



## **General Certificate in Education**

# **AS History 5041**

**HS03          Course Essays**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2008 examination – January series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

**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 Course 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 indiscriminating, 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 (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 (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 (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 (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 (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.

### Summary of mark scheme for HS03

Marks	Understanding of question	Knowledge	Analysis	Balance & judgement	Quality of language and structure
<b>1-4</b>	Little understanding or reference to focus of question.	Lacking specific relevant factual information.	Generalised assertion.		Poorly structured. Limited grammatical accuracy.
<b>5-9</b> <b>Either</b>	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.
	<b>Or</b> Understands question, at least in part.	Some appropriate material but rather thin.	Some analysis but limited and/or addresses only part of question.		
<b>10-14</b>	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.
<b>15-17</b>	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.
<b>18-20</b>	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.



---

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

With what success did the Military Orders meet the problems of geography and manpower facing the Crusader states between 1129 and 1188?

**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 consider the ways in which the military orders faced problems of geography and manpower and should assess the extent to which these problems were addressed successfully.

Answers should show knowledge of the defensive problems of the Crusader states after c1130 and show the role of the military orders.

By 1130 the two military orders, Templars and Hospitallers, were well-established within the four Crusader states formed in the aftermath of the First Crusade, Jerusalem, Antioch, Tripoli and Edessa. The security of these states was very fragile; they were spread out down the eastern Mediterranean and surrounded by hostile Muslim states. Outremer was weak with limited manpower, reliant on crusading armies as a temporary source of defence. Because of these fundamental geographic and manpower problems, the Orders were arguably vital for the defence of the Crusader states.

Runciman believed that in battle, the Hospitallers and the Templars were what the Kingdom 'most needed'. They were a permanent source of defence, unlike the crusading armies, and the knights the Orders provided were an elite force. They were highly trained and disciplined soldiers, who would not desert in battle. Such was their bravery that William of Tyre described them as having 'the spirit of fury in their nostrils'. Furthermore, these orders added much needed man-power to the Kingdom's armies, and were free, unlike mercenaries. They were also very well-equipped in both armaments and mounts, due to the

large wealth within the Orders. An example of the success of the military Orders in battle was the Templars' rescuing of Baldwin IV and attacking and destroying Saladin's forces at Montgisard in 1177.

Another military function of the Orders was their holding and maintaining of castles in the East. Unlike much of the Frankish nobility, the Templars and Hospitallers were rich enough to build and maintain their own castles. They were also given or sold castles by rulers and nobles who lacked either the manpower or resources to keep their castle. The Hospitallers alone were responsible for twenty-five castles in the East, including Krak des Chevaliers. This castle was of great importance as it was part of a 'great frontier' (Riley-Smith) and was the centre of operations against the Muslims in the region.

Evaluation of their success may focus on limitations in their ability to meet the geographic and manpower demands. This could include: rivalry between Templars and Hospitallers; their corporate independence and difficult relationship with secular and religious authority within Outremer, especially the Crown; their greed and their fanaticism and the Muslim response they provoked. Defeat at Jacob's Ford in 1179 may be seen as symptomatic. Also, the role of Gerard de Ridefort at the Springs of Cresson and the Battle of Hattin will be examined as this individual did much to bring on the virtual collapse of the Crusader states between 1187 and 1188.

The role the Templars and Hospitallers played in the defence of the Crusader states is open to interpretation, and this is reflected in the leading secondary sources; Riley-Smith believes that the 'contribution' they made to the defence of the Latin East was 'comparatively modest'. This is supported by the small numbers they provided the Kingdom's armies, as well as their numerous limitations, such as their independence and greed which led to a number of problems in the Latin East. Moreover, it was the bad advice of the Master of the Temple, Gerard de Ridefort, who persuaded King Guy to make the wrong decision and attack Saladin at Hattin in 1187, that led to the near destruction of the Crusader states.

---

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

How important was the strict interpretation of the Rule of St Benedict in the success 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 will consider a range of reasons for the success of Cistercian monasticism, in particular the attraction of the Rule of St Benedict, compiled by Benedict of Nursia between AD 535 and 550, which was the blueprint for all monastic life in the 11<sup>th</sup> century. As 'reformed Benedictines', the Cistercians sought to react to Cluniac corruption of the original rule and restore the balance between manual labour and liturgy.

A clear contrast will be presented between the 'New Monasticism' of Cistercian monasticism and Cluniac ideals. The debates between the leading Cistercian Abbot, Bernard of Clairvaux, and his Cluniac counterpart, Peter the Venerable, may be used to highlight the issue of dissatisfaction with Cluniac practice in interpreting the Rule. Focus on the contrast could highlight the Cistercian constitution and organisation and structure, especially mutual visitations as a means of preserving the Rule. Analysis of the strict Cistercian interpretation could focus on the Cistercians' answers to the causes of laxity; their Carta Caritatis (Charter of Charity) and the impact of the organisation and discipline it provided, including the role of its author, Stephen Harding. Students may analyse the role of his Carta Caritatis in maintaining discipline, uniformity and austerity while expansion took place. This monastic observance, outlined in the Carta Caritatis and Exordium Parvum, was a literal observance of the Rule of St Benedict. Other elements which contributed to Cistercian success will include mother houses, the annual general chapter, ties of love, mutual support to enforce collective discipline, uniformity which extended to architecture, the role of Bernard as an inspirational figure (by the time of his death in 1153 his abbey at Clairvaux had sent out monks to create 68 new abbeys), also 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.

Candidates may also refer to the role of Robert of Molesme, founder of the first Cistercian monastery, Citeaux, in 1098. Robert was an inspirational figure who did much to form the ideals of the Cistercians; for example the return to the original rule of St Benedict; their austerity and retreat to the wilderness. However, he was only at Citeaux for about one year and the expansion into a monastic order took place under the influence of Stephen Harding, Abbot of Citeaux from 1109 to 1133 and Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux.

Other factors might include the Cistercians' economic success; their focus on the wilderness; benefactors and uncultivated land; sheep farming and wool production; manual labour and the use of converse; the flood of endowments; papal privileges and the economic context of European demographic and economic expansion.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### ***Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion***

##### **A: The Origins of the French Wars of Religion**

How important, by 1562, were the economic and financial problems of France in bringing about the Wars of Religion?

#### **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 a range of factors which promoted dissatisfaction and conflict which polarised into the Wars of Religion, for example:

#### **Factors linked to the economic situation:**

- there was a rapid growth in population in the early part of the century (in common with much of Europe) possibly 15 million in France by 1550. This put pressure on resources and led to food shortages, rising prices and consequent unrest in both town and country
- towns grew rapidly, e.g. Paris, Lyon and Rouen (became the biggest towns in Europe) – this generated cramped conditions, problems of supply etc.
- industry grew rapidly, e.g. printing industry in Lyon; although a source of income for workers and profits for managers, this added to social problems
- in other towns, textile manufacture collapsed and generated poverty and discontent
- feudal structures were being replaced by patronage, clientage and hierarchies in the workplace – in towns there was a growing lower class alongside a prosperous merchant class, generating tension
- a general increase in prosperity occurred but inflation was a balancing factor
- rural population stopped growing after 1570 and payments of feudal dues, tithes and rents were less – this impoverished the landed classes

**Factors linked to the financial situation:**

- the Crown sank into debt, aggravated by the wars – increasing the general economic downturn – in 1547 the debt was 2.5 million; by 1559 – 11.7 million
- much of the revenue from taxation went to bankers rather than to the Crown and this led the government to increase taxation
- the Crown became, as a result, more exposed to the influence of the nobility, some of whom were inclined towards Huguenot ideas or interested in acquiring Church property
- additional taxes were imposed increasing discontent.

However, this might have been managed if it was not happening in the context of religious and political change, e.g. the growth of Protestantism and events such as the Tumult of Amboise; the untimely death of Francis II which brought Catherine de Medici to power; the failure of the Colloquy of Poissy 1561; the consequences of the Massacre at Vassy 1562; the failure of the French Catholic Church to consider reform (including that advocated by the Pope at Trent).

Alternatively, it could be argued that understanding of economic and financial change was not well-developed; systems and structures had been in place for a long time and stability had always been anticipated; the rate of change was a significant issue.

Some candidates may legitimately combine economic and financial problems and address these as a single factor balanced against other factors, e.g. religious and political.

---

**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, 1562–1598**

How important was the role of Charles IX in influencing the course of the Wars of Religion from 1562 to 1574?

**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 nature of the question may well push responses into a chronological approach, but good responses will, within that, focus very clearly on linking the role and influence of Charles IX, alongside that of Huguenot and Catholic leaders, in order to establish an assessment, for example:

- from 1560–1562 Charles was king but a minor and his mother, Catherine de Medici, still had control. Initial Huguenot influence at court led to the Colloquy of Poissy, Massacre at Vassy, the assassination of Guise, and the Peace of Amboise. Result – the Huguenots gained freedom of conscience but only limited rights of worship and this led to increased tension
- in 1564 Charles came of age but his lack of political flair exacerbated the situation by, for example, meeting the Duke of Alva. Conflict continued, e.g. Battle of St Denis, Battle of Longjumeau, Battle of Jarnac. Huguenots forced to withdraw to La Rochelle. The Huguenots were disappointed with Charles IX
- by the late 1560s Charles was strongly influenced by Coligny, for example, that the conflict was a plot by the Catholics to draw attention away from other issues, e.g. events in the Netherlands. Charles was encouraged to, for example, pursue war with Spain and give freedom of religion to Huguenots. Charles ultimately agreed the

Peace of St Germain in 1570 which promoted some reconciliation, e.g. Huguenots given 4 towns as their security for 2 years and were allowed freedom of conscience

- Charles IX gave the order for the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre in August 1572 but evidence suggests he did not call for a general attack and the situation got out of control; similar events took place in other towns in September 1572.

**Other factors also influenced the course of the wars:**

- Catherine de Medici – she attempted to maintain the balance in the early years; she wished to end the power of the Guise but her appointment of Antoine of Navarre as Lieutenant-General created Guise-Bourbon conflict, riots throughout the country. By 1572, she saw Coligny as a threat and persuaded Charles there was a plot which eventually led to the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre
- the failure of the Colloquy of Vassy in 1561 which led to Huguenot retaliation after the Massacre at Vassy 1562, raising both Catholic and Protestant anger
- the assassination of the Duke of Guise in 1563 was blamed on the Huguenots although war was averted with the Peace of Amboise, 1563.
- the massacres of 1572 emphasised the extent of religious conflict and enabled the Huguenots to gain a stronghold in the west.

Some conclusions might be drawn: for example, by 1574 France was a divided country – Huguenots had established a 'republic' in the southwest with its own parliamentary body, taxes and administrative system; towns were fortified but at great cost in lives and with an uncertain future. The personality of the new King Henry III was initially seen as weak, but although the Huguenots continued to resist, the struggle had reached a stalemate which was not resolved until the emergence of Henry III of Navarre. The St Bartholomew's Day Massacre was clearly a turning point; it coloured how the monarchy was seen and radicalised the Huguenots.

Charles IX may be perceived as making little impact with the major decisions taken by his mother; this had a major effect on how the monarchy was perceived; respect was not fully retrieved until the accession of Henry IV.



## 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 nobility was responsible for the difficulties of the Regency in domestic affairs.

#### **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 identify the areas of failure in domestic affairs and consider the responsibility of the nobility in comparison with other factors. There may be some attempt to assess the degree of failure and this indeed might be very useful in arriving at a sound conclusion. Good responses might well appreciate the link between the nobility and other factors such as noble tax privilege accounting for financial problems which in turn allowed Parlement a focused basis of opposition to royal authority.

#### **Domestic Problems**

- difficulty in asserting the absolute authority of the Crown, especially in relation to Parlement and their opposition to John Law's schemes; opposition to Jansenism and Unigenitus; intransigence of the nobility and the Polysynodie; the Will of Louis XIV and his attempts to limit Orléans' authority as regent
- financial difficulties, due to war debts of Louis XIV and unequal taxation policies
- opposition of Galicans to papal intervention in domestic affairs
- factionalism at court.

#### **Role of the Nobility**

- there was opposition on a personal level to the elevation of Orléans as Regent. Rumours of his poisoning his way to power did not help, but more significantly his hedonistic lifestyle, rumours of incest, and his shunning of the increasingly austere

Madame de Maintenon and of the court at Versailles had done little to bolster his reputation amongst the nobility. There was a widespread belief that Philip V of Spain had a prior claim to the crown and to the regency

- Louis XIV in June 1714 had made his two sons by Madame de Montespan, the Duke du Maine and Count de Toulouse, eligible to succeed if the direct line died out. Orléans was to serve merely as head of a regency council. This simply increased the factionalism of the nobility at Versailles in the last days of Louis XIV
- many of the nobility felt that a disputed succession, combined with the young age of Louis XV, would allow them to increase their role in government. This was certainly significant given the long reign of Louis XIV and the weakening of the nobility on both a regional and central level. Louis' use of intendants and of Versailles had been in part a consequence of the disruption of the *Fronde*s, and some nobility no doubt considered another regency as an ideal opportunity to undo some of the centralisation of Louis XIV
- in the early years of the Regency, and certainly up to 1718, Orléans needed the co-operation of the nobility to cement his position and also to overturn the provisions of Louis XIV's will. This gave the nobility hope of a greater role in government and this seemed to be confirmed by Orléans' agreement to continue with rule through councils. Most obviously the establishment of the Polysynodie – a system of seven specialised councils dealing with foreign affairs, finance, religion etc. – each with a *noblesse de robe*, and the abolishment of offices of state, including that of Controller-General, seemed to confirm the central role of the nobility and the consequent weakening in the authority of the monarch/regent
- candidates may, however, identify that the Polysynodie actually gave little away in terms of authority. Orléans was still obliged to accept majority voting on the regency council, but he appointed its members. The increasing size of the council indicates its increasing insignificance and by 1718 minutes ceased even to be taken of its proceedings. The Polysynodie was circumvented by Orléans' increasing use of private advisers such as Law and by 1718 Orléans was effectively ruling in the same style as Louis XIV had done
- financial concerns were exacerbated by the exemption of the nobility from direct tax. An attempt to introduce a graduated *Taille* in 1718 failed due to fears over attack on privilege.

### Other factors responsible for domestic problems

- the responsibility of Parlement is a most obvious factor. The return of pre-registration remonstrance at the start of the Regency, largely again as a result of Orléans' need for support in overturning Louis XIV's will, ensured that Parlement had a more important role in government under Orléans. Certainly they again felt aggrieved by their perceived relative insignificance under Louis XIV. Their opposition was notable over John Law's financial reforms, and this became the grounds on which a conflict over monarchical authority was fought. Despite being exiled, it was they who opposed the use of foreigners as advisers and they who also published an *arrêt* on Law's new paper money. Ultimately candidates might argue that Parlement achieved victory as Law was sacrificed in order for Orléans to get Parlement's co-operation over the registration of Unigenitus in 1720. Parlement increasingly portrayed itself as protector of gallican rights and as a bulwark against excessive centralisation
- if authority was the greatest problem faced by Orléans then finance was not far behind. This certainly was due in part to an inequitable taxation policy, but the huge debt was inherited from Louis XIV and might be argued as an insoluble legacy

- Law's *Système* was in itself flawed, and the financial problems were caused also by the greed of speculators. It was unreasonable to expect that some of Law's policies and especially universal taxation would ever be implemented
- The legacy of Louis XIV is also significant. It was he who, in an attempt to control France beyond his death, established the weak position of the Regency and undermined Orléans by the elevation of his illegitimate children
- Jansenism and the issue of Unigenitus had also not been solved by 1715. This was a problem created in part by Louis XIV and remained a problem throughout the Regency.

### **Conclusion**

A conclusion might suggest that there are apparently good reasons to assume that the nobility played a significant role in domestic problems, especially in relation to the authority of the monarch/regent. However, such issues were largely confined to the period 1715–1718, and whilst the granting of the Polysynodie and rule by majority vote might give the impression that Orléans had conceded a great deal in the face of noble opposition, in actual fact the Polysynodie was little more than a façade. As soon as his position was secure, Orléans effectively dispensed with rule by council and returned to the use of trusted advisers and ministers common under Louis XIV. More significant was Parlement and its attempt to wrestle more influence in government, most obviously illustrated by its opposition to Law's *Système* and the registration of Unigenitus. The failure of financial measures and the legacy of Louis XIV may also be much more significant.

**HISTORY**

**UNIT 3**

**COURSE ESSAYS**

**HS03**

**Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743**

**B: Cardinal Fleury, 1726–1743**

Examine the extent to which, in domestic affairs, Cardinal Fleury's government was a success.

**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 focus should clearly be on degree of success across a range of issues, perhaps with some relative assessment that leads to a conclusion.

Criteria for success might be considered to include: preserving the authority of the monarchy, amicable relations with Parlement, satisfactorily addressing the issue of Jansenism and especially Unigenitus and solving the economic and financial problems inherited in 1726.

**Success**

- the most notable area of success might be considered to have been economic. The long period of peace and relative stability offered by Fleury allowed not only for retrenchment but also for substantial growth. Perhaps most significant was the stabilisation of the livre in 1726 which then remained stable until 1785
- the improvement in infrastructure was another significant boost to the economy, especially under Orry who extended the *corvée royale* in 1738 thereby dramatically improving a national framework of roads and opening up access to and from the provinces
- the use of mercantilism and protectionism with the re-imposition of punitive tariffs might be argued to have encouraged trade, although might equally be argued to have had a detrimental effect in the longer term

- the development of the major Atlantic ports such as Nantes might reasonably be said to have promoted overseas trade, especially in conjunction with the development of colonies, although this might easily be argued to have been a consequence rather than a cause
- finance was also an area of success due to the reduced demands placed on it by Fleury's policy of pacification
- Orry managed to balance the books in 1739 and later achieved a surplus. This was significant for its rarity in the eighteenth century
- regular payment of royal debt accrued under Louis XIV ensured that future loans were raised with more ease and at a lower rate of interest
- the creation of a *General Farm* aided the collection of taxes returns from which they were greater due to the success of the economy
- in religious matters, Fleury's policy of conservatism might be considered a success. The Huguenot issue was allowed to remain with little enforcement of government policy thus avoiding conflict. Likewise, Fleury sought to moderate between the Gallicans and Jansenists and consequently to calm the controversy. Opposition from Parlement over this issue was dealt with swiftly and authority re-asserted
- the return of Parlement to Paris in 1732 after enforced exile allowed Fleury to ban further remonstrance over religious issues and this followed in the wake of enforcement of the King's declaration of 1730 that all clergy should support Unigenitus. This can be seen as a successful assertion of royal authority
- Fleury provided a stable administrative system that at least initially did not allow for the rise of faction. Candidates might argue that this was much better than might have been expected from the personal rule of Louis XV.

### Failure

- the most obvious charge is that by not enacting major reform Fleury allowed the monarchy to stroll towards crisis. What was needed was innovation, not retrenchment, especially considering the growing confidence of Parlement and the size of the royal debt
- finances were improved but largely as a result of the years of peace. The failure of Law's *Système* had effectively handicapped future governments and made radical reform much more difficult. The fundamental problem of an inequitable taxation policy remained largely due to the influence of the privileged. The establishment of the *General Farm* was a backwards step. A national bank had not been established. Government income was still bolstered by emergency wartime taxation such as the *dixième* re-established in 1733 and again in 1741 only to be abolished at the end of the conflict. Although interest rates were reduced on loans, these still stood at a very high 10.5%. The demands of the War of Austrian Succession proved how fragile royal finances remained
- economic developments were significant but these were largely an urban phenomenon. Agriculture remained under-developed; improved communications certainly eased distress but there was still widespread famine 1739–1740. Mercantilist ideas and high tariffs damaged French competitiveness as did excessive state regulation. Perhaps most significantly it can be claimed that any economic developments were more an unintended consequence of a policy of pacification, rather than of a clear sighted economic programme
- Parlement continued to assert its authority and was beginning to assume a representative role in the French political structure. Then regional parlements were beginning to act in concert in a *union des classes* which was ill boding for future relations with the monarchy

- religious issues were essentially allowed to fester. Although royal authority had been asserted over the issue of Unigenitus and Jansenism, nothing had fundamentally been solved
- factionalism at court increased dramatically over the issue of war. Certainly in the later period of Fleury's government it was clear that Fleury had lost much of his former control of the administration as evidenced by France's eventual involvement in the War of Austrian Succession.

### **Conclusion**

Candidates might well suggest that Fleury's government was more a period of missed opportunity but that he achieved all that might have been expected of him considering his age and also the fact that he lacked the authority of a king. The economy certainly benefited as did royal finances, in fact the whole period is typified by retrenchment and avoidance of domestic conflict. Yet this was the very essence of his failure. In the short term these policies provided stability, but this was not necessarily what was needed. Much of the success was not due to fundamental reform or innovation. This cautious approach from Fleury succeeded in cementing his position in government for such a long period, but did little to help France. Consequently Fleury's government failed to address the fundamental problems facing France.

---

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

Was the Mehemet Ali crisis the biggest threat to Great Power co-operation in the years 1825 to 1835?  
Explain your answer.

**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.**

**Summary and Possible Approaches**

The co-operation of the Great Powers was challenged by a number of events/crises in the period 1825–1835. The Mehemet Ali Crisis was a significant threat as it reawakened Great Power rivalries in the Near East due to the decline of Turkey. However, war was averted (at least until 1854) through a re-confirmation of the East/West divide and balance of power following the Münchengrätz Agreement of September 1833. Candidates should consider other events/problems which threatened Great Power co-operation in this period. Descriptions of these events/problems will not be useful. Candidates should use their material to focus on the extent of threat to co-operation and draw conclusions about their relative importance in comparison with the Mehemet Ali Crisis of 1831–1833. These other events/problems may include one or more of the following:

- the Greek Question
- the Revolutions of 1830–1831, in particular the Revolutions in Belgium and possibly France
- the Spanish Crisis of 1830–1835

### **Impact of the Mehemet Ali Crisis on the co-operation of the Great Powers**

Following the invasion of Syria by Mehemet Ali's (Viceroy of Egypt) son and subsequent advancement of Egyptian troops to within 150 miles of Constantinople the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire appealed for aid from the Great Powers. Only Russia responded directly with several thousand troops which forced Mehemet Ali to back down and retreat. The Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi (1833) was signed between Russia and Turkey with a secret clause which implied that Russia could demand the closure of the Black Sea Straits to warships of all nations. It was Russian intervention and the Treaty of Unkiar-Skelessi which had the most impact on the Concert of Europe.

- Austria was determined to prevent Russia's independent action and signed the Munchengratz Agreement with Russia (September 1833)
- Prussia joined the Munchengratz Agreement a month later, reasserting the solidarity of the eastern powers
- Russian actions increased British and French mistrust of Russia's policy in the Near East
- the reaffirmation of the eastern powers led to Britain, France, Spain and Portugal signing the Quadruple Alliance (1834) as a liberal counterbalance.

**It can be argued that other events/problems were a greater threat to Great Power co-operation**

#### ***Impact of the Greek Question on Great Power Co-operation***

There was a change in Great Power relationships, most notably:

- Austrian and Russian relationships were strained because of Russia's support for their Greek co-religionists
- the St. Petersburg Protocol (1826) demonstrated British willingness to work with Russia, an empire formerly regarded with suspicion because of her absolutism
- British intervention in the Greek Revolt deepened Anglo-Austria hostility
- France demonstrated her capabilities as a Great Power and maintained links with Russia through the Treaty of London (1827)
- despite tensions over the Revolt and independent Greece was a triumph of Congress Diplomacy
- the creation of an independent Greece represented a crushing blow for Metternich and Austria found itself virtually excluded from the Concert of Europe in the final years of negotiations.

#### ***The 1830–1831 Revolutions in Europe – evidence could include:***

- the Revolutions were the first clear violation of the Vienna Settlement of 1815
- the Revolutions threatened to wedge a divide between the autocratic Eastern powers who were opposed to revolution and threats to legitimacy and the more liberal powers of Britain and France
- Nicholas I refused to recognise Louis-Philippe as King until January 1831, souring relations between Russia and France for twenty years
- Metternich wanted to intervene and crush the revolution in France, Palmerston disapproved strongly and Britain welcomed the regime in France and pursued an Anglo-French entente
- the Eastern powers feared intervention in Belgium by the new 'liberal' French Government in support to fellow Catholic Belgians



- the London Conference of November 1830 agreed the re-establishment of the old United Provinces (Holland) and the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium)
- the initial fears of the eastern powers about France proved unfounded as Louis-Philippe acted with caution and moderation in his pursuit of foreign policy, e.g. non-intervention in Belgium, co-operating with the British in 1834 over Spain
- the divide between the autocratic and liberal powers was not rigidly set in stone and the Great Powers did co-operate successfully to resolve the Belgian Revolt of 1830–1831 and although Britain and France did not agree with Russia crushing the Polish revolt in 1830 they did not take action to stop it from happening.

### ***The Spanish Crises of 1830–1835***

- Anglo-French co-operation sealed by the Quadruple Alliance of 1834 turned to hostile rivalry by 1836
- the Concert of Europe was not seriously threatened by the Spanish crisis as France exercised national self-restraint and respected the terms of the Quadruple Alliance
- members of the Holy Alliance (Austria, Prussia and Russia) did not involve themselves in Spanish Affairs.

### ***Conclusions***

The Mehmet Ali Crisis was a great cause of concern for the Great Powers because it re-intensified the existing Eastern Problem. However, it can be argued that it was not the greatest threat to co-operation due to the sensitivity of the issues. Candidates may argue that the issue of Belgium caused the greatest threat to Great Power relations in the period as moves towards conflict were made – but reward whatever argument is adopted provided that it is well-supported.

---

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

How important was the economic crisis of the 1840s 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.**

There were a number of political, social and economic triggers to the 1848 Revolutions in Europe and the purpose of the question is for candidates to judge the relative importance of one of the key triggers, that of economic crisis against political and social factors. Candidates should draw upon evidence from the Revolutions in France, Italy, Austria and Germany. More sophisticated answers should approach the question in a thematic way and link economic depression to rising social tensions. Weaker answers may take a country by country approach describing social, economic and political conditions, rather than linking and evaluating causal factors.

**Evidence of economic decline**

The mid-1840s saw a number of economic crises, evidence can range from:

- Agricultural – potato blight (1845), failure of the grain harvest 1846, steep price rises in staple foodstuff (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
- Industrial – 1845–1847 overproduction and saturated markets, unemployment, low wages

- Financial – a sudden rise in bankruptcies – especially among the *petit 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, there is a case to be argued that the worst of the economic crisis was over by 1848 as the harvest of 1847 was more successful than those of 1845 and 1846 and food prices had started to decline.

### **Social factors**

The perception of the ruling classes of Europe in 1848 was that social unrest from the 'lower classes' was the trigger for the revolutions of that year. Marxist historians stress the importance of working class action in bringing about the Revolutions of 1848. However, it is clear that unrest was expressed by a number of social groups. For example, in the Italian States the urban classes were often the vanguard of the original revolutionary surge, yet the peasants were quick to come to the aid of the townspeople. In the German States the middle-class liberal grabbed the headlines, but it was the violence of peasant uprisings and the fighting of workers and artisans on the barricades, which frightened the governments into meeting some of the demands of the liberals. The trigger of the peasant, artisan and working class unrest can mainly be found in the economic conditions of the mid-1840s, whereas middle class unrest was usually an expression of discontent about the uneven distribution of political power and the demand for liberalism.

### **Political Factors**

The middle classes demanded liberalism in France and the German States, whilst in the Habsburg Empire and the Italian States they demanded nationalism. These political demands coupled with the threat of widespread social disorder due to the economic crisis witnessed the almost voluntary capitulation of governments in Europe.

Weak political leadership was certainly an important factor in the initial success of the 1848 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.

### **Conclusions**

A severe and widespread economic crisis contributed greatly to rising social unrest. Yet ultimately it can be argued that it was the incompetence and lack of nerve of the political leadership of Europe which led to the downfall of Louis-Philippe and the resignation of Guizot and Metternich et al. Please note that any of the above factors can be argued to be most important, but the clearer the links and connections made between social, economic and political factors the candidate makes, the higher the level of understanding demonstrated.

---

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

How important was rivalry between the major powers 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 which spread across the Balkans from 1875 marked the start of the most serious crisis during this 20-year period. This destabilisation would highlight the rivalry between the major powers, as each sought to keep others from filling the power-vacuum in the Balkans. However, other factors were important in explaining why there was a crisis, such as an emerging Balkan nationalism which would no longer be easily controlled and also the further disintegration of the Ottoman Empire.

**Factors supporting the importance of rivalry between the major powers:**

- Austria-Hungary – wanted to extend her control into the Balkans to resist the spread of nationalism to her multi-racial empire and she might also acquire Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Russia – if nationalism spelt disintegration for Austria-Hungary, it offered opportunities for Russia through Pan-Slavism for territorial gains to extend her military and commercial interests. Any such development was unacceptable to the British. After the break-up of a conference in Constantinople, Russia then tried to control events by war, which increased the likelihood of European interference and emphasised Russia's inconsistent approach. With Russian forces advancing on Constantinople, war was threatened on a European scale. The resulting Treaty of San Stefano, with the creation of 'Big Bulgaria', was clearly unacceptable to Austria-

Hungary and Britain, with the latter mobilizing troops and moving her fleet into the Straits

- Britain – aimed to bolster Turkey to withstand pressure from Russia and protect her interests in the Mediterranean and beyond
- Germany – wanted to avoid taking sides, but would be forced to choose between her allies. Ideally, Germany wanted partition, but this would be blocked by Britain
- the Congress and Treaty of Berlin appeared to end the crisis and remove the threat of war, but nothing was solved and great power rivalry remained, especially with Russian humiliation and Austria-Hungary's foothold in the Balkans.

**Other important factors:**

- the rivalries of the different groups within the Balkans would prove increasingly difficult for the major powers to control as the Christian populations determined to win independence. In 1875, the oppressed Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina rose in rebellion, and in 1876, the revolt spread to Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro. These nationalities would not be fobbed off with Turkish promises of reform
- the terminal decline of the Ottoman Empire was an important factor in the crisis, with little sign of reform within Turkey. The Sultan firmly believed that Britain would not stand by and watch Turkey be dismembered. Misrule and corruption were deeply ingrained and only sweeping changes could bring about reform, but such changes would give the restless subject peoples the chance they were waiting for to throw off Turkish rule. In 1876, despite an internal power struggle, Turkey recovered enough to massacre the Bulgarians and defeat Serbia. These atrocities forced the Bulgarian issue onto the European stage and the major powers felt obliged to intervene
- in the early months of the crisis, as the Serbs rose in rebellion in 1875, the major powers seemed largely indifferent with little sign of rivalry and the following year, a collective diplomatic approach was evident with the Andrassy Note and the Berlin Memorandum (except Britain) trying to defuse the crisis and instigate political reforms within the Ottoman Empire
- on the eve of war with Turkey in 1877, the rivalry of the major powers seemed under control as Russia successfully negotiated Austro-Hungarian neutrality.

Higher level responses will clearly provide more than a narrative of the events of the 1875–1878 crisis and, for balance and development, should analyse factors beyond the rivalry of the major powers, appreciating the importance of Balkan nationalism which emerged as the crisis developed and also the decline of the Ottoman Empire as the underlying cause.

---

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

Examine the degree to which the ambitions of Austria-Hungary explain the growth of international tension in the Balkans in the years 1908 to 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.**

The main events which reflected the growth of international tension of the Balkans between 1908 and 1914 are the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, the two Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, and the July Crisis following the assassination in Sarajevo in 1914. The ambitions of Austria-Hungary focused on her desire to extend her control in the Balkans, in order to resist the spread of nationalism to her own multi-racial empire, and, in particular, to annex the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, other factors are also important in explaining the growth of international tension in the Balkans, such as Russian Pan-Slavism, the nationalist ambitions on the Balkan states, and the increasing threat from two competing European alliances.

**Factors stressing the importance of Austria-Hungary's ambitions in the growth of international tension:**

- with the appointment of Aehrenthal as foreign minister and von Hotzendorff as army chief, a more aggressive approach entered Austrian diplomacy. Austro-Hungarian ambitions now aimed at the elimination of Serbia because it was believed to be the nucleus of a South Slav state which would stimulate unrest among the Croats and Serbs within the Empire. With reliance on German support, significantly in 1908 and 1914, Austria-Hungary developed an over-confident gambling spirit
- Austria's unexpected annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 marked a significant turning point. It shocked the major powers and 'struck at the roots of all good

international order'. Despite negotiations with Iswolsky (Russian foreign minister), Aehrenthal issued a unilateral declaration – even the Germans were annoyed at receiving little notice of his intentions. Aehrenthal's vanity had screwed up tension in the Balkans and created much alarm in Europe. Russia felt humiliated, while Serbia was embittered – above all, the crisis ended the Austro-Russian *détente* over the Balkans

- after the First Balkan War, Austria-Hungary succeeded in creating an independent Albania to thwart Serbian ambitions – thereby sowing the seeds for the Second War. After the Second Balkan War, Austria's strategic position declined sharply, for Serbia was now a formidable Balkan power capable of putting 400,000 troops into the field. The nerves of the European powers jangled, as Austria-Hungary now looked for a military opportunity to eliminate Serbia – which the assassination in Sarajevo would provide
- during the July Crisis, 1914, the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia on 23 July shocked several foreign ministers by its severity, and seemed deliberately framed so that no self-respecting state could accept. Austria's declaration of war on Serbia, on 28 July, marked the start of military conflict.

**Other factors to explain the growth of international tension:**

- Serb ambitions also clearly threatened peace in the Balkans as she sought to unite all Serbs into Greater Serbia. This would prove a deadly threat to the Habsburg Empire. The situation was aggravated by the Serbian government's inadequate control over the nationalistic secret societies. Serbia's humiliating climb-down after the Bosnian Crisis in 1908, provoked resentment and a sense of grievance. Serbia took the initiative in 1912 in forming the Balkan League with Bulgaria, Greece and Montenegro, with the ambition of driving Turkey out of Europe. The impact of Serb nationalist ambitions reached its climax in 1914 with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo by a member of a Serbian terrorist group. The complicity of the Serbian government could not be allowed to pass unpunished and led to a chain of events which provoked European war
- Russian Pan-Slav ambitions provided a further undercurrent to the growth of tensions. Russia also helped to promote the Balkan League and in 1914, following their climb-down in 1908, the Russian government was not going to give way and initiated military preparations. With the decisive Russian full mobilization on 30 July, international tension escalated into European war
- German ambitions of *Weltpolitik* impinged on events in the Balkans at several crucial stages. Instead of exercising a significant moderating influence on Austria-Hungary, she chose the opposite path, notably with the ultimatum during the Bosnian Crisis and also with the 'blank cheque' of unqualified support in 1914. Some historians believe that Germany was prepared to launch the First World War to achieve hegemony
- the continued disintegration of the Ottoman Empire provided the context for international tension and for the ambitions of several major powers in the Balkans. However, the Bosnian Crisis was triggered by the Young Turk movement which aimed 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 had serious

implications for Austria-Hungary, provoking her pre-emptive annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina

- Italian aggression over Tripoli in 1911 encouraged the formation of the Balkan League and Bulgaria instigated the Second Balkan War by attacking Serbia
- the rivalry of the two competing alliances increased the prospects of international tension and conflict.

Higher level responses should include a balanced range of factors to explain the growth of international tension in the Balkans and should present a convincing and well-argued evaluation. Some may conclude that Austria-Hungary's ambitions did most to provoke conflict. Her annexation in 1908 reopened the difficult Balkan question and her ultimatum in 1914 raised her quarrel with Serbia to the level of a grave international crisis. Austria-Hungary was the first power to resort to force by attacking Serbia.



---

**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 weakness of their opponents explains the Bolsheviks' victory in the civil war of 1918–1921.

**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 should focus on the key reasons for the outcome of the civil war, making a sustained and relevant judgement on the reasons for the Bolshevik victory, with a particular focus on the weaknesses of the opposition.

It is important to note that the phrase 'civil war' in this context is sometimes taken exclusively to mean the White opposition to the Bolsheviks/Communists, i.e. internal Russian opposition; but sometimes it is taken to include forces of the foreign armies of intervention. It is equally permissible for candidates to focus just on the White opposition, or to include the foreign intervention also.

The civil war began soon after the Bolshevik seizure of power in October 1917, which was not surprising given that the Bolsheviks had no mandate, and had seized power in a relatively small *coup d'état* in a small part of Russia, centred on Moscow and Petrograd.

White opposition included all those Russians and subject peoples who resented the Bolshevik seizure of power and/or who were fundamentally opposed to all that they stood for. It included other radical left-wing parties such as the Mensheviks and many Socialist Revolutionaries. Although these groups had been opposed to the Tsarist system and had been active in the Soviets, they had not taken part in the October Revolution and had no reason to accept Bolshevik rule. This was particularly the case when the Bolsheviks closed down the new Constituent Assembly in January 1918 when it proved to have an anti-

Bolshevik majority. Other White opponents included supporters of the previous regime, even though there was little sympathy for the Tsar himself, who had long seemed an irrelevance, e.g. tsarist generals, and landowners and businessmen whose influence and wealth was rapidly destroyed by the new regime. There was also opposition to the Peace of Brest-Litovsk with Germany, by which the Bolsheviks ceded huge tracts of land and resources in order to save Russia from further German attack. There was opposition to the Bolsheviks for their radical socialism, their anti-clericalism, their violence etc.

Foreign powers joined the Whites for various reasons: officially intervention began in an attempt to get a regime which would continue the war against Germany. However, countries such as Britain, France and the USA gradually became committed to the anti-Bolshevik cause *per se*. Other countries, such as Japan, also had territorial ambitions.

The reasons above also help to explain the weaknesses of the Whites: basically there was no unity or coordinated approach amongst them towards overcoming the Bolsheviks, simply a hatred of what they stood for. Other Left-wing groups had been taken by surprise by the Revolution, and did not have the ruthless determination of men like Trotsky and Lenin who seized the moment and filled the gaping power vacuum in Russia. The Whites were split internally, e.g. the Left SRs from the Right SRs.

'Bourgeois' opponents of the Bolsheviks faced a fundamental weakness: they had no mass support since they could offer little except for some sort of restoration of an old regime which had long been discredited. For example, they could not get the support of the masses of the peasantry. The peasants had no particular love for the Bolsheviks, despite being allowed to seize the land, because under the draconian measures of War Communism, they had most of their grain seized. However, they would not support White generals who were likely to take away their newly-won land.

The main White threat came from the motley armies of generals such as Denikin, Wrangel and Kolchak. Although they made advances, they lacked sufficient support and advanced weaponry. Equally important, there was no unity or coordinated approach amongst themselves.

Foreign intervention was largely ineffective: other countries were war-weary, and the intervention was basically uncoordinated and half-hearted.

The Reds had weaknesses themselves: many opponents had problems within their own ranks, e.g. from disgruntled workers. However, they had many advantages also. Essentially their leadership was united: despite arguments, Lenin was clearly in charge. The Bolsheviks were absolutely ruthless in their approach, e.g. through the requisitioning under War Communism and the terror imposed by the Cheka or secret police. The Red Army was effectively led by Trotsky. The Bolsheviks were masters of propaganda. The Bolsheviks did not initially control much territory, but they did have the heartland of Russia with its individual cities, transport and interior lines of communication.

The civil war was already virtually over by the time that the Reds were involved in The Polish War of 1920.

Good answers will probably focus on the Whites' weaknesses, but they are also likely to make a balanced assessment of White weaknesses set against Red strengths.

---

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

Examine the degree to which errors by the Left Opposition of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev explain Stalin's success in gaining power in the USSR 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.**

Answers should focus on the activities and weaknesses of the Left Opposition in permitting Stalin's rise to power in the 1920s.

Stalin gained power by 1929 for several reasons including his own skills, and his use of his influential positions in the party which he had already consolidated by the time of Lenin's death in 1924. However, his own rise to power was also undoubtedly due to the weaknesses and errors of his opponents, particularly on the Left.

Trotsky was very influential in the early 1920s; his reputation built on his vital role in the October Revolution and leading the Red Army to victory in the civil war. However, he lacked a strong party base and was too arrogant to cultivate one. Some saw him as too 'clever'. Some were suspicious of his Menshevik background before 1917. He completely underestimated Stalin. He changed alliances and his views were sometimes unpopular or did not seem to accord with Russia's needs at the time, e.g. his calls for 'permanent revolution' when internal stability was the prime need. Some feared he would carry out a military coup. He missed crucial opportunities, e.g. failing to use Lenin's damning indictment of Stalin in Lenin's Testament to secure Stalin's demotion in 1924 or 1925.

Zinoviev and Kamenev also made errors. Both had to live down the fact that they had opposed Lenin's decision to carry out the October coup. Both underestimated Stalin's ability and cunning. Zinoviev was head of the Petrograd Party organisation between 1918 and

1926, and head of the Communist International (Comintern). Kamenev ran the Moscow party in the early 1920s. However, despite building up local support, neither had the depth of party support which Stalin built up.

A weakness and possible error of the opposition was that it did not appear consistent. In 1922, during Lenin's illness, Kamenev and Zinoviev allied with Stalin because they feared Trotsky's influence. Having formed the 'Triumvirate', they then feared Stalin's growing influence and allied with Trotsky in the United Left Opposition (1926–1927).

As Stalin's influence grew, the three opponents saw their influence steadily eroded. All were expelled from the party (Zinoviev and Kamenev were later re-admitted, although powerless), and Trotsky was exiled in 1928.

All three men could be seen as opportunistic in their tactical alliances and changing stances. Although all were 'intellectuals', it appeared that they were as much concerned with personal influence as promoting Communist ideology. Even their ideas seemed dubious: for example Trotsky's 'internationalism' and hard line economic theories at a time when NEP appeared to be restoring stability.

Other factors were responsible for Stalin's rise. Very important was his strength as General Secretary, even before Lenin's death, enabling him to build up a strong score of support, e.g. packing congresses with his supporters. He also appeared moderate, a man of the centre; his policy of 'socialism in one country' appeared to meet Russia's immediate needs; he successfully inherited Lenin's mantle. He skilfully used Bukharin and the Right to oppose the Left – and by the time he turned on the Right in 1929, the Left was effectively already dead and buried. Stalin was lucky – he could easily have lost his influence after Lenin's death, but the point is, he capitalised on the failure of his Left opponents to take advantage of these opportunities, partly because they underestimated Stalin, and partly because they did not have the nous or ability to get the party on their side.

A good answer is likely to consider the relative importance of the Left's errors and Stalin's strengths in accounting for Stalin's rise to power by 1929 (obviously both fed off each other to some extent), but the main focus should be on the Left's errors.

---

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

Examine the extent to which the terms of the Weimar Constitution were responsible for the collapse of democracy in Germany between 1928 and March 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 provisions of the Weimar Constitution which allowed and/or encouraged the undermining of the very democracy it was meant to uphold. These would include terms relating to elections and proportional representation, the powers of the President, particularly Article 48 and the choosing of the Chancellor by the President. Candidates will need to focus on the developments of 1928–1933 and will probably point out that these years spelt the end of German democracy but this was largely accomplished within the terms laid down by the constitution. They should show some assessment of ‘the extent to which’ the terms were so important by explaining how they were used (and abused) by the non-democratic forces – Hindenburg, his cronies and the Nazi Party in particular, and then pitting these facts against other reasons for the democratic collapse.

**Relevant material on the the importance of the terms of the Constitution may include:**

- because of proportional representation, Weimar governments were coalitions. In 1930, the grand coalition fell because it could not agree over cuts in unemployment benefit. (Part 2 of the Constitution obliged the state to provide social insurance.) In 1932 Proportional Representation allowed the extremist Nazi and Communist parties to gain powerful representation in the Reichstag
- the Constitution put a great deal of power in the hands of a President (already aged 81 in 1928) whose power was legally reconfirmed in the presidential elections of 1932
- the President had the power to appoint whomever he chose as Chancellor (he was

not obliged to make the leader of the largest party chancellor – otherwise Hitler would have received that position in July 1932)

- the President could dissolve the Reichstag and seek support for his own nominee in an election – as he did for Brüning in 1930
- under Section 48 the President could invoke his right to ‘take the measures necessary’ for the restoration of public security and so put the Reichstag ‘aside’. This article was used for 3 years between 1930 and 1933 and the government thus became increasingly authoritarian
- the constitution had created a weak central government and had preserved the federal state governments of Prussia, Bavaria and other states. Those who controlled the country after 1930 – President Hindenburg and right-wing politicians and army officers – could exploit its flaws and argue for stronger central government to deal with the Depression. The election of a Social Democratic government in Prussia in July 1932 encouraged right-wing politicians to turn to the Nazis for support and Papen’s unconstitutional step (taken under Article 48) to depose it
- Part 2 of the Constitution made provision for the ‘economic freedom of the individual’ and worker/employee co-operation ‘on an equal footing’. This angered some large scale industrialists who felt a more authoritarian government would keep workers in their place. These were therefore willing to give support to Hitler
- January 1933: under the terms of the Constitution, Hindenburg was to appoint Hitler as Chancellor. In February the ‘Protection of the People and the State’ decree legally suspended civil liberties and in March 1933, Hitler was able to win the two thirds majority demanded by the terms of the Constitution for its alteration and pass the Enabling Act.

**For a balanced answer, candidates will need to examine the extent to which the terms of the Constitution were less important than it might seem:**

- was it the existence of Article 48 or the attitude of Hindenburg that was more at fault? Stresemann had used the same article to counter hyperinflation, but this was only for a few months as a prelude to a full return to parliamentary democracy
- the Weimar Constitution had generally worked effectively before the coming of the Depression. This does not necessarily make the provisions of the Constitution less important but could be used to suggest the economic crisis was the most important cause of the collapse of democracy.

Another approach would be to point out that following the failure of the Munich Putsch, Hitler had been determined to come to power legally. Consequently the terms of the Constitution were vitally important in enabling him to do this. However, his determination was such that he was also prepared to use other methods such as provoking street violence through the SA and intimidating opponents.

Candidates are likely to conclude that the terms of the Constitution were important for a variety of reasons but that it took a particular set of circumstances for them to be linked to the collapse of democracy in Germany. Hindenburg and the right wing elites (as much as Hitler) wanted a revision of the Constitution towards a more authoritarian government with fewer powers for the Reichstag. However, to overthrow the Constitution would have been likely to invoke civil war, which the politically powerful army could not countenance. Papen might have risked it but Hindenburg was dubious and his options were therefore limited. He turned to Hitler.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### **Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938**

#### **B: The Nazi consolidation of power, 1930–1938**

Examine the extent to which Hitler succeeded in winning the loyalty of the army leadership in the years 1934 to 1938.

#### **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 relationship between Hitler and the army leadership. Candidates will need to consider how supportive the army officers were, whether they could be trusted, and/or whether their position posed any threat to Hitler's power.

**Material which suggests that Hitler could rely on the loyalty of the army leadership might include:**

- the lack of overt opposition shown in the early years of his rule
- the enthusiasm of some of the 'younger' army officers such as Blomberg and Reichenau
- the loyalty of Blomberg as Minister of Defence and Fritsch as Commander-in-Chief,
- apparent support for the 'twin pillar' idea and Blomberg's loyalty speech of June 1934 which encouraged Hitler to take action against the SA
- the purge of the SA in June 1934, which was designed to appease any unconvinced members of the Reichswehr
- army officers did not protest when Hitler took the position as Commander-in-Chief from August 1934 following Hindenburg's death and the oath of loyalty was given – perhaps this was Hitler's reward for destroying Röhm and the SA
- the Nazis' enforcement of law and order, nationalism and rearmament (1935 restored conscription) increased support from officers.

**However, there is also evidence which could be used to suggest that Hitler could not totally rely on the loyalty of the army officers:**

- the traditional aristocratic/conservative attitude of many army officers who underestimated Hitler in the early years of Nazi rule, believing he could be controlled. (Hindenburg also adopted this view.) They were anti-Nazi although they regarded Hitler with apathy and reserve rather than outright hostility
- older generals tended to be more hostile to Nazi activities, particularly the SA, than the younger men
- some officers (e.g. Fritsch) expressed concern about the pace of rearmament
- the growth of the SS was seen as a challenge by the army
- Hitler's expansionist ideas (which went beyond a reversal of the Versailles Treaty) were seen as over-ambitious although the majority of Generals failed to take plans seriously or were afraid to express fears
- the Hossbach Memorandum brought matters to a head
- Hitler felt compelled to remove Blomberg and Fritsch
- Beck's conspiracy to overthrow Hitler shows the opposition of some army officers in 1938.

Candidates are likely to conclude that Hitler was never entirely able to rely on the support of the army leadership in this period. They may identify key turning points in the relationship between Hitler and the army – the Night of the Long Knives or the Hossbach meeting, for example. They may point out that by 1938, Hitler's position was so entrenched it was almost impossible for army officers to oppose him with any success.



---

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

Examine the degree to which Mau Mau terrorism explains why Kenya achieved independence in 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.**

The focus of this question is upon the contribution made by the Mau Mau towards the achievement of independence for Kenya. Particular emphasis is placed on the role of terrorism as a tool of nationalism. Implicit in this area are the wider issues of the extent to which Mau Mau represented the majority of Kenyans, alternative forms of non-violent nationalism and the responses of the British rulers towards terrorism. To address the evaluative element of this question, candidates need to consider the other factors which also contributed to Kenyan independence.

- **Mau Mau:** reference may be made to the nature, scale and longevity of Mau Mau terrorism. The British were forced to institute a State of Emergency in order to contain the terror – which was particularly gruesome. It tended not to be focused in urban areas – being largely a rural phenomenon directed mainly against native Kenyans, who, to whatever extent, appeared to collaborate with the British rulers and settlers. By about 1958 the Mau Mau had been brought under control by the British – most of them were either dead or in detention camps while the remainder were isolated from potential support. The Mau Mau were always representative of the Kikuyu tribe rather than of Kenyan society as a whole and this inevitably marginalised them. Reference may be made to the very effective military action taken by the British and especially the counter-insurgency measures they adopted. Despite their limitations Mau Mau did keep the issues of independence alive and they did force the British to commit large numbers of security forces – at considerable financial cost.

---

Links may be made to suggest that some pre-independence initiatives, such as the Lyttleton Constitution, could be seen as the political response to Mau Mau actions.

### Other factors

- **Macmillan:** his role in the achievement of independence may be viewed as pivotal. He came into his Premiership in early 1957 – when the Mau Mau, although weakened, were still active. He came in as a ‘new’ Conservative. He was not cast in the Churchillian mould of a diehard imperialist. Macmillan’s focus was on Britain’s economic future and its status as an international power. The issue of retaining an imperial presence in Kenya was subjected to Macmillan’s pragmatism – would holding on to Kenya deliver Macmillan’s objectives? There is certainly scope here to explore Macmillan’s thinking and to evaluate the impact of Mau Mau terrorism on that thinking. Candidates may also consider the wider context in terms of the failure of the post-war colonial economic development programme and Macmillan’s growing leanings towards Europe. The issues of pan-African nationalism can be linked to Macmillan through his ‘Wind of Change’ speech in February 1960. Macmillan also put into office new people who were also sympathetic with his priorities, particularly men such as Macleod as his new Colonial Secretary. Macmillan came into office as a result of the Suez Crisis. This may have influenced his thinking on colonial issues and potentially had a greater impact on him and the future of Kenya than anything the Mau Mau had done up to this point
- **Pan-African nationalism:** the Mau Mau may be considered within the framework of the wider movement for independence across Africa. Comparisons may be made between the effectiveness of non-violence nationalist movements such as those found in Ghana and the terrorism of the Mau Mau. Similarly, links may be made with the violence of the FLN in Algeria. The wider nationalist movement may also be considered in terms of the overall direction of the movement for independence. Mau Mau may be viewed as part of this wider movement even though it focused its methods on terrorism
- **Early attempts at compromise:** as referred to above, links may be made between Mau Mau and the attempts to establish some limited power-sharing opportunities based on multiracialism. The details of the Lyttleton Constitution may be examined, particularly in terms of the motives of the British at this point. The role of the white settlers and their part in the independence process may also be considered
- **Kenya’s political maturity:** by the late 1950s it was apparent that new non-violent political leaders were on the scene. It was becoming increasingly clear that Kenya had developed the foundations of an effective political structure with competent leaders. Individuals such as Tom Mboya could be examined in order to suggest that Mau Mau terror was not the primary factor. Kenya was politically strong enough to establish a stable state, something which was clearly not the case under the Mau Mau.

---

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

How important was weak political leadership within France, during the years 1954 to 1958, in enabling Algeria to gain independence in 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.**

The focus of this question is on the impact of France's weak political leadership in the period 1954 to 1958 (when de Gaulle took over). The question calls for an evaluative approach in terms of determining the relative importance of weak political leadership compared to the other factors which also impelled France towards granting independence.

**Weak political leadership:** some may argue that France's initial response to the terrorism which began in 1954 was robust. Francois Mitterand (Minister of the Interior) made a strong speech committing France to retain Algeria. President Mendes-France increased troop numbers. He also appointed a new Governor, Jacques Soustelle. He lacked initiative and failed to propose a political solution. The French government was accepting moves towards independence for the neighbouring Protectorates of Tunisia and Morocco – but not Algeria. Old policies such as 'integration' were still backed by Soustelle. The new Premier, Edgar Faure, continued to hesitate and allowed the military conflict to intensify. The next government under Mollet and Mendes-France recognised 'Algerian identity'. France's colonial policy was in tatters. A series of new Governors followed each other – e.g. Catroux and Lacoste. In effect candidates may argue that the French leadership lacked direction and any meaningful commitment to a political solution. This position changed with the arrival of de Gaulle.

**Other factors:**

- **The role of Charles de Gaulle:** he may be regarded as central to the fulfilment of independence for Algeria. Although initially supporting the army's position he soon experienced a form of political conversion. His moves towards backing independence also had the effect of generating opposition from military leaders and this was transformed into the OAS. De Gaulle's contribution to independence emerged from a number of factors: a need to create political stability in France, and the Algerian issue was undermining stability, a need to establish France as a dominant European power and Algeria was a profound diversion in this process, a need to bring the army and its power under control. While the Algerian question continued there was always the possibility of the army's intransigence undermining France as a nation. To this extent candidates may argue that the army's actions in Algeria acted positively towards independence and they may suggest that this attitude and the actions it led to were directly linked to the loss of Indo-China
- **Political instability under the Fourth Republic and its impact on the army:** factors which enabled the army to indulge in its own political and military ambitions in Algeria were the political instability and weak political leadership. Premiers such as Mendes-France may be examined by candidates in order to illustrate these flaws and how the army exploited this. Mendes-France, it could be argued, had an opportunity to negotiate moves towards independence and he failed to exploit this. The army was largely free to determine its own strategies in Algeria and these often led to a growth in the power and membership of the FLN
- **The role of the FLN:** as the primary nationalist and terrorist group this organisation deliberately developed strategies that were designed to frustrate the French army and provoke the army into acts of brutality and terrorism which served to strengthen the FLN's support in Algeria. The FLN kept the drive for independence alive although by about 1958 its ability to challenge French control had been seriously undermined by the successes of the army. Candidates may suggest that the FLN failed to deliver independence because of the army's effectiveness and thereby imply that the delay in achieving independence was not directly linked to the army's attitudes after Indo-China, but rather the result of straightforward military success against terrorism.

---

**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**

How important was the failure of Lenin's government to provide 'Bread' in explaining the instability in the USSR 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.**

Candidates will need to examine the all-important issue of food. The new regime failed to end hunger despite promising 'Bread' and this led to intensified opposition. The problem was made worse by the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in which Russia lost the Ukraine, a key 'bread basket'. The requisitioning of grain under War Communism led to famine costing millions of lives. Clearly Lenin's government did fail to provide 'Bread'.

There were other reasons for this instability including the Tsarist Generals. They had fled from the Bolshevik armies in the early stages of the Bolshevik Revolution. Generals Alexeev Kornilov and Deniken had formed the Volunteer Army and besieged Ekaterinodar. They met fierce resistance and Kornilov was killed so Deniken abandoned the siege. Lenin prematurely celebrated the end of resistance because the real Civil War was yet to break out. In a short time the generals had built up White armies – Deniken and Alexeev in southern Russia, Admiral Kolchak in Siberia, Yudenich in Estonia, Mannerheim led the Finnish White army.

There is no specific date that marks the start of the civil war and candidates may well consider this as part of their answer. In January 1918 the Bolshevik-Left SR coalition had issued a decree to set up a Workers' and Peasants' Red Army to meet the growing threat of counter-revolution, but nothing was done until April 1918 when Trotsky took steps. The White Guards were also forming armies while foreign armies were establishing themselves on the borders. In May 1918 events became more critical when the Czech Legion (a group of about 40 000 Austro-Hungarian POWs formed to fight the Central Powers) feared they

were to be handed over to the Germans by the Communists and revolted. They took control of a large part of Asian Russia then joined up with the Whites. The Allies supported this resistance.

Another cause of instability was the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Lenin was determined to end the war against Germany and, against the advice and wishes of many, negotiated a very punitive peace with Germany. The terms were so severe that some Bolsheviks refused to agree but Lenin argued he had no choice but to sign. Russia lost one third of her European land including her part of Poland that she had held since the Napoleonic wars and the Baltic states – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to Germany. Turkey took the Caucasus and Finland; Georgia and the Ukraine were to become independent. Russia lost half her capacity and had to pay six billion marks in reparations to Germany. Some patriotic Russians joined the Whites because they opposed the government that had betrayed 'Mother Russia'.

Political change added to the instability. Opposition to the Bolsheviks especially after the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly created many enemies, e.g. Mensheviks and SRs joined the Whites when they were banned from the Executive Committee of the Soviets, June 1918. In July 1918 the Left SRs left the coalition with the Bolsheviks. Two Left SRs began an insurrection taking Cheka chiefs prisoner and occupying key communication posts. The insurrection was crushed in three days. The civil war began in the summer of 1918 but had been preceded by months of armed resistance. There were several attempts on Lenin's life.

The problem of the nationalities added to the instability. The break-up of the Russian empire: some fought the civil war to secure self-government and others fought to resist the break up of 'Russia, one and indivisible'.

The Civil War was a time of great confusion during which Bolshevik power almost collapsed on several occasions. The Kronstadt Revolt was the watershed marking the introduction of the NEP; one consequence of NEP was that agricultural productivity rose. Candidates will need to evaluate the relative importance of several factors to explain why there was so much instability. The answers may put great stress on the part played by the failure to provide bread, or may focus elsewhere. One good paragraph on the continuing problem of feeding the people and critical examination of other factors developing links to build coherence might prove an effective approach to the question.

---

**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, by the end of 1923, the German political system had recovered stability after the breakdown in government at the end of the First World War.

**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 show knowledge and understanding about the breakdown of government after the First World War and its effects on the German political system, and then to be able to assess how far Germany had recovered by the end of 1923.

- at the end of the war Germany had a political revolution. The appointment of a civilian government led by Prince Max of Baden in October 1918 and the abdication of the Kaiser in November 1918. During 1919 to 1923 Germany faced a series of political challenges from the left and from the right wings. Both political extremes were determined to end democratic government
- left wing opposition began in December 1918, some three weeks after the transition of power from the Kaiserreich to the new Republic, with demonstrations. The Spartacists broke from the USPD to form the KPD in January 1918 led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. They were motivated by internal difficulties within the USPD, their revolutionary links with Bolshevism in Russia, and by social and economic grievances in the German towns and cities. The Spartacist revolt was crushed but strikes were common across Germany, and workers attempted to set up independent socialist republics. In the spring of 1921 the KPD was encouraged by Comintern to try to seize power in Saxony, but failed. They were only successful in Bavaria

- right wing opposition focused on the terms of the Treaty of Versailles signed by the Weimar government in June 1919. They objected to the dictated peace, the variance with the 14 Points especially national self-determination, the war guilt clause and demilitarisation. The Freikorps and the Kapp Putsch were particularly incensed by the terms. Assassinations of signatories such as Erzberger and Rathenau by Right Wing opponents and eventually the emergence of the NSDAP, are evidence that the extreme right wanted to end democracy and reinstate a more authoritarian system of government
- the 1923 NSDAP Munich Putsch was more easily defeated. The Weimar Republic could call on the police and army to crush the revolt suggesting political recovery by 1923
- the Weimar constitution was very democratic and progressive. Contemporaries and historians debate whether the Constitution strengthened or undermined the new Germany and that the debate will be central to the candidates' essays. The system of Proportional Representation led to a succession of coalition governments. The argument that coalition government undermined the strength of the Constitution is less popular with modern historians than it once was. Article 48 allowed the President to rule by decree; again this has been interpreted as a flaw. Under Ebert, however, modern historians write, this power was used to resolve crises and restore parliamentary government.

Candidates may well conclude that the political system appeared to have recovered from the breakdown at the end of the First World War and that democracy appeared much more stable by the end of 1923. A fruitful line of enquiry might be the extent to which political recovery was superficial or deep-rooted.



---

**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**

How important was the impact of the First World War in explaining the political crisis in Italy in the years 1918 to 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.**

The crisis in Italy followed the emergence of the two new political parties – the Socialists (PSI) and the Catholic Party (the Popolari) to challenge the Liberal bloc. The parties were not willing to co-operate with each other; coalition governments were short-lived. This political instability meant social and economic problems and the growing threat from the Fascist Party was not addressed effectively.

**The War was a major factor in the crisis:**

- the Peace Settlement was considered ‘mutilated’ by many Italians and this disillusionment partly explains the Fiume episode 1919. The peace treaty agreed at St Germain denied Italy possession of Fiume and North Dalmatia. The treaty agreed at Versailles denied Italy any colonies in Africa. This created crisis through a feeling of national grievance
- the war distorted the economy particularly during the adjustment from wartime to peacetime production and so unemployment soared
- the war generated expectation of social change, many of the demobilised soldiers were drawn to Mussolini’s promise of a ‘trenchocracy’. The experience of trench warfare hardened soldiers’ attitudes against war profiteers and industrial workers who stayed on the Home Front and gained from rising wages. Equally Socialist Trade Unions grew rapidly culminating in the ‘biennio rosso’, 1918–1920

- the war also created a fear among the propertied classes that revolution was imminent particularly with the growth of the Socialist Party. They lived in fear of communism and looked to the Fascist Party to provide protection.

**Candidates will need to balance the impact of the war with other reasons to explain the crisis in the Italian state:**

- the political situation on entry into the First World War. Italians and their leaders did not even agree on entry into the war. Prime Minister Salandra secretly negotiated terms for land in south east Europe before joining the Triple Entente and defaulting on the Triple Alliance. Giolitti wanted Italy to remain neutral and his neutrals became the targets of street demonstrations and press campaigns. The Italian state had been in crisis in 1915
- the government presented a better post-war world as a reward for Italian wartime sacrifices. This raised the expectation of wide-ranging reform and so fanned instability when the reconstruction proved insufficient. The Fascists were able to play on the resulting disillusion. This fanned social unrest
- longer term foreign policy problems were also unresolved. Membership of the Triple Alliance had drawn Italy into an anti-French line of policy but had not assisted in the acquisition of empire
- the attitudes of the leading politicians also contributed to the crisis. The leader of the Liberal government tried to find a way of bringing the Fascist Party into the parliamentary system in order to out-manoeuvre the Socialists. Some historians believe Giolitti actually strengthened fascism rather than contained it.

Candidates will need to understand that the Fascists gained from the crisis but were, in 1920, still a relatively insignificant political force. In September 1919, D'Annunzio occupied the city of Fiume with Fascist support. Although he was forced out by Giolitti he had introduced a style of rule that Mussolini did not defend D'Annunzio in late 1920 because he had reconsidered his political tactics. He started to use the fasci to intervene in class conflict on behalf of employers against workers so building support from the middle class in north and central Italy.

Candidates will need to balance these factors in explaining the political, social and economic crisis in the Italian state. The war was clearly a significant factor but by 1920 events had moved on so other factors had developed, e.g. the 'biennio rosso'.

**HISTORY**

**UNIT 3**

**COURSE ESSAYS**

**HS03**

***Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870–1950***

**A: Population change in Britain, 1870–1945**

How important were developments in public health as an explanation for population growth in Britain in the years 1870 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.**

Some typical arguments which may be put for the importance of improvements in public health are:

- the lower death rates due to improved public health brought about by medical advances and social reform legislation meant more children reached an age where they were able to reproduce
- Chamberlain in Birmingham, and other local campaigns, cleaned up towns providing a healthier environment, enabling individuals to raise healthier children and live longer
- the provision of school meals from 1906 onwards and infant welfare clinics
- the improvements in public health, especially in support for pregnant women, e.g. maternity clinics spread after the Great War
- more people had a better diet – even in wartime when rationing enabled better nutrition for poorer classes.

A balanced answer will need to look at other factors that may have contributed to population growth. These might include:

- limitations on awareness/use of contraception
- the higher proportion of women getting married after the First World War
- the continuing limited perception of the female role – limited range of careers available to women, encouraged their role as ‘mothers’

- increased social provision – welfare reforms helping children/elderly in particular and providing protection in times of sickness and unemployment.

## 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**

Were trade unions the most important factor in the decline of the cotton industry in the years 1870 to 1950?  
Explain your answer.

In your answer you need not refer to the periods 1914 to 1918 and 1939 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.**

#### **Reasons why trade unions could be seen as critical:**

- the more powerful role of trade unions in the UK compared to the USA and Japan
- union pressure to maintain employment rather than innovation

#### **Examples of union concerns:**

- the refusal of the weavers to adopt the more looms system in 1931
- the complex piece rate system to which the wages were tied.

#### **Evidence of other reasons for the decline of the cotton industry:**

- 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
- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton
- the growth of the US cotton industry in the 1920s which saw its own domestic market boom behind the protective wall of tariffs created by Congress
- increased US and Japanese competition in China

- renewed competition in the 1950s from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong
- the loss of markets such as India due to the First World War
- the growth of alternative fabrics such as rayon in the 1930s which Courtaulds did develop too
- the low investment in the 1920s due to low profits and high interest rates
- the Great Depression in the years 1929–1939
- 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%)
- the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936
- only £2.8 million out of the £12 million available under the 1948 Cotton Industry (Re-equipment Subsidy) Act was used by the mill owners
- other industrialised countries such as Germany had introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941

##### **A: America, 1919 to 1929**

How important were the long-term problems of agriculture in bringing about the crash of 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.**

#### **Role of Agriculture:**

The context of agriculture needs to be examined since farming is a long term problem within the economy during the 1920s.

- farming did not enjoy the same prosperity that the rest of the economy did
- there were serious problems such as overproduction, soil depletion due to over farming and poor farming techniques. Share cropping and subsistence agriculture in parts of the South meant that African Americans could not buy equipment etc.
- farmers overextended themselves and borrowed too much from banks so that they lost their land when foreclosure struck
- when the rest of the economy began to falter farming was already in a bad way
- farming and farmers contributed to the crash because of the excessive borrowing that had gone on and their failure to develop markets. Prices of crops dropped on the exchanges so this also contributed to the decline in Wall Street.

#### **A balanced answer will also look at other factors:**

- a decline in world trade meant American industry could not maintain a high level of exports
- American banks overstretched themselves by lending too much

- unsustainable nature of stock market because of speculation and borrowing on the margins was an important factor. It overheated
- this led to the stock market crash but the market had been at dangerous levels and the warning signs had been there for industry such as overstocking of goods
- Republican policies had not helped the overheated stock market or monetary problems. They wanted industry and the markets to rectify themselves rather than getting involved
- Republicans and their policies in the 1920s had not helped farmers and so they were the poorest section of the economy and overproduction had been their way to enjoy some prosperity

The crash was caused by a number of short and long term factors. Agriculture was more a long-term weakness in the economy. The crash was waiting to happen because the government did not stop the over speculation or try to bring in a correction to the market.

Many candidates will argue that long term agricultural problems were contributory to the Depression which followed the crash, but that other factors were the cause of that crash.



---

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

How effective was the New Deal in helping the poorest sections of society in the years 1933 to 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.**

An explanation of the poorest sections of society could be diverse and wide-ranging and include African Americans and other ethnic groups both urban and rural. Also it could include poor whites in both urban and rural settings. Poverty could include: living in Hoovervilles, shanty towns, wrong side of the tracks in the South, on the streets of the cities. Unemployment and having to live on soup kitchens. Disease and misery were all associated with poverty. The New Deal helped some of the poor but not all. It was effective in some instances and not so in others.

**Effective were:**

- CCC provided jobs for a short space of time, hence people had wages and could buy food
- TVA – Tennessee Valley Authority showed what could be done in a very backward part of the USA with the development of hydro-electric power and this is considered to be successful
- NIRA – helped industry and as this picked up so too did jobs and hence people had work and so were able to buy food and/or rent somewhere for themselves
- where the poor were farmers there was some help for them through the AAA but this tended to help the better off landowner and not the sharecropper in the South. Nor did it help the migrant worker. So it is debatable as to whether this helped the very poor

- some Native Americans were helped on reservations through New Deal measures. This included the poorest sections of society
- when jobs were created through Federal Programmes the very poor could and did benefit.

Some candidates may wish to argue that charitable giving was helpful in the first instance rather than government aid.

**Lack of effectiveness**

- when the economy went into recession again in 1937 the poor were hard hit again showing just how temporary the respite from poverty had been
- Harlem was still poor and African Americans in the South still suffered discrimination and poverty and were again the first to be fired from their jobs
- the US government was not very effective with ethnic groups and marginally better with poor whites
- yet when the money was stopped in the late 1930s, programmes failed to help the poorest sections of society.

The New Deal failed to end discrimination for African Americans and women, so success was always going to be thin. Long-lasting success came with the TVA and little else. Therefore the success of the New Deal is very debatable and a case can be made for both sides of the argument.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03****Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1135****A: The Introduction of Norman Military Feudalism, 1066–1087**

How important was the contribution of knights to Norman military strength in England in the years 1066 to 1087?

**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.**

Norman rule was initially based on force and the enfeoffments/subinfeudations that followed Hastings were designed to support this. The Normans were dependent on knight service to:

- maintain the conquest
- allow mobilisation of large forces in times of crisis
- play a role in castle guard.

However, there were limitations to this. Overall the armoured knight may appear to be the mainstay of Norman military strength, but he played only a limited and usually defensive role in warfare.

- **Maintain the conquest**

To answer the King's military requirements and to protect the new order against rebellion it was estimated that William required 4 000-7 000 knights – an obligation he was unable to meet personally. Quotas were issued c1072 (Evesham Abbey)

They were fighting men armed, trained and equipped to be part of a mounted army on a Continental pattern

Knights were at first part of a military household (familia). These were usually young and unmarried with the advantage of swift movement. These were first seen as part of monastic quotas (Westminster Abbey 1086)

As immediate danger receded knights were enfeoffed but this was less evident in unstable regions (the north) where familias remained the pattern for longer

The King respected the privacy of the honours and the number enfeoffed depended on the individual barons as numbers conferred prestige.

- **Castle guard**

The regular work of the knight was to accompany his lord, campaign for at least 2 months at his own expense and give 40 days a year to training and castle guard

The importance of castles is relevant here as emphasis on castle guard shows (Windsor)

Some served permanently as castle garrisons and were eventually given estates nearby (Montacute)

- **Limitations of knights' contribution:**

Knights' fiefs later crippled the economic position of a barony

Barons came to rely on knights mainly for financial benefits (aids, relief)

Cavalry were seldom deployed in large numbers for fear of destruction

Hastings was an exception

William could also rely on other troops (the Fyrd)

The growing centrality of siege warfare and the importance of castles meant that a large cavalry force was relatively unimportant (siege of Norwich castle)

Limitations on service made them less effective as they formed only part of the army, the need to fund a mercenary army – most of whom served as infantry – led to demands becoming more financial than military (scutage, Domesday Book).

---

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

Examine the extent to which the period 1066 to 1135 was one of monastic change in England.

**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 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 be focused on the degree of change and continuity afforded by the conquest and the influence of monastic reform in Europe generally at this time. At the highest levels, answers will show understanding of the extent of change and continuity in English monasticism across the whole period.

The range of relevant factors will include Lanfranc's reforms, effects of patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, racial tension and culture clash, spoliation and the imposition of feudal service and the effects of the introduction of new Orders. A range of well-chosen factual examples should support answers.

- In the first generation after the conquest changes occurred that affected both the discipline of the monasteries (Lanfranc's reforms) and their personnel (Normanisation). Some abbeys also lost lands transferred to Norman houses (Le Bec) or to knights in order to meet the impositions of feudal service (Abingdon). Strains were caused by the maintenance of military households (Wulfstan of Worcester) and there were violent clashes as a result of the imposition of new practices (Glastonbury)
- The second generation viewed themselves more as 'Anglo-Norman' and monasteries benefited from an increase in both royal and aristocratic patronage. Refoundations

were made after the Harrying of the North (Jarrow, Monkwearmouth, Whitby) that continued the monastic tradition in this area.

The introduction of new Orders (Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinian canons) led to an upsurge in the number of those joining orders, as well as to the economy, particularly of the Cistercian foundations in Yorkshire. There were changes in the design, and layout of monastic churches now followed the *Decreta* of Lanfranc (Rochester, Evesham, Durham) rather than the *Regularis Concordia* (Winchester)

- Latin replaced the vernacular but annals were maintained through later writers (Orderic, Vitalis, Eadmer, Simeon of Durham). By preserving the past, a degree of continuity was maintained. There was continuity of English saints (Swithun, Cuthbert, Edmund, Werburgh) and hagiographers rewrote the lives of such English saints for new audiences (Augustine, Edith of Wilton, Wulfhilde of Barking)
- English monasticism also experienced cultural interchange on a wider scale than previously. The effect of an Italian archbishop from Normandy, Norman abbots – and monks – in the wake of the conquest and the impact of Bernard of 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
- in the first generation after the conquest there was spoliation of English houses, removal of native ecclesiastical leaders and their replacement by Normans, racial tension and culture clash, the introduction of new practices, rebuilding, imposition of servitia and the endowment of Norman monasteries with English lands. But English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of English and Norman culture, the introduction of the new Orders and being drawn into the mainstream of European reform; but English saints still protected their churches, attracted pilgrims and provided mausolea.

---

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

Examine the extent to which Henry VII's grip on power was threatened by the challenges he faced from internal rebellion and foreign invasion in 1497.

**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 focus of this question is on Henry VII's security in 1497 – and the degree to which that security was menaced by the challenges he faced in that year. Answers will be expected to explain a range of 'challenges' – including Perkin Warbeck, foreign support for Warbeck from Scotland and elsewhere, the Cornish rebellion, and the possibility of losing the support of disaffected groups within the nobility. Answers should focus on a range of issues in 1497, although it cannot be expected that coverage will be comprehensive or equal. Some answers will emphasise certain challenges more than others. Successful answers will be based on explanation and assessment; rigid narrative description will be of little value.

The key words 'grip on power' obviously invite analysis of Henry's position by 1497 – this allows scope for discussion of the success or otherwise of Henry's consolidation of power since 1485. Some answers may argue that Henry did not need to be very worried in 1497 because the danger period of his rule (the first two years) had already been safely navigated and that his position was effectively secure after Stoke in 1487. But such explanations should not unbalance the answer; the main focus must be on 1497.

Other answers may argue that the dangers he faced in 1497 were, in themselves, relatively trivial and easy to deal with – quite apart from the extent to which Henry had consolidated his power by then. One feature of good responses may be the ability to differentiate effectively between the seriousness and urgency of one 'challenge' rather than the others, perhaps suggesting that the threat from Scotland was significant whereas there was only a

very limited chance of the regional uprising by Cornish rebels actually weakening Henry's authority nationally.

There is, however, a plausible case to be made that Henry's position was seriously endangered in 1497. Perkin Warbeck was a threat Henry took seriously for many years. His marriage to the Scottish noblewoman, Katherine Gordon, raised the prospect of internal opposition supported by James IV – a Scottish invasion was launched in 1496. Although this was soon repulsed, Henry was worried enough to raise money and troops for a major invasion of Scotland in 1497 – the fact that the Cornish rebellion broke out while Henry's armies were moving north combined two different threats in an alarming way.

The Cornish rebels numbered about 10 000. The size of the rebel army was serious enough and support for the rebels from disaffected gentry and nobles such as Lord Audley made it seem more than just a regional protest. The Cornish rebels got a long way, to Blackheath in Kent. Even when the rebel forces were defeated and driven back, there was a second rising and Perkin Warbeck landed in Cornwall in September to lead it. Although royal forces under Lord Daubeney crushed this second rising and Warbeck was captured soon afterwards, it can be argued that this was indeed a major challenge to the Crown – and might have been an even bigger danger with better coordination between the Cornish rebels, Warbeck and the Scots.

Foreign observers such as Raimondo Soncino made much of Henry's successes in 1497; and Henry VII continued to be twitchy about Warbeck gaining dynastic support from Spain or the Emperor. Henry had good reasons to fear potential disloyalty from elements in the nobility. Some historians argue that he never felt safe until 1506, when the Earl of Suffolk was handed over by the Archduke Philip.

Such evidence could be used to support the contention that Henry was under serious threat in 1497. There are equally strong arguments that Henry remained essentially in control. As usual, the key requirement is a relevant and balanced argument, supported by well-chosen specific evidence.



---

**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 policies enhanced the power of the Crown in the years 1513 to 1525.

**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 focus of this question is specifically on Wolsey's role in serving the interests of Henry VIII. There is scope for a variety of approaches and interpretations.

Some answers may legitimately challenge the implicit assumption in the question, arguing that Wolsey was not aiming to increase the power of the Crown because he was mainly concerned with building up his own personal prestige and power base. Others may argue that Wolsey's policies were subordinated to the immense power Henry VIII already had and that Wolsey was merely the loyal servant to a dominant king.

Many answers, however, will accept the premise of the question and will seek to explain a range of evidence showing the successes of Wolsey's domestic policies in strengthening the position of the Crown. Such factors might include:

- enclosures
- legal reforms
- finance
- political infighting with the nobility (for example the defeat of Warham)
- the relationship between the Crown and the Church.

One feature of good answers may be the ability to differentiate – between examples of success or failure, or between different phases of Wolsey's career. The end date 1525 is

there to avoid issues about the royal divorce and Wolsey's decline and fall; but it does allow for attention to the Amicable Grant and its significance for both Wolsey and the King.

Many candidates will be tempted into a discussion of Wolsey's character and the nature of his relationship with the King – but this must be directly applied to the question – biographical detail on Wolsey's career will have little value. Similarly there is some room for consideration of Wolsey's power and prestige based on his successes in foreign policy – but the central focus of the answer must be on domestic policies. As usual, the key requirement is a relevant and balanced argument, supported by selected specific evidence.

---

**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**

How important was the Millenary Petition in influencing James's response to Puritanism in the years 1603 to 1611?

**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 nature of Puritanism**

Candidates will probably attempt some definition of Puritanism – extreme Protestants who sought further reformation of the Church; the 'godly' or 'elect' who through predestination could perceive themselves as better than others. Collinson has provided the most accepted definition of Puritans as 'the hotter sort of Protestants'.

From such definitions, candidates can illustrate that the essential problem of Puritanism for James was the desire to reform the Church and thus, no matter how James responded, Puritans would always be a potential problem for James as their desire for reform and depth of belief could undermine his religious authority. As James was only Supreme Governor, as monarch, the religious problem of Puritanism was also a political problem.

Stronger responses will illustrate that the majority of English Puritans were essentially moderate and James's swift recognition of this, coupled with his own pragmatism, shaped his response. Many might therefore argue that the problem of Puritanism was not actually that great in real terms, even if the potential problem remained.

The Millenary Petition was important in shaping James's response as its moderate nature quickly made clear to James the difference between most English Puritans and the Presbyterianism of Scotland.

**James's response**

James was a Calvinist and thus had some sympathy with some of the Puritan agenda. Stronger answers will recognise that James responded to Puritanism as part of his general way of dealing with religion – moderation for moderates and persecution of radicals who posed a more serious problem. James aimed to maintain a broad church in which moderate Puritans, the vast majority, felt they could conform and would thus not pose an overt problem.

James wished to deal with the moderate Millenary Petition but also outline his general religious position; he did this through the Hampton Court Conference. This was reinforced by Bancroft's Canons. Both could be seen as part of the same process – establishing a broad church but with the machinery to remove those who could really pose a threat.

**The importance of the Millenary Petition:**

- distinction can be made between the potential threat of the Petition and how it was shaped to appeal to James's authority. In particular the authors of the Petition (rather than the 1000 claimed signatures, it was actually mainly the work of Henry Jacob) wanted to stress to James that they were not Presbyterians. This was done through an appeal to his authority desiring him to lead reformation of the church. They stated directly that they did 'not aim at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical'. By this statement they made clear their recognition of James's authority as Supreme Governor, thus accepting his religious and political authority. They recognised James as the 'physician' who would heal the Church. They declared that they did not aim at 'schism' and that they were not 'factious men'. As the central factor of the question, better candidates should have this kind of detail on the Petition
- linked to the presentation of the Millenary Petition was the Hampton Court Conference; stronger candidates will see this as part of James's response to the Petition, but also as a means to outline his religious position at the start of his reign. James used it, by inviting only moderate Puritans, to shape what he expected. Some might give the example of Dr Reynolds. These invited Puritans were balanced by bishops. James's use of the Conference to make clear his position was particularly clear in the 'no bishop, no king' episode where James made clear that he would never tolerate Presbyterianism.

Candidates can also consider what came out of the Conference rather than just show it was an immediate response to the Millenary Petition and in doing so they are addressing other factors.

**The importance of other factors:**

- the outcome of the Hampton Court Conference  
the most lasting outcome of the Conference was the King James Bible (1611). The vast majority of Puritans were happy with this English Authorised version. This was, like the conference itself, another example of James's essential response to Puritanism being focused on maintaining his authority. By removing the need to use the Geneva Bible and its problematic, potentially republican, marginalia, James was shaping the language of political discourse open to Puritans. James saw the Conference as a settlement and was determined to impose his authority. Thus Bancroft's Canons were designed to do this and better responses will

make clear the links between the Petition, the Conference and Bancroft's Canons as the legislative response. All were thus part of the same process as part of James's response to ensure that moderates could recognise his authority and radicals could be dealt with

- Bancroft's Canons  
as a response to Puritans, James's chief reaction was a determination to separate the radicals from the moderates and this was at the heart of Bancroft's Canons. Bancroft as a proto-Arminian was chosen deliberately as the means to do this. The key measure was Canon 36 which enforced the 39 Articles. By this 1% of ministers were removed from the Church. This figure can be used to illustrate that most Puritans were moderate but also that James's Church was left so broad that most felt they could conform. That many of this 'Silenced Brethren' removed themselves to America or the Netherlands lessened the problem of Puritanism for James. As the measure to deal with all Puritans and a form of enforcement, candidates can justifiably argue that Bancroft's Canons were the most important part of James's response to the problems of Puritanism in this period. The maintenance of a broad church, what has been referred to as 'the Jacobean balance', and the removal of radicals was at the heart of James's approach to religion and Puritanism
- the appointment of George Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury  
the appointment of Abbot in 1610 is symptomatic of James's maintenance of a 'Jacobethan balance'. A broad church would allow as many to conform as possible and thus not push many into opposition. Abbot was an orthodox Calvinist who had real sympathy with Puritans. That he could be archbishop, alongside other bishops like the Arminian Lancelot Andrewes, was part of James's response to Puritans and all groups; a church to which all moderate Protestants could feel they belonged.

Candidates may choose to link all these developments to the Millenary Petition or they may argue that the Canons, Abbot's appointment and the Hampton Court Conference were 'other factors'. Some may suggest that James's response was not shaped by the events mentioned here but by other, perhaps intellectual or political, factors. Those who have clearly defined Puritanism and linked the potential threat they posed and that James's reaction was based on his position as Supreme Governor, are in effect commenting on political factors that shaped James's reaction. Intellectually James's wish for a broad church can be seen as part of his self-image and desire to be 'Rex Pacificus' and acceptance of the Catholic Church as the 'Mother Church'. Reward any argument that shows balanced analysis and supported judgement in the higher levels.

**HISTORY**

**UNIT 3**

**COURSE ESSAYS**

**HS03**

**Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640**

**B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603–1641**

How important are religious factors in explaining the problems James I had in ruling Scotland in the years 1603 to 1625?

**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 importance of religion:**

There should be some assessment of the depth of problems created by religion. This can be illustrated through James's increasing attempts to strengthen his religious position in Scotland through the following methods:

- James sought to draw English and Scottish institutions together
- restoration of bishops 1606–1610
- Supreme Governor 1612
- Articles of Perth.

Assessment of importance of religion in relation to other factors should be made. In doing so, candidates will probably stress although there is no obligation that they should do so, that religion was the most important problem James faced. This was particularly the case given the strength of Presbyterianism in Scotland. Candidates can argue that James's absentee kingship was generally successful because of the other factors whereas religion proved more problematic.

**The importance of other factors:**

- absentee kingship: candidates can consider the problems of absentee kingship from the context of a problem beyond Charles's control. At first James stated that he would return to Scotland every three years. In reality he returned once in 1617 – he thus aimed to rule as an absentee king. James claimed that 'This I must say for Scotland, here I sit and govern it with my pen, I write and it is done, and by the clerk of the Council I govern Scotland now, which others could not do by the sword'. As a result the Scottish Privy Council became very important and should be considered as part of how James dealt with the problems of absentee kingship. He reduced it to a core of royal officials and this increased its efficiency and authority. Evidence of the Council Register indicates James kept a very close watch on Scottish affairs. This was strengthened by an efficient postal service which James used to send lots of directions to his Council
- control of Scotland: growing number of his councillors among the Lords of the Articles helped James manage Parliament. The introduction of JPs in 1609 increased influence of the Crown in localities. The role of the Earl of Dunbar (1605–1611), who moved between the two kingdoms frequently, also ensured good direction of policy by James
- the nature of power within Scotland: the elite were able to have much more influence and many were determined to assert their authority at the expense of the Crown
- the influence of Presbyterianism: in a similar vein to the power of the Scottish elite, the nature of the Presbyterian church and its relationship with the Crown can be considered
- overall assessment: James's objectives should be outlined to make a fuller assessment of problems. James, unlike Charles, had 'an instinctive understanding of Scottish politics' and he can be generally regarded as successful. The extent to which the problems were caused by policies was due to James or his ministers in Scotland may be part of an assessment. However, candidates can also point out that problems really emerged post-1617, particularly centred on religion but deriving from absentee kingship.

---

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

How important is weak military leadership in explaining the failure of the Jacobite Rebellions of 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 nature of the leadership of the Jacobites during both rebellions and should balance this against other factors contributing to the defeat of the Jacobite cause. Leadership can be interpreted as both military leadership on the ground, and the role played by both Old and Young Pretenders.

In 1715, the Earl of Mar was unable to take advantage of numerical superiority (he enjoyed the services of 5 000 men and 18 Scottish lords, in contrast to only 1 500 government troops), notably with his indecisiveness after the inconclusive Battle of Sherrifmuir; other Jacobite commanders, such as Forster and Derwentwater, can be similarly criticised. Also, the Old Pretender waited too long before landing at Peterhead. In 1745, the Young Pretender can be criticized on various fronts: he failed to make adequate efforts to secure French support, or support from English Jacobites, and demonstrated indecisive leadership (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. By this time the Old Pretender had become a relatively remote figure in Rome, giving little positive encouragement to supporters.

Other factors include the fact that, in both 1715 and 1745, there was a lack of promised French support; there was little French enthusiasm for involvement in 1715, and in 1744 the French were somewhat grateful for the bad weather which interfered with their plans for a landing in Britain. Also, Jacobite support within Britain was limited: whilst there was substantial Jacobite support in Scotland and parts of northern England in 1715, there is no



real evidence of support in the rest of England; the same geographical spread applied in 1745, but with smaller proportions. The Hanoverian regime was reasonably well-equipped to handle both rebellions: in 1715, George I had chosen a solidly Whig ministry and the Tories, most likely to be sympathetic to the Jacobites, were demoralised when Bolingbroke and Oxford fled the country; by 1745, the Hanoverian dynasty and the Whig government were even more securely established and 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 disunity amongst the Indian princes the most important factor in the expansion of British influence in India in the years 1757 to 1785?  
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 will need to explain the disunity amongst the Indian princes: the religious tensions between Muslim and Hindu and the commercial and political struggle between Britain and France – both of which increased disunity between individual princes. Balanced against this was Clive's desire to expand British influence by whatever means possible, with exploitation of divisions amongst princes high on the list; in contrast, Hastings demonstrated greater respect for native Indians, with emphasis on consolidation rather than expansion, but ultimately did take advantage of native divisions.

**Importance of divisions:**

- Muslim-Hindu split militated against unity
- most princes sought links with one of the European powers, rather than seeking co-operation against foreign influence
- deliberate exploitation of divisions and weaknesses by Clive
- widespread nature of corruption left co-operation much less a priority.

**Other important factors:**

- the military/diplomatic skills of Clive
- the impact of the Seven Years' War
- the support for puppet rulers demonstrated by both Clive and Hastings
- the cautious/determined approach of Hastings
- the collapse of French influence.

Substantial advance of British interests was possible during the Seven Years' War, with Clive determined to exploit any weaknesses among Indian princes, and replace them with British sympathisers or puppets. When the Nawab of Bengal, Siraj-ud-daula, attempted to take advantage of British pre-occupation to expel British influence ('Black Hole of Calcutta'), Clive's response was a series of victories culminating in the Battle of Plassey. After the Battle of Plassey (1757), the Nawab of Bengal, Siraj-Ud-Daula, was executed and replaced by his disloyal commander, Mir Jafar. He in turn was later deposed by the anti-British Mir Kasim, but Mir Jafar was restored after Hector Munro's victory at Buxar (1764). On his return to India in 1765, Clive also placed a British puppet on the throne in Oudh.

With corruption in Madras resulting in a major challenge to the authority of the pro-British Nawab, Hastings was sent to India to introduce reform and stability. He marginalised the position of the corrupt Nawab of Bengal, supported the pro-British Nawab of Oudh in the Rohilla Wars (1774), interfered decisively in a disputed succession in the Mahrattas against a pro-French candidate (1775) and acted decisively to protect the fortune of the Nawab of Oudh against the Begums (his mother and grandmother) in 1782. Most important of all, he had defeated a hostile coalition of Indian powers under Haider Ali at Bombay and Madras in 1780, after which he skilfully split the coalition. Although his priority had been consolidation, the corruption, ambitions and unpopularity of native princes had opened the way for further expansion of British influence.

Thus in the early part of this period the rivalries and ambitions of the Indian princes was a major factor, fully exploited by Clive; in the latter part, native corruption forced Hastings to take a more expansionist role than intended, but once he embarked on this course of action he followed Clive in deliberately exploiting divisions and rivalries.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841

##### **A: Government Response to Poverty**

Examine the extent to which the New Poor Law was more effective than the system it replaced.

#### 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 consider ways in which the New Poor Law was more effective, e.g.:

- the New Poor Law reduced costs to ratepayers and was more efficiently organised
- the workhouses provided a significant deterrent to the poor
- the apparent uniformity it created met the arguments of those who had disliked the disparate nature of the Old Poor Law and believed its provisions unfair.

For a balanced answer, candidates should also consider ways in which it was no more effective, or even less effective:

- it was unable to cope with the cyclical depressions in the northern industrial areas and consequently never became fully operational there
- it failed to supply the outdoor relief which some of the poor needed to help them out between periods of unemployment
- it created a social stigma which encouraged some to starve rather than enter the workhouse
- a 'centralised' system did not take account of regional variations and could not respond quickly or easily to disasters.

The best answers will make direct comparisons between the New and Old Poor Laws – commenting on whether the changes were improvements or not. Many will differentiate between the Act's effects on different 'groups' of the poor and on the middle class rate

payers, asking 'more effective for whom?' Essays that address such issues directly and convincingly should be well-rewarded.

---

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

Why was Roman Catholicism so important in causing political controversy in the years c1820 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.**

Candidates should consider ways in which Roman Catholicism was ‘so important’ in creating political controversy.

In an overwhelmingly Protestant England, in which Catholics were discriminated against in many aspects of public life (including Parliament) and at the universities, any consideration of Catholic ‘rights’ or ‘interests’ was bound to cause controversy. The Tory Party in particular had long been associated with staunch Anglican interests and issues of Catholic emancipation were to divide the party in this period. Furthermore, questions of Roman Catholicism were bound up with another politically sensitive area – Ireland. It was really only after the Act of Union when the blatant unfairness of making Irish Catholics support an alien Protestant Church revived issues of Catholic rights. Catholicism became ‘so’ important because there were Irishmen – such as O’Connell – who were determined to fight for the ‘Catholic cause’, and Tories, such as Peel, who were prepared to be persuaded. The issue was also of concern to those outside political circles, as the immigration of Irish to work in the growing industrial towns as agricultural gangs or as navvies on the railways, brought ‘pockets’ of Catholicism into England. Between 1820 and 1841 Roman Catholicism was the fastest growing denomination so it is hardly surprising that this created friction.

In assessing why the issue was ‘so’ important, candidates should not only explain a variety of factors; they should also consider how those factors linked together and make some judgement as to which were the most important. Reward any convincing analysis which provides a well-substantiated conclusion.

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

Examine the relative importance of practical political considerations and ideological aims in the introduction of welfare reforms by the Liberals in the years 1906 to 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.**

Answers are expected to consider and distinguish between practical political considerations and ideological aims in a context of competent knowledge of the major welfare reforms of the Liberals. They should weigh the relative balance of the importance of those political considerations against the impact made by the ideological aims of New Liberalism.

New Liberalism was derived from both a changing philosophy and changes in society evident by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Gladstonian Liberalism had emphasised individual freedom, responsibility and ‘self-help’, together with strict limitations on state expenditure. ‘New Liberalism’ had a different ideology and had to contend with different political considerations and context in the early twentieth century.

**Responses may refer to some of the following points in assessing the importance of practical political considerations:**

- in 1906 the Liberals had no great scheme for welfare reform and did not produce one. The reforms were piecemeal from 1906–1914, dealing with issues without an overall plan. However, they were focused on particular groups: children, the elderly, the unemployed and conditions at work
- a desire to tackle the problems of poverty and ameliorate them, certainly from one wing of the Liberal Party following the lack of social reform by the Unionists during

the previous 20 years. The need to maintain clear differences with the Unionists'/Conservatives' record in government (1900–1905) was seen as important in electoral terms

- the need to react to the findings of Booth and Rowntree (and, in terms of national efficiency, to the official 1904 *Report on Physical Deterioration* following the poor conditions of recruits during the Boer War). The main causes of poverty had been clearly identified as unemployment and old age
- the need for a healthy and fit working class for economic and military reasons, especially in the context of economic and military rivalry, notably from Germany
- the Liberals were also trying to enhance their appeal to the working class electorate and some were clearly conscious of rivalry from the new Labour Party. This partly explains introduction of improved conditions for British seamen, the 1906 Workmen's Compensation Act, the Trades Disputes Act, limiting the miners' working day and the Shops Act
- the political ambitions of Lloyd George and Churchill and also the ambitious civil servant, William Beveridge, at the Board of Trade. Lloyd George introduced legislation (e.g. pensions and National Insurance), but also promoted redistribution of wealth by progressive taxation (1909 Budget). Churchill implemented measures to combat unemployment and wage levels in the sweated industries
- before those reforms in the early years of the Liberal government, measures for promoting children's welfare had been introduced (school meals, medical inspection, the Children's Charter).

**In consideration of the ideological aims (associated mainly with New Liberalism) for introducing Liberal welfare reforms there may be reference to the following:**

- influence of the liberal philosopher, T. H. Green
- in terms of New Liberal ideology Hobson and Hobhouse advocated not socialism, but to 'supply all workers at cost price with all the economic conditions requisite to the education and employment of their powers for their personal advantage and enjoyment'. These included a right to work and to a living wage. Individual liberty for the working classes had not been fully achieved and was limited by the extent of social and economic deprivation
- recognition that the leading politician in implementing 'new radicalism' had been Joseph Chamberlain. His concept of state (and local government) action to tackle poverty and unemployment remained with many who had stayed in the Liberal Party and who advocated reform to improve living and working conditions
- encouragement of the need for action following the findings of Booth and Rowntree in their studies of London and York respectively and the revelations of poor health and fitness of recruits for the Boer War
- the intellectual arguments, as well as action, were pursued by some Liberal politicians and notably Churchill, Lloyd George and also Asquith. They continued to uphold the concept of individual liberty but together with state promotion of measures to improve conditions for 'the multitude' and especially the poor



- genuine belief in compassion and need for social justice held by many Liberals. New Liberalism was not, and was different from, socialism, but recognised the importance of using state power to bring about welfare reform. It attempted to focus on the 'larger community interest'.

Candidates can argue about the relative importance of the influence of practical political considerations, as against ideological, either way in terms of the introduction of welfare reforms, or with balance. For example, the issue is not clear-cut as to whether concern about the challenge from the new Labour Party was more important than the new Liberal aims to ameliorate the effects of poverty through state action. There may be reference to reasons for the reforms in the context of the historiographical debate about the decline of the Liberal Party, e.g. the views of Dangerfield, Wilson, Morgan, Searle or Adelman.

There may be candidates who try to weigh both political considerations and ideological aims against other factors. This is a legitimate (although not expected) interpretation of the question and such should be marked on their merits.

---

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

Examine the extent to which the policies of John Redmond explain why Irish nationalism changed during the years 1898 to 1916.

**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 address the extent to which Redmond's policies explain the changes in nationalism during this period from 1898, when there was no realistic prospect of the Westminster Parliament granting Home Rule and was the year which saw the first publication of the *United Irishman*, to the republican Easter Rising of 1916. They should also consider other factors causing Irish nationalism to change and their significance relative to Redmond's policies.

At the beginning of this period Irish nationalism essentially was the policy determined by the Irish Nationalist Party (officially the 'Irish Parliamentary Party'), whose MPs at Westminster advocated Home Rule for the whole island of Ireland of the kind which Butt and Parnell had advocated, and Gladstone had failed to deliver in 1886 and 1893. Points relating to that Home Rule policy objective of Redmond and his party may include some of the following.

- Redmond, first elected to Parliament in 1880, had backed Parnell when the Irish Parliamentary Party had split over Parnell's divorce and leadership
- Redmond became leader of the Party in 1900 and the most effective politician to hold that position since Parnell. He was clear that he wanted Home Rule – not independence for Ireland, was anti-violence and committed to parliamentary means

- 
- however, the moderate leadership of Redmond meant the Irish Nationalists had to wait for the advent of a Liberal government which could overcome opposition by the House of Lords to get through the necessary legislation and implement Home Rule
  - Redmond's Irish Nationalists with their policy of Home Rule clearly remained the more important and popular nationalist party until the First World War when the dramatic shift in the nature of Irish nationalism took place, especially in 1916
  - until then, Redmond had rather neglected changes taking place in Ireland. He focused on developments in the Westminster Parliament. Crucially, after the 1910 General Election, the Liberals needed Irish Nationalist votes in the Commons, especially in reducing the Lords' powers. Following pressure from Redmond, a Third Home Rule Bill was introduced in 1912, which under the Parliament Act timetable was due to become law in 1914. Like the previous Home Rule Bills it was moderate in that some Irish MPs would sit at Westminster, and though the Irish had responsibility for most internal affairs, the British government retained considerable control. The Irish Nationalists were enthusiastic (but not the Republican groups such as Sinn Fein)
  - the arming of Ulster Unionists led to the nationalist equivalent, the Irish Volunteers. Ireland (and possibly Britain) was probably saved from civil war by the outbreak of the First World War. Redmond and his MPs tended to downplay these developments and retain faith in the Liberal Government's ability to implement Home Rule and enforce it on a reluctant Ulster
  - Redmond accepted the delay in implementation until the end of hostilities, as Home Rule seemed the final decision (though not accepted by the Unionists) after the failure of Asquith's government to find a compromise with the Unionists
  - in 1914 most Irish Nationalists at first rallied to the war effort. Redmond encouraged Irish Volunteers to join British forces. 'Extreme' elements used that co-operation to oppose Redmond and increase their own support. 169 000 of the Irish volunteers backed Redmond in 1914, but 11 000 did not
  - by 1916 many Irish considered Redmond to be far too close to the British government and Westminster 'environment'.

More 'extreme' nationalist elements advocating (total) independence for Ireland with some wanting a republic had existed for decades, if not centuries, but in the later 19<sup>th</sup> century had little influence and small numbers of supporters. However, even before the First World War there were significant developments with a rival Irish nationalism emerging to challenge the objective of merely Home Rule. Responses may refer to the following:

- beginning of the Sinn Fein 'movement' in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. There were cultural developments through the work of the Gaelic League amongst others. Sport was encouraged by Sinn Fein looking for fit young Irish men
- the development of a separate cultural identity containing a concept of a (completely) separate political identity for Ireland. Aggressive, separatist nationalism challenged Home Rule, e.g. Arthur Griffiths started the *United Irishman* in 1898 which preached 'Sinn Fein' ('Ourselves')

- foundation of Sinn Fein as a party by Griffiths in 1902. The Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) began in 1907
- the emergence of more extreme nationalism coincided with the return of the Liberals to government in 1906
- growing concern amongst Protestants, including armed resistance, especially in Ulster from 1912, that Home Rule, let alone an independent Ireland, might again become a real 'threat'
- Sinn Fein's rejection of Home Rule (and constitutional means) and its call for complete independence, using violence if necessary
- however, in 1914 it remained a marginal political party with limited support for the changing nature and objective of Irish nationalism.

During the war the dramatic change in Irish nationalism took place. Responses may refer to the following:

- until 1916, Sinn Fein did not enjoy wide support
- the turning point at Easter 1916 with the republican Rising by the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB)
- the brutal way in which the Rising was suppressed and martyrs created by the actions of Asquith's coalition government. The Rising itself had not enjoyed widespread support. However, after surrender, martial law was imposed and the ringleaders executed. The 'martyrs' (15 executed in Kilmainham Gaol) became heroes
- as a consequence the Irish Nationalists, led by a seemingly complacent and ineffective Redmond, and still linked closely to the British Liberals, were severely damaged
- the change in Irish nationalism in 1916 was confirmed by later events, e.g. the winning of two by-elections by Sinn Fein in 1917 and the General Election of 1918 in which Sinn Fein won 73 seats (to the Irish Nationalists' 6) and formed the Dail.

The catalyst for the dramatic major change in Irish nationalism was right at the end of the period 1898–1916 with the Easter Rising and its consequences. British mistakes in brutal suppression of the Rising and the execution of its leaders greatly intensified support for Sinn Fein and its political agenda of independence and republicanism. In 1916 for many (if not most) nationalists, Home Rule, as still advocated by Redmond, was no longer an acceptable option. Irish politics had become polarised by intransigent Unionist opposition to Home Rule, or worse, a prospect of independence for Ireland, and Sinn Fein's determination to establish a 'free' independent Republic. There was no longer significant support for Redmond, his party and the Home Rule policy.

It was not so much the failure of the British government to carry through Home Rule up to 1914, or even 1916, nor the complacency of Redmond and his Nationalists at Westminster, which led to the growth in support for Sinn Fein, but British government actions in and following the Easter Rising. These produced changes in Irish politics which were crucial in

the advance of Sinn Fein and its gaining of mass support, and for the effective demise of Redmond's policies.

**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 extent to which Britain's economy in 1750 showed characteristics of under-development.

**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.**

**Focus of the question**

The question asks candidates to examine the extent of under-development in Britain's economy in 1750. Weaker candidates may focus on 'un-developed' as opposed to 'developed' but the concept of under-development suggests that there was some development and the capacity for more. In some respects, particularly the London market and its capacity for investment, suggests that Britain was developing, but the relatively unspecialised nature of agriculture suggest under-development. Some candidates will wish to make a distinction between England and the considerably more backward Wales, Scotland and Ireland.

**Elements which suggest that there was under-development but the capacity for change:**

- agriculture in Wales, Scotland and Ireland and significant areas of England, was largely subsistence-based. Much of this subsistence farming was shaped by existing practice, poor transport networks and lack of alternative employment, which would have created the need for an increase in production
- Britain was essentially rural – very few people lived in towns; there was no significant growth of provincial towns. The capacity for growth of markets was linked into the growth of manufacturing. The development of proto-industry, which was regionally

based, had the capacity to transform regional centres through the development of markets. Even where goods were produced for sale, the majority of the produce was sold in the local markets rather than exported outside of the area

- demographically, much of Britain was under-developed. In Scotland there was still evidence of famine and in much of England and Wales the population was shaped by the vagaries of nature and disease. Age at first marriage was high and life expectancy was low. There was the capacity for an increase in population through a fall in the age limit at first marriage for women, which would result in a higher number of births. This could happen with the development of alternative employment
- transport systems were under-developed. The majority of heavy goods were moved by river and sea. Roads existed in good repair where there was a need to move goods to market. Improvement in the infrastructure could take place where there was a need to move people and goods and where investment was possible
- although the banking system was limited, there is evidence that development of agriculture had stimulated a source of investment. Money created by trade was being invested in agricultural improvement and profits from agriculture were being invested in proto-industry. The role of attorneys was significant but greater investment and lending was possible through the merchant banks. This could be used to finance growth of industry and transport
- the use of power suggests under-development. Horse power was the most common form of extraneous power which was dependent on hay and corn provided by agriculture. Iron production was dependent on charcoal. The existence of fast flowing water and major coal deposits which were being mined in the north east demonstrate the potential for other more efficient power sources.

**Elements which suggest that there was evidence of significant development:**

- there is evidence that the developing market of London had encouraged the diversification of agriculture and stimulated the development of market gardening in the Home Counties. The development of domestic production had also stimulated specialisation of agriculture; innovation had taken place in East Anglia, resulting in increased productivity of wheat, and in response the clay lands of the Midlands had concentrated on production of cattle for meat. Other areas had also specialised to meet the demands of increased purchasing power through dairy products
- the development of proto-industrialisation had begun to transform key regions through the development of employment and markets; the East Midlands concentrated on the production of lace and hosiery, Yorkshire on woollen cloth, Lancashire on cotton, Bedfordshire on straw plaiting etc. The West Midlands concentrated on tin toys, buttons and small arms. The growth of regional manufacture had resulted in the development of the infrastructure necessary for the export of materials
- in proto-industrial areas and the agricultural areas around London there was a significant shift downwards in the age at first marriage. The growth of the market economy and wage dependency enabled family formation to begin at a much earlier age and, whilst infant mortality remained high, the longer period of child bearing enabled the population increase

- London was a major stimulus for development as a market for manufactured goods, agricultural produce and as an exporting base for foreign markets. London also had the manufacturers of jewellery, clothes, furniture, silver etc. It was a source of employment and enterprise.

### **Overall**

Candidates are likely to contrast the different regional extremes with some reference to Ireland, Scotland and Wales. The weaker candidates may focus on the extremes undeveloped and developed but there needs to be a recognition as to why Britain was able to become the first industrial nation and what evidence there was that this was taking place by 1750. There are lots of sources that can be used for this. E A Wrigley is very useful, but it is likely that candidates will refer to Pat Hudson and Peter Mathias for their assessments of industrial development. The more able may consider some of the more conceptually-based analyses such as Rostow's 'take-off'.



---

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

Examine the extent to which there was an improvement in the standard of living in the north, but not in the south, of England in the years 1780 to 1830.

**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.**

**Focus of the question**

This question contrasts the experience of those living in the north of England who are most associated with the process of industrialisation and those in the south for whom the spectre of Speenhamland is predominant. Some may argue that there is little difference between the two groups but the geographical distinction should not obscure the difference in experience of different groups: landowners in the south, factory owners and skilled workmen in the north. It is also possible to distinguish between the experiences of those employed in agriculture in the south and those who worked in areas contiguous to industrial areas in the north.

**The experience of industrial working classes in the north:**

- the classic debate about the consequences of the standard of living of industrialisation focuses on the northern urban working class. The evidence put forward by Aston/Hartwell and Hobsbawm/Thompson is inconclusive as it is based on fragile indices of real wages and can be distorted by the start and end dates for analysis. Few would deny the living conditions experienced in urban areas, the graphic accounts of Manchester given by Engels which focus on inadequate houses and the absence of sanitation. Such evidence is supported by low levels of life expectancy and significant periods of unemployment

- not all industrial workers were located in the towns. The case of the handloom weavers is a classic case of highly-paid workers being reduced to destitution as they experienced cuts in piece rates and dependency on the purchase of increasingly expensive foods.

**The experience of agricultural labourers in the north:**

- agricultural labourers in the northern counties where alternative employment was available tended to experience a higher standard of living; wages were kept relatively high through the sale of market gardening and the need to keep labourers in the locality. Such workers tended to be more likely to benefit from the improved nutrition, which came with improvements in agriculture. Wage evidence suggests that these labourers were paid more than they were in areas which lacked an industrial stimulus.

**The experience of factory owners, skilled workers and the professional classes in the north:**

- factory owners, skilled workers and the professional classes were all beneficiaries of industrialisation. Wage indices demonstrate a significant divide between engineers, solicitors, highly skilled workers and the majority of those employed in factories and mills. The purchase of land, the construction, maintenance and development of machinery required numeracy, literacy skills and qualifications which were at a premium. The capacity of such groups to purchase higher quality food and better housing set them apart from artisans and labourers. Factory owners were not always successful, nor were they always working men made good, but their ability to create profit was sufficient to enable them to participate in a substantially different standard of living to their workers. Nevertheless, life-expectancy for such groups was considerably lower in Manchester than for their contemporaries in Rutland.

**The experience of agricultural labourers in the south:**

- agricultural labourers in the south were those most affected by enclosure and the account given by the Hammonds in *The Village Labourer* is most apposite. Labourers found their ability to support themselves restricted by the disappearance of the common land and access to common fields to glean after the harvest. The increasing burden of poor relief in these areas is well-documented. The condition of the agricultural labourers was made worse by the Corn Laws and attempts to restrict poor relief through methods such as the roundsman system. The plight of the poor was made worse by the development of threshing machines and the use of Irish labouring gangs to bring in the harvest
- however, those who remained in the countryside, even on depleted diets, did experience longer life-expectancy. It is likely that access to fresh air, clean water and the easier disposal of sewage had a significant impact on health.

**The experience of landowners in the south:**

- landowners were well-placed to benefit from the development of the market economy. Those living in the towns needed to purchase food, not only the bread which was the staple diet of the labourer, but to meet the increasing demand for milk, butter, cheese and meat required by the middle classes. Landowners who were able to invest or borrow money to finance improvements associated with enclosure

benefited from greater output and market penetration. The profits made on their produce were used to build new farmhouses and to furnish them with the latest fashions. Sons and daughters were educated on these profits. A new lifestyle was developed distinct from the labourers who were discouraged from living in.

### **Overall**

The standard of living debate is one of class distinction. For different reasons that of the working classes in the towns of northern England and the villages of the south declined. The experience of northern agricultural labourers did defy the worst aspects of urban living. Those who benefited from the process of industrialisation were those who could either invest in change or whose skills needed to exploit the markets – namely the middle classes. Candidates are likely to refer to the traditional sources for the debate Ashton/Hartwell, Hobsbawm/Thompson but may also refer to Hammonds, Taylor and R S Neale.

---

**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 changes in the role and composition of Parliament, in the years 1832 to 1848, were the consequence of the 1832 Reform Act.

**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**

The question asks candidates the consequences of the 1832 Reform Act with respect to its influence on the role and composition of Parliament. Answers should show awareness of the different components of Parliament, namely Lords, Commons and Monarchy. The 'role' of Parliament might include legislation and powers. Changes should be clearly linked to the 1832 Reform Act.

**Changes in composition**

- **Changed the nature of representation**  
the Act ensured the enfranchisement of 20% of adult males, gave Scotland and Ireland wider franchises, extended the vote to £10 renters and the Chandos Amendment spread the franchise to renters in the counties
- **Changes to the Commons**  
the House of Commons composition became more reflective of the middle classes enfranchised in 1832.

**Changes in role**

- **Changed relative importance of different components of Parliament**  
The House of Commons asserted its primacy over the **House of Lords**. The Lords had suffered a serious defeat, and been forced to accept reform that it fundamentally opposed. 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

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

**The House of Commons** now became the dominant House, introducing a series of further reforms in the 1830s and 1840s. The 1833 Factory Act and the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act are the best known of these reforms, but reference may also be made to the Abolition of Slavery (1833), the Compulsory Registration of Births and Deaths (1835), The Mines Act (1842) etc.

Furthermore, the **Monarchy** was also made aware of its subservience to the House of Commons. The Crown was no longer able to choose the Prime Minister, who would then with this Royal acclaim 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 that his proposed Prime Minister, Wellington, could not command a majority. Queen Victoria was therefore forced to accept Peel as PM in 1841 when she wanted Melbourne.

- **Changed party dominance**

The Tory dominance of the previous 50 years was broken – whilst the party had governed for all but three of these years, it 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, benefiting from votes cast by the new middle-class voters repaying the Whigs for the suffrage.

- **Changed perception of Parliament's role**

An age of reform can be identified as the Whigs especially adopted the view that government could act to improve society and the economy. Government started to expand its role.

- **Changed the type of legislation that Parliament passed**

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 Peel decisively 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.

To assess extent, candidates should show awareness of what did not change and should challenge **the importance of some of the factors**. It may be argued that the composition of Parliament did not significantly change, as 71% of the Commons were still members of the British Landed Elite in 1841 and that such a body retained its conservative nature, rejecting the Chartist Petitions.

**HISTORY**

**UNIT 3**

**COURSE ESSAYS**

**HS03**

**Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848**

**B: Chartism and other Radical Movements, 1838–1848**

How important were the divisions amongst the Chartist leadership in explaining the failure of the Chartist campaigns in the years 1838 to 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.**

Candidates will need to be aware of the Chartist campaigns which peaked in 1838/9 with meetings and a petition to Parliament, in 1842 with a second petition, the rejection of which led to strikes and riots, including the Plug riots in Lancashire and finally in 1848 with a third petition following a rally at Kennington Common in London. The Chartist aims are the six points of the People’s Charter, namely

- Secret Ballots
- Universal Suffrage
- Equal Constituencies
- Annual Elections
- Payment for MPs
- The abolition of the property qualification for MPs.

Answers should focus on the failure of the movement. The question directs candidates to one factor, the divisions amongst the leadership. Other factors should also be considered, including the general divisions amongst the movement, the reactions of governments of the period and the failure to win over Parliament.

Answers should consider **divisions amongst the leadership as a reason for the failure of Chartism:**

- reference is likely to be especially made to the division between Fergus O'Connor and William Lovett
- 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. O'Connor also viewed with distrust the Complete Suffrage Union as a middle-class takeover of popular radicalism. Lovett supported the CSU
- O'Connor supported 'physical' force Chartism and Lovett 'moral' force Chartism. They also represented the Northern and Southern movements respectively. The division between different conceptions of Chartism significantly undermined the movement
- **Lovett was dismissive and jealous of O'Connor.** He attacked him as 'the great "I Am"' of politics; indeed the first settlement was renamed O'Connorville. 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. He disliked O'Connor taking over the movement. His 'new wave' of moral force was a reaction to O'Connor, but only served to undermine the movement
- O'Connor became increasingly focused on his **land scheme**, which attracted 70 000 subscribers. His advocacy led to the establishment of the Chartist Land Co-Operative Society in May 1845. The Land Plan failed, as the amount of money raised was insufficient to allow the purchase of enough land to set up subscribers as landowners. Only 250 out of 70 000 acquired a smallholding. This undermined Chartism.

**However, other factors should also be considered.**

**There were other divisions amongst the movement:**

- the Chartist movement was divided between geographical regions generally, with the result that there was little co-ordinated action. The 1839 Newport Rising was meant to be the precursor to further uprisings in Yorkshire, but instead it was an isolated event
- those who were more concerned with economic aims often drifted to supporting the other powerful counter-attractions for the dissatisfied (Ten Hour Movement, Anti-Corn Law League, Trades Unions)
- objections to violence lost support to the Anti-Corn Law League.

**Furthermore, the actions of successive governments were also responsible for the failures of the movement:**

- the governments' **attempts to alleviate suffering** and therefore remove support; Peel's government aimed to deprive Chartism of mass support by removing many of the grievances of those who sought further reform. The introduction of income tax enabled the repeal of the Corn Laws and ensured cheap food, whilst a Factory Act restricted hours of work for women and children. For those supporters of Chartism as a 'knife and fork' movement in response to economic depression and unemployment, the government was addressing their concern. Furthermore, the

ending of import duties was a great symbol of government intervention for the good of the majority

- government's contribution could also involve discussion of the more **confrontational response** that the movement engendered. Arrests of leading Chartists in 1839 and 1842, armed response to public meetings in Newcastle in 1838, riots in Lancashire and South Wales in 1839 (20 killed at the Newport Rising), use of the army in Wolverhampton in 1842. The use of troops transported swiftly by railway and the use of urban police forces after 1839 were part of this response.

**The failure to win over Parliament also was crucial:**

- the **lack of a middle class alliance with the working class** after 1832. Apart from a brief period in 1842 when middle class non-conformist radicals supported the movement, the campaigns threatened the middle class who had won the vote in 1832
- the reformed **House of Commons was still dominated by aristocratic interests**. Having created an aristocratic/middle-class alliance in 1832, the aristocracy were keen to prevent any further reduction in their power. The unchanged power of the aristocracy in the House of Commons (in the 1841 election, 71% of MPs returned were British landed elite) meant that the House happily rejected the First and Second petitions. Thomas Babbington Macauley was a key opponent of the Second petition in 1842, despite having been in favour of reform in 1832.

**Judgement** may involve arguing that **divisions amongst the leadership have been exaggerated**. O'Connor's preferred strategy was physical force, but it often focused on intimidation, and he sometimes prevented violence, as in January 1840 and April 1848. Lovett was capable of violent language, and having worked with radicals like Francis Place he understood how to move a crowd. Therefore the divisions between the two leading figures were not as great as first appeared.

Alternatively it may be argued that O'Connor so overshadowed other leaders that there was **no effective division amongst the leadership** that led to the movement's failure. O'Connor was the central figure, as a dynamic rabble rouser, editor of the *Northern Star* newspaper, martyr to the movement who served a prison sentence, MP for Nottingham from 1847.

Effective judgment could equally be focused on **prioritising the reasons** offered for the movement's failure, concluding that the failure to win over Parliament was essential, as this was the one body who could grant the Chartists' demands.



## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951

##### A: The Making of the Welfare State, 1942–1951

How important was the impact of the Second World War for social and welfare 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.**

In considering the importance of the impact of war on social/welfare reform, candidates might refer to both general and specific effects.

#### General

- made it more a civilian war than any before – a ‘People’s War’ – and so laid basis for a ‘People’s Peace’ in which major improvements in the lives of ordinary folk became expected
- created greater sense of national unity – the bombs did not discriminate by social class – so creating a consensus that major reforms would be necessary once the worst of the war was over
- forced government to produce plans for future reforms as a way of maintaining morale
- determined that future social and welfare reforms would go further than those in the past
- got people used to greater State planning and regulation in social and welfare matters.

## Specific

- mass evacuation of children and refugees between 1939 and 1941, and again in 1944–1945, brought wider awareness of the extent of deep poverty in the inner cities. 'Evacuation carried the evidence of deprivation...into rural and middle class homes'.(Fraser)
- understanding resulting from evacuation stimulated support for better housing, education, family allowances, health care some of which began to be introduced by 1945. 'Evacuation aroused the nation's social conscience' (Fraser)
- fear of mass casualties from bombing led to the reorganisation of the hospital service in 1940–1941 which laid the basis for proposals in 1944–1946 for hospital reorganisation as part of a national health service
- mass casualties from bombing also forced government to extend free medical treatment under the Emergency Medical Service to ever wider categories of the population and promoted the idea of a free national medical service after the war
- fear of mass casualties also led to the setting up of the National Blood Transfusion Service – another step towards a national health system
- the damage and destruction of homes made urgent the need for a major rebuilding programme after the war. About a third of the housing stock was damaged in some way during the various phases of the German bombing. This promoted debate about post-war planning laying the basis for the Town and Country Planning Act
- experience of rationing, conscription, propaganda etc. encouraged belief in State planning and control as a means of solving social problems.

## Other factors:

- presence within the war coalition of Labour leaders such as Attlee, Bevin, Morrison and Greenwood encouraged ideas about reconstruction
- wide range of pressure on government from academics like Abercrombie and Barlow, civil servants like Beveridge, churchmen such as Archbishop Temple, politicians in all parties, e.g. Willink and Butler of the Conservatives, Beveridge of the Liberals
- memories of the mass unemployment and pockets of deep poverty in the 1930s and a general determination not to return to these after the war
- Beveridge Report 1942 and its popular impact
- series of Reports and White Papers on such topics as National Insurance, a National Health Service, full employment, Town Planning, between 1942 and 1944
- the political consensus on the need for social reform resulted in the enacting of the 1944 Education Act, providing free secondary education for all and the Family Allowances Act 1945
- the findings of Mass Observation, opinion polls, by-elections won by the Common Wealth Party showed popular expectations of social reform
- the 1945 general election campaign further stimulated interest and debate on the form that social and welfare reform should take.

Candidates may conclude that whilst the impact of the Second World War was one amongst many factors stimulating social and welfare reform, it made at least three crucial contributions: creating greater awareness of deprivation and poverty; a determination to create a better society after the war; and faith in a more collectivist approach to solving social problems.

## 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 part played by Winston Churchill in creating a mood of national unity and determination in the years 1940 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.**

Although the question invites evaluation of Churchill's role throughout the period of his War Coalition government, candidates will understandably focus much of their time on the 1940–1941 period when Britain stood alone and Churchill was the nation's war leader in its 'finest hour'. Wider answers will, however, look at the mid-1940s, looking both on victories and disasters, as well as considering the role of other factors.

**Evidence and arguments for Churchill's importance might include:**

- his ability to shape the national mood through his speeches in the Commons and on the wireless, especially in 1940–1941, but also at other turning points in the war whether disastrous or hopeful, e.g. the Fall of Singapore, El Alamein, the Battle of the Atlantic, D-Day
- his creation of inspiring myths such as Dunkirk or the role of the Few
- his creation of an effective War Cabinet including his bringing in key Labour ministers
- his refusal to seek a compromise peace with Hitler
- his willingness to ally with Soviet Russia in the common struggle despite his deep distaste for Communism
- his ability to obtain aid from the United States before and after Pearl Harbour
- his popularity as an inspirational war leader.

**Evidence and arguments against Churchill's importance:**

- candidates may well differentiate between the early and later years of his War Coalition
- some may refer to his lack of support for social reform as an area where Churchill did not contribute enough to either unity or determination to create a new Britain
- candidates may well suggest that the 1945 election campaign and its results show that he had become a force for national disunity
- there may be reference to criticisms of him as a war leader, e.g. votes of no confidence.

**Other factors might include:**

- the sense of national unity which already existed in September 1939
- the serious situation facing Britain in the summer of 1940 – isolated and threatened with invasion
- German bombing both in 1940–1941 and again in 1944–1945
- Growing popular confidence in ultimate victory after the entry of America into the war in late 1941 and Russian victories such as Stalingrad in early 1943
- proposals for post-war reform – notably Beveridge – which made the war seem about a 'Better Britain' and not just national survival
- the effectiveness of greater State control for the war effort which many believed could be used to deliver a better future
- the role of other ministers such as Bevin, Morrison and Woolton, especially from 1942 onwards.

Answers cannot be expected to be fully comprehensive or evenly balanced, but successful answers will cover a range of factors between 1940 and 1945 and will show balance in assessing Churchill's importance and the role of 'other factors'.