

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work:

- Unit 2 – High Level Response



**Unit 2 –January 2009 –high level script containing responses to:**

- HIS2B The Church in England: the Struggle for Supremacy, 1529–1547
- HIS2R A Sixties Social Revolution?: British Society, 1959–1975

**HIS2B**

Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

- 1 (a)** Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from the views in **Source A** in relation to the aims of those who led the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536. (12 marks)

Both sources refer to the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536 which came at a time when many reforms, especially religious reforms, were underway in England. Many of those involved in the Pilgrimage felt the need to oppose these reforms. In Source A where the reasons are numbered, for example, it states ‘to have the observant friars restored to their houses again’ and ‘to have the heretics punished’. Similarly in Source B, numerous reasons are mentioned such as ‘peasants were dissatisfied with... new taxes’ and ‘the gentry disliked... lowborn councillors’.

Furthermore, both sources mention Cromwell by name, Henry’s chancellor and overseer of the reformation, as a key reason behind the pilgrimage. Source A mentions how those involved wish ‘to have Lord Cromwell...receive punishment’, and Source B states that ‘Cromwell had misused the power and thrust’ granted to him by Henry. It is apparent that Cromwell, as the ‘lowly born councillor’ was a major cause of the pilgrimage and that his downfall was one of the pilgrimage’s targets.

However, both sources do differ in places, for example where Source B claims the pilgrimage aimed to be ‘peaceful’ and Source A tells a different story, stating that those involved ‘demand’ change and desire heretics to be ‘punished by fire’ and ‘destroyed’. This suggests a much more aggressive form of opposition to the view in Source B.

Source B also states that the pilgrimage’s aim was not to ‘overthrow the king’, but Source A informs us that the rebels ‘demand’ the Supreme Head of the Church should be ‘returned to Rome’, clearly revealing that they wish the removal of the king’s control over the church and a return to Catholicism and papacy.

Thus there are clear differences and similarities between the sources, showing the differences between a selection of reasons given by those actually involved in the Pilgrimage of Grace, (although not every member would necessarily think the same), and a modern historian’s interpretation of those aims, which looks beyond specific reasons to wider issues such as ‘bad government’.

**Examiners Comments:**

*There is excellent identification of similarities and differences with some effective comment showing good understanding. Well written.*

*Level 4 (12 marks)*

Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

**1 (b)** How far was the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536 a threat to Henry VIII? (24 marks)

One of the great questions surrounding the Pilgrimage of Grace was whether the rebels presented a real threat to Henry VIII and his position as king. Some historians such as Elton (Source C) have emphasised that the motive of the pilgrimage was not to overthrow the king but that it was an attempt by the conservative faction at court and Mary's supporters to win a victory over Cromwell. Elton also emphasised the peaceful nature of the pilgrimage and this is shown by the agreement between Norfolk and Aske at Doncaster Bridge, where, despite considerably outnumbering the Duke's men, they avoided violence and wanted to negotiate. Overthrowing Henry was also never mentioned in the Pontefract Articles (Source A), where it seems that the pilgrims wanted instead to reverse the religious and economic changes which had occurred. It was Cromwell that they seem to see as responsible for these changes. Fellows, in Source B, also says, 'it was not a military rising designed to overthrow the King'.

It can also be argued that, even if the pilgrims did intend to overthrow Henry, they would not have been able to succeed. The Pilgrimage was a highly regionalised rebellion and there were no similar risings in the south, meaning that Henry could have relied on his allies in the south to protect his position. Moreover it is apparent that many of the Pilgrimage's leaders were not prepared to challenge the king and risk losing their lives. For example, when the rebels reached London, the nobility quickly dispersed when the Earl of Surrey's men approached, and by the time they arrived, the pilgrims had all but vanished too. It would therefore be fair to assume that as well as not being committed to their cause, the leadership of the pilgrimage was not of sufficient quality to be a threat to Henry.

Despite this, some historians argue that the Pilgrimage of Grace represented a significant threat to Henry's reign and could have led to his downfall if he had not been so shrewd in his handling of the rebellion. The fact that Aske had been able to assemble 30 000 men who were both well equipped and organised suggests that had they wanted to directly oppose the king they could have done so. In Source C, Elton states that 'the influential Percy interest was discontented', implying the power that could be held against Henry. Also the way in which Henry decided to give lands to the Earl of Derby suggests that the king was afraid of more nobles turning against him and joining the pilgrims. The only possible threat that Source A suggests, however, is the demand to return to the power of Rome. This evidence from the time, does not mention challenging the king.

In conclusion, the Pilgrimage was not a threat to the king but a threat to his changes and the man responsible for those changes, Thomas Cromwell. All the sources agree that the pilgrims did not have the inclination to remove Henry from power and if they had tried they would have failed as they did not have enough support.

**Examiners Comments:**

*This provides a balanced picture and investigates a number of relevant ideas. The judgement is not fully sustained but this uses both the sources and own knowledge to present an analytical response.*

*Level 4 (20 marks)*

**HIS2R**

**3 (a)** Explain why the number of women in paid employment grew in the years 1959 to 1964. (12 marks)

The first reason for the growth of women's employment was because women had shown their capability during the war years and although the belief that women should stay in the home to carry out domestic roles persisted, many women felt that the social stigma attached to women working had been loosened. This new sense of freedom was probably the most important reason for change as 'working women' became increasingly socially acceptable.

A second reason for the rise in numbers is that women could be paid less than men. Because there was a consumer boom, there was plenty of work during the early sixties managers were happy to save money by employing women

More women were employed because of their suitability for jobs such as secretarial/office work, which increased as businesses grew. They were also in demand as teachers since education was expanding and more people staying on at school. Girls had benefited from the girls' grammar schools set up by the Butler Act which also meant more females seeking rewarding work when they left school.

Finally there was a growth because women were anxious to earn money to be able to buy the latest gadgets, such as fridges and washing machines for their homes. These were heavily advertised and they had become more affordable. If a woman bought these things, she also gained more free time in which to work.

In conclusion women increasingly worked because it became more acceptable for them to do so. There were other reasons too and the growth in the number of jobs was important, but they would not have got jobs if attitudes had never changed.

***Examiners Comments:***

*A good range of reasons given and there is an attempt at prioritisation to take this to Level 4.*

*Level 4 (12marks)*

**3 (b)** 'The position of women in Britain changed little between 1964 and 1975.' Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

The 1960s was undoubtedly a time of change for women in Britain. An increased number were entering education and the workplace whilst a series of acts seemed to give women extra power and protection. The appointment of Margaret Thatcher as leader of the opposition at the end of this period could be seen as a sign that the position of women had changed. Between 1964 and 75, however, the position of women in society was evolving rather than undergoing a revolution.

An important change came through a number of acts passed by the government which affected women directly, In 1964 the Married Women's' Property Act allowed women to claim the money they saved from housekeeping. The Divorce Reform Act of 1969 allowed women to escape marriages: all they had to prove was that the marriage had 'irretrievably broken down'. Divorce increased as a result. Finally there were the Equal Pay Act of 1970 and the Sex Discrimination Act of 1975 which appeared to tackle the inequalities between men and women at work.

However, the advance in the position of women was not as great as these acts suggest. In 1970 women accounted for 35% of the country's workforce, yet only earned about 80% of male salaries. They also held the less prosperous positions and were under-represented in the police, army and government. It was also mainly middle class females that went to work as there was still some social stigma attached to working women who society thought should only be housewives.

The growth of a new feminist movement backed by Vanessa Redgrave helped change the position of women and had a significant impact on laws, such as that for equal pay. It also influenced other laws which were passed. Due to a number of deaths in the years 1958 to 1962, the government decided to make abortion legal in 1967 which gave women the opportunity to terminate unwanted pregnancies and as a result the abortion rate rose. Contraception using the Pill became available in 1961 and had an effect on women at this time. It was said that this affected attitudes and lifestyles and liberated women by giving them the chance to plan families more reliably. However, this only affected a small percentage of the population, as Catholics would not use it and in 1970 only 19% of married women and 9% of single women used contraception. Evidently the position of women in the short term did not change that much.

Improvements in education also allowed women's position in society to change. More women went to grammar schools and stayed on at school, even entering universities in growing numbers, although they never equalled the men there. The appointment of Margaret Thatcher, a middle-class woman who had attended a grammar school to the leadership of the traditionalist Conservative party was an example of what females could achieve. However, she married a successful businessman who had considerable influence and once she became a politician, she lowered her voice and adopted more manly mannerisms, suggesting that this achievement was 'despite' her being a woman. Even in 1975, women were vastly underrepresented in the House of Commons.

Clearly the position of women was beginning to change through this period. Thatcher's appointment and an increased feminist voice provide evidence for this change. The laws and liberalisation also appeared to give females more influence in society. However, none of the changes was extensive or really revolutionary. The period between 1964 and 1975 was no more than a period of gradual evolution and therefore I do not fully agree with the statement in the question.

***Examiners Comments:***

*A full answer which debates the changes mentioned and provides a balanced picture. The argument is sustained and the detail good. Just reaches Level 5.*

*Level 5 (22 marks)*