Party in the early stages of his premiership in 1940, but this is not a requirement. A balanced approach is essential but we cannot expect answers to provide comprehensive or equal coverage. Successful answers will respond to the key dates, covering a selected range of issues during 1940-41; and will have a balanced view of Churchill’s “contribution” as compared to other factors.

Summary of mark scheme for HS03

| Marks | Understanding of question | Knowledge | Analysis | Balance & judgement | Quality of language and structure |
|----------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1-4 | Little understanding or reference to focus of question. | Lacking specific relevant factual information. | Generalised assertion. | | Poorly structured. Limited grammatical accuracy. |
| 5-9 Either | Some understanding – may be implicit. | Selects some relevant and accurate material. | Mostly narrative or descriptive with some links especially in introduction and/or conclusion. | | Loose in structure. Some effective use of language but limited grammatically. |
| | Or Understands question, at least in part. | Some appropriate material but rather thin. | Some analysis but limited and/or addresses only part of question. | | |
| 10-14 | Generally explicit understanding. | Selects appropriate material but may lack depth. | Shows some analysis with arguments and comments responding to the question but may lack weight. | Limited balance – not fully developed or convincing. | Coherent structure. Generally effective use of language. Some grammatical errors. |
| 15-17 | Explicit and aware of different approaches to question. | Generally precise and well selected. | Develops a focused argument for most of the answer. | Covers all parts of the question to provide a balanced explanation. | Coherent structure. Effective and mostly accurate language. |
| 18-20 | Explicit and sustained. | Precise selection of relevant and accurate material. | Maintains a consistent argument for the greater part of the answer. Good understanding. | Reasonably balanced and offering some convincing judgement. | Accurate, fluent and well structured. Shows some maturity and conceptual awareness. |

Note that the actual mark awarded at each level will depend on how well the candidate matches the given criteria. Marks may go up for slightly better knowledge/analysis/balance or quality of language, and down when one or more of these is weaker. Examiners start in the middle of a level and then adjust up or down.