

**History**

Advanced GCE A2 7835

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3835

**Report on the Units**

---

**June 2007**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Advanced GCE History (7835)

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3873)

#### REPORT ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
2580 - 2582	Document Studies	7
2583 – 2584	English History	33
2585 – 2586	European and World History	53
2587 – 2589	Historical Investigations	69
2590 – 2591	Themes in History	95
2592	Independent Investigation (Coursework)	109
2593	Independent Investigation (Open Book Examination)	117
*	Grade Thresholds	121



## **Chief Examiner's Report**

**AS HISTORY [3583]**

**A2 HISTORY [7835]**

### **General Comments**

This Report can be read in conjunction with the Mark Schemes and centres are encouraged to discuss the Report with their candidates. The sections on individual Units comment only on questions to which there were a sufficient number of answers on which to base general conclusions but it will be helpful to read sections on Study Topics that have not been taught because generally relevant points are made about most questions.

What is the mood of a Chief Examiner at the time that this Report is written? Frustration that standards have declined alarmingly from the days when every A Level answer was an elegant piece of prose that was enlivened with classical references? No. There is no evidence that standards have dropped either at the top or the bottom. There is strong evidence that candidates are better prepared for the examination. It might be argued that candidates are more drilled to answer examination questions but this might also be interpreted as thorough teaching that is directed towards success in the examinations that are so important to candidates' progress and future achievement. However, rote learning, and rote teaching, will not result in the highest standards. Grade A candidates in every Unit are expected to show some individual judgement. Nor does this History specification make fewer demands on candidates than formerly. It is true that the range of some - but not all - Study Topics is narrow but the total programme of study demands that candidates must address a wide variety of historical topics and is comparable to previous specifications. The new specifications with 4 Units instead of 6 will address the narrowness of study but the constricting nature of the current specification should not be exaggerated.

Candidates must also demonstrate a wide variety of historical skills. The combination of range of knowledge, appropriate depth, the opportunity to pursue an individual problem and the requisite variety of historical skills means that candidates are well-prepared for higher education. Those who gain an overall A grade at A Level will have demonstrated very high standards in the different tasks that are needed in the combination of AS and A2 Units.

As for standards in the award of grades, decisions about the marks required to achieve grades are made on several bases but examiners' judgements are paramount and these include not only the views of a chief examiner but also those of an experienced team of senior colleagues. Archives of scripts from previous years are consulted to ensure year-on-year equivalence. Statistical evidence is available but is not used as a primary instrument. It is fair to use statistical evidence to check that standards are equivalent between Units in the same subject. For example, in this specification, there is no reason why different proportions of candidates should get an A or an E in AS English History Period Studies and AS European and World History Period Studies. The content requirements are equivalent and the assessment objectives are the same. If the outcomes are different, the statistics do not dictate a change but lead to an enquiry about the reasons. Other evidence might support or negate the need for a change. Statistics can be a useful guide to year-on-year standards. Questions should be asked if the proportion of candidates attaining any grade (not just A) is significantly different from previous years. Again, other evidence might or might not lead examiners to recommend a change. The results in this session of individual Units and the final results that aggregate the Units were very similar to those of Summer 2006 and indeed of previous summers.

It continues to be gratifying that new centres entered candidates for assessment and it is constantly refreshing to be faced with a new generation of A Level candidates. Most of them make considerable progress in AS whilst the standards that some achieve at A2 are impressive. Comments are sometimes made that it is difficult to fail A Level and a superficial reading of the statistics might indicate this. The reality is that AS offers candidates the alternatives to proceed to A2 and the full A Level or to terminate their studies at that first stage. Those who enter for A2 and therefore A Level will almost always be those who feel confident of some success on the basis of their AS marks. Accordingly, the proportion of candidates who fail A Level is smaller. This is preferable to the traditional pre-Curriculum 2000 system when failure in the end-on A Level meant that two years had been wasted in terms of qualifications. Correspondingly, the proportion of candidates who gain Grades A or B is higher because the proportion of failures is lower. Weak candidates who would formerly have failed after two years will often have withdrawn after AS. Happily a very high proportion of OCR's AS candidates decide to continue to A2. The AS-A2 'drop-out' rate is comparatively low.

Some question whether AS serves a useful purpose. The argument is that some candidates attain very high marks and have already reached A2 standards in their ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding. This is not a reasonable criticism of AS Level as such. In any form of assessment, some will do extremely well but this does not invalidate the exercise unless the proportion of these candidates is excessive. The proportion of AS candidates who are awarded Grade A is not excessive. It is a useful exercise for the most able because it should give them confidence in their abilities as they embark on A2. AS is a useful benchmark for candidates who attain the middle grades; it might spur some to do better at A2; others who had little idea of their capabilities beyond GCSE might be encouraged by what has been achieved. As indicated above, AS can also serve as a filter to the least successful who might well consider an alternative to the A2 stage in History.

The Specification comprises six Units. They represent five different types of task with a similarity in aims and skills only in the two AS Period Studies Units. Centres should study carefully the comments in this Report by Principal Examiners of the Units, especially the introductory comments which guide centres about the best approaches to each Unit. A cause of frustration to examiners is that many of the candidates who achieve the middle or lower marks could improve their work by paying attention to some basic requirements of Units that are not difficult to remember. Answers in the middle bands sometimes contain sufficient knowledge but it is not used to frame an explanation but included in answers simply to describe developments. Answers that are awarded low marks sometimes ignore such instructions in questions such as the need to compare sources or use both sources or Passages and their own knowledge. In the Themes papers, some focus on a narrow period instead of trying to consider long-term developments. Assignments in the Individual Investigations can be general essays that are written without references to sources. Centres are encouraged to ensure that candidates are familiar with the different demands of Units.

Except for the Sources and Passages Questions in Units 2580-82 and 2587-89, candidates are offered a choice of questions. It was noticeable that in some centres, including very large centres, almost all candidates selected the same alternative. Across the cohort as a whole, there were no significant differences between the popularity and apparent difficulty of the alternatives. This might indicate that some centres, including some with very large numbers of candidates, are not giving equal time to each of the Key Issues in Study Topics. This is unwise because, if a favoured Study Topic does not appear in the examination paper, candidates' choice is narrowed. There is also evidence that the selection of the same question by a large number of candidates leads to stereotyped answers; the best are satisfactory but a smaller proportion achieve the highest marks. The same point has been made about the choice of topics and coursework by the Principal Examiner of Unit 2592 Individual Investigations. Questions should not be subtle tests of candidates' ability to decode their meanings but they do require that candidates use their knowledge to frame appropriate arguments. For example, half a dozen questions can easily be set on the Elizabethan Puritans or nineteenth century Russia.

Candidates are encouraged to practise planning and writing answers but they should be discouraged from going into an examination to repeat prepared answers, perhaps to questions that have been set in a previous session and used in Mock examinations.

Most candidates allocated their time efficiently. Some did not differentiate between the times needed to answer questions that were weighted differently in the Documents Studies (Units 2580-82). In Historical Investigations (Units 2587-89) and Themes in History (Units 2590-91) candidates must answer two equally-weighted questions. Most divided their time effectively but some spent considerable more on one question than on the other.

Standards of writing continue to be a matter of public debate. The general quality of writing is stable but there are differences between individual centres. In some centres, it is not unusual to read scripts that are clearly and accurately written, even by candidates who have limited success in terms of History. In other centres, candidates whose knowledge and understanding are sound write inaccurately. Candidates are asked not to use abbreviations; this is most common when names are used frequently in answers, e.g. Dis for Disraeli or LG for Lloyd George. Abbreviations are suitable for notes but not examination scripts. It does not take much time to write fully and is good practice because one of the intentions of A Level History is to encourage accurate and clear writing that will be useful to candidates in other contexts. Handwriting - a different issue - is becoming a matter of concern, again in some but not all centres.

There were a few complaints from centres about questions. Units 2592-93 are Individual Investigations and do not give rise to complaints about examination questions at this stage.

Unit 2580 - 0	Unit 2583 - 1	Unit 2586 - 2	Unit 2589 - 1
Unit 2581 - 2	Unit 2584 - 2	Unit 2587 - 0	Unit 2590 - 0
Unit 2582 - 0	Unit 2585 - 1	Unit 2588 - 1	Unit 2591 - 0

Although these figures are very small, especially in view of the number of centres who entered candidates and the total number of questions in the examination papers, each was given serious consideration. OCR made a response to each after consulting the Chief Examiner and relevant Principal Examiner. They were discussed individually at the Grade Award meeting, when the relative difficulty of papers is considered as part of the process of deciding grade boundaries. Results of candidates who had answered particular questions were scrutinised at the Marking Review stage.

It is worth including a reminder of the things that occasionally go wrong. Candidates should be reminded to complete the information on the cover page. The most frequent error is the writing of the wrong Candidate Number. Question numbers should be indicated. It is usually possible to identify the question(s) attempted but sometimes not, especially when the script is weak. Attendance Registers should be completed accurately. An incorrect indication of presence or absence can lead to confusion. Envelopes should be posted to the correct examiner. It is very helpful when scripts are posted as soon as possible. They might not be marked for a few weeks but they are checked immediately for their contents and examiners are instructed to alert OCR to late arrivals - the centres might be contacted. Early receipts can lead to a view of the comparative popularity of questions, useful information at the standardisation meeting that precedes full marking.

A number of centres have joined OCR's History's ECommunity, a facility which allows virtual networks of subject specialists to share their knowledge, views and ideas. This is intended to increase support for centres by allowing virtual networks of those working with these qualifications to share their knowledge, views and ideas. The ECommunity brings together those working with History A Level, and allows them to discuss issues relating to their qualification. The web address is

<http://community.ocr.org.uk/community/history-a/home>

OCR has secured final approval from the Qualifications and Curriculum (QCA) of the new specifications to be taught from September 2008. Centres can use the two following websites: OCR's Home Page website: [www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk) and the History Page [www.ocr.org.uk/develop/history/historya](http://www.ocr.org.uk/develop/history/historya). They should note that there are minor changes to the provisional specifications already posted on the websites. OCR will be offering two alternative History specifications. In Curriculum 2000, awarding bodies were allowed to offer only one specification in every subject. OCR will offer an extensive programme of training to introduce centres to the new specifications.

This Report is intended primarily as feedback to the teachers in centres about candidates' performance and the reasons why some candidates were awarded high marks and others low marks. However, teachers are encouraged to discuss relevant parts of the Report with their candidates. The next pages are included so that teachers can photocopy them and either post them as notices or circulate them among their candidates. They are intended as advice to candidates about preparing for assessment.

**OCR HISTORY  
CHECKLIST  
AS LEVEL**

	<b>YES</b> ☺	<b>NO</b> ☹
<b>DO YOU KNOW WHAT CONTENT YOU SHOULD STUDY IN EVERY UNIT?</b>		
<b>DOCUMENT STUDIES: DO YOU KNOW HOW TO COMPARE SOURCES?</b>		
<b>DO YOU KNOW HOW TO TEST IF A SOURCE IS RELIABLE?</b>		
<b>CAN YOU LINK SOURCES AND YOUR OWN KNOWLEDGE?</b>		
<b>PERIOD STUDIES: CAN YOU WRITE AN ESSAY FOR 45 MINUTES WITHOUT NOTES?</b>		
<b>DO YOU KNOW WHAT RELEVANCE MEANS?</b>		
<b>CAN YOU WRITE A GOOD, BRIEF PLAN?</b>		
<b>DO YOU HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE?</b>		
<b>CAN YOU SORT OUT IMPORTANT AND LESS IMPORTANT POINTS?</b>		

**OCR HISTORY  
CHECKLIST  
A2 LEVEL**

	<b>YES</b> ☺	<b>NO</b> ☹
<b>DO YOU KNOW WHAT CONTENT YOU SHOULD STUDY IN EVERY UNIT?</b>		
<b>HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS: DO YOU KNOW HOW TO COMPARE PASSAGES?</b>		
<b>CAN YOU WRITE A 45 MINUTES ESSAY INCLUDING DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS?</b>		
<b>THEMES IN HISTORY: DO YOU KNOW THE MAIN DEVELOPMENTS IN YOUR OPTION OVER 100 YEARS?</b>		
<b>DO YOU KNOW THE MAIN TURNING POINTS IN YOUR OPTION?</b>		
<b>DO YOU UNDERSTAND CHANGE AND CONTINUITY?</b>		
<b>INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION: DO YOU KNOW HOW TO CHOOSE A GOOD TITLE?</b>		
<b>DO YOU KNOW HOW TO COMMENT ON YOUR SOURCES?</b>		
<b>DO YOU KNOW HOW TO WRITE UP YOUR ASSIGNMENT?</b>		

**June 2007      Report on Units 2580/01-2582/01 Document Studies (AS)**

**General Comments**

The total number of candidates for the June entry is fairly constant at 18,145, but there was a slight increase in all three units. Performance across the Units reflected customary patterns, with 2580 clearly the best in terms of attainment, reasonably closely followed by 2581, and then a drop to a more normal pattern for 2582 as befits the Unit with by far the largest entry. There was a wider spread of marks at the bottom end, although marks below 20 were not common. Most candidates were to be found in the 30s and 40s. It was relatively rare for candidates to score much beyond 50, largely because they found it difficult to sustain two Band II and above answers. Whilst usually a little more secure on the comparison question (where alas much of the 'extra' time has been spent, against our advice) Q(b) provides a much wider challenge and the tendency was to 'lose' the gain made in Q(a).

The standard and quality of work, along with predictions from Centres, was much in line with last summer, although we are pleased to see that our detailed advice is getting through. Most candidates do seek to answer the question, the sources at least providing a basis for this, and what separates candidates is their relative ability to handle sources appropriately. This, after all, is the essence of the three papers.

Very few candidates misused their time, although there is a marked tendency to spend too long on Q(a) and (a relatively new and damaging development) to introduce extraneous own knowledge that, in weaker hands, spirals out of control and moves far from the two sources and the key issue for comparison. This then leads to a significant minority whose answer to Q(b) is far too short. The requirement here is demanding: analysis and evaluation of four sources in relation to a proposition and the deployment of relevant own knowledge to achieve this, concluding with a judgement on the proposition in the light of the argument. These requirements cannot be met in an answer of little over one side and candidates should realise that if they write so little it is unlikely that they will be able to access the high bands. The converse fault, of writing at such length that the answer was unfinished, is less common since the removal of the old part (a) but it still does happen, usually because too much time has been devoted to new part (a).

A minority still compare the **wrong sources** (the ceiling here is the top of Band VI, 5) but we are more worried by the frequency of a new trend, that of **comparing all four sources in Q(a)**. Although the preserve of a tiny minority this never used to happen and appears to be growing. Candidates might scoff if warned but they should be made aware that one or two candidates in many centres are guilty of it.

Many Centres and candidates remain unaware of the need to evaluate sources in Q(b). They know to use provenance in Q(a) (although far fewer realise **why** they have to) but seem unaware of the need to assess this to give value to their points and arguments in Q(b). Without doubt this is the **single most serious fault on this paper**, evident in weak, middling and strong answers. It means they **cannot access Band I and II** which is reserved for those who do evaluate the sources in relation to the argument and key issue. We marked a good deal of excellent writing from candidates who framed balanced answers to the question, understood the sources well and could use them intelligently for reference and illustration. However they did not gain higher than Band III because they did not attempt to evaluate the sources. We are disappointed not to put greater distance between potentially able candidates and the efforts of uninformed candidates who tried to evaluate the sources even if they were incapable of much more than general assertions about typicality, reliability or usefulness. It is very important that candidates are taught the importance of critical source evaluation. We have constantly reiterated the need to do this in every report written, with very specific advice on how to teach this in the classroom, between 2004 and 2007. Centres are well advised to consult the general comments in the summer reports of 2004-2006.

These will be published in a new format later this year as the basis for advice for the AS Document papers in the new specification, so Centres will have the chance to read or re-read a consolidation of the advice contained therein.

As a result of this there is a marked Centre effect, commented on by almost all examiners. The problem, usually but not always, is with relatively small entries, where the candidates seem to have been taught the History and its content but not the requirements of the paper as referred to above. For example, whole Centres begin Q(a) with- ' *I shall begin by comparing the content of the two sources and then I will assess the provenance and then I shall reach a conclusion*'. Whilst certainly ensuring 'coverage' this is unlikely to reach the highest Bands precisely because it separates out and prevents linkage. It tends to lead to sequencing with comparison only in the final paragraph.

Our other major concern is with the very tenuous grasp of many candidates of the correct way to write English. In the past we have tried to be positive about candidates' attempts to communicate their ideas and skills on paper, always careful to see what they are trying to do behind the limitations of their expression. Spelling was often atrocious with basic errors from the first line (often on the paper or in the source). It is not a matter of time pressure. Sentence construction was sometimes so unclear as to obscure meaning and prevent effective communication. It is clear that many candidates seem to make no attempt at all to write accurately, copy proper names from the paper, or use the normal conventions regarding capital letters, agreement between nouns and verbs etc. What is to be done is a national issue but we cannot disguise the impact that this is having on a written subject such as History. It does not help to be told that the Duke of York wanted to be a Protectorate, that there were 'members of the papacy', that members of the Hitler Youth were muppets, that Hitler was an 'evil git', or that from the 'get go' there was opposition (from the start?) There are also many 21<sup>st</sup> century expressions, no doubt to assist communication in the classroom, which when used in answers, distort and mislead. For example, it is not very helpful to claim that Henry VI 'lacked the key skills for ruling' or that 'buy to let' was a social problem in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century it is not very useful to claim that Parnell was let down by 'a drying up of sound bites and a media frenzy over sex'.

What follows is our usual litany of the traps that candidates fell into with particular reference to those problems commented on by examiners this June.

### **Lessons to be learnt in answering sub question (a)**

There seems to be continued improvement here, although as remarked above the extra time available since the paper was restructured is not always well spent.

- Sequencing remains prevalent in weaker answers and it is a common reaction to examine the first source in this manner before comparing in the second half of the answer. Weaker answers often simply link separate accounts by 'however' or 'whereas'. Without substantiation they are given no credit for such laziness. Implicit comparison will gain Band V. A couple of comparative points, often quite randomly selected, and a hint of provenance are sufficient only to put a candidate into Band IV or the bottom of Band III.
- **The methodological straightjacket** is unfortunately on the rise and seriously impedes candidates. Some Centres seem to impose this upon candidates who then force the material through unhelpful and predetermined structures that invariably come between their natural intelligence and the material presented to them. Such structures are based upon the misuse of the mark band descriptor for Band I in part (a) whereby candidates work through a checklist of qualities for assessment and comparison, occasionally appropriately but, more often, not. In some Centres most discussed authenticity (a few knew vaguely what it was), typicality and consistency but ignored content.

This meant that the basis for discussion of these qualities was inadequate. In many cases it was difficult to discern what the candidates meant by 'consistency'. In other Centres candidates persistently commented 'this source is high/low on the hierarchy of sources' about each source. It is meaningless and irritating and Centres should **not** adopt this approach. They harm their candidates' chances of responding afresh to what is presented to them. They put up barriers to using the content of a source.

- **'Comparing as evidence for..'** was a trap for some. Most know they should compare/contrast content and provenance, but 'as evidence for....' is more challenging, requiring the candidate to use the point of comparison rather than simply noting differences and similarities. It is the ability to apply their comparative analysis to the issue in the question that marks a really strong candidate, making a 'genuine comparison' (Band I) or a very effective comparison (high Band II). It is important that candidates understand what they are doing rather than simply jumping through hoops and gaining a Band III or low Band II. Most candidates note similarity and difference with no apparent appreciation of the significance of these comparisons/contrasts in relation to the sources 'as evidence for....' Thus few can be described as 'genuine'.
- **Provenance** is too frequently seen as a separate, stand-alone issue. Candidates should be encouraged to understand **why** they have to comment on this. The function is to explain a similarity or difference and provide criteria for a judgement as evidence for a particular issue. When provenance appears as a 'bolt on', in isolation, it is not being used to reach an **explanation** or **judgement**. If this occurs it is difficult to go beyond Band III. Provenance must be **used** not merely noted or stated. Listing authors or dates does **not** count as provenance analysis.
- **Missing the focus of the question.** Candidates start by comparing without remembering that they are comparing the sources as evidence **for a particular issue** (attitudes to the Nazi regime, support received for the People's Crusade or how the catholic church reacted to criticism). We advise the use of a highlighter in the exam to emphasise the key issue in the question as an aide memoir. Again a Band III at best is the mark a candidate might achieve if they neglect the question's focus.
- **Close reading** of the sources, questions, introductions (steers) and attributions is of great importance. Please see the comments on individual questions for numerous examples of carelessness that lead to major misinterpretation and serious error.
- **Stock evaluation** is a major fault and is all too frequently divorced from the issue in question. Candidates seem very reluctant to engage with content and use it to exemplify general evaluative points. If this is the case, it becomes 'stock' in approach. We are in the world of assumptions, far removed from what the source has to say.
- **Too much own knowledge.** Own knowledge can be useful for establishing context and understanding key issues and individuals but used in long introductions or in asides that become whole paragraphs it diverts into irrelevance. It becomes a barrier between the candidate and direct engagement with the material.
- **Comparing what is there.** Candidates sometimes comment on what they would have liked to have seen rather than what is there or, in a variant of this, fail to spot that two sources maybe talking about different things. This was the case with question 2(a) on 2581, the German Reformation.
- **Asking the right questions.** Many candidates, using inappropriate approaches and assumptions, immediately ask themselves: is the writer reliable or is he/she biased? It would be much better to ask 'is the writer likely to be well informed?' 'What does this tell me that other sources do not?' 'What is the purpose of this source?'

The answers to these questions will be much more informative and would have saved candidates from much error.

- **The opinions of others.** Sometimes sources quote others. They consist of a dialogue, real or otherwise (Q3(b) on 2581), or deal with a range of theories. When candidates ascribe these views simply to the one writer or miss them out altogether, they waste what is frequently very useful evidence.
- **Avoiding automatic pilot.** This is part, we suppose, of the straightjacket approach but candidates who can engage with unseen sources are **flexible** and bring natural intelligence and common sense to bear on the comparative process. They pick up on the telling detail and gain the higher Bands. Centres by all means need to provide effective teaching and structures to help candidates but in the examination they will need to think independently.

### Lessons to be learnt in answering sub question (b)

As commented on earlier candidates do not spend sufficient time on this question. The key problem is to get the **balance** right between using the sources, their evaluation and deploying own knowledge as part of this process. The main fault is either to rely too much on source content or on own knowledge. The other key fault, referred to above, is a **failure to evaluate the sources**, which prevents candidates from moving beyond Band III, where they merely **address** the sources or **refer** to them. We expect candidates to argue a case based around the use and evaluation of the sources deploying knowledge to confirm or question the status of source comment and assertions and to identify the limitations of the sources by advancing alternative arguments not covered by them. What follows are the customary weaknesses which, if addressed by Centres and candidates, will result in better answers and better History.

- **Evaluation of the sources is crucial for Band I and Band II.** By this we do not mean mechanical and separate comments on provenance but an assessment of what the sources can contribute to the argument, their relative value, typicality and approach. Candidates should build their answer around the sources, using own knowledge to extend and qualify the information and insight provided. The sort of thing the candidates need to spot are purpose, date, (change over time), group, and judgement as a set.
- **Grouping** is intended to assist evaluation, a 'sort' method for candidates in terms of view, type, and possibly date of source. It is not intended as another straightjacket. Candidates must understand why they are doing this and must not simply start an answer with a stated grouping only to revert to traditional sequencing in the bulk of their answer. However it must also be flexible as all too frequently sources can bear different interpretations. Here a structure that focuses on two or three views can be helpful. Then sources can be considered in different lights. Occasionally grouping is not appropriate and a different 'organizer' is necessary. Q7(b) on 2582, Nazi Germany, was a case in point. Here the dating of the sources, pre-war and during the war was a more useful 'organizer'. An evaluation according to opposition group was another way of approaching this.
- **Referencing** of sources, where candidates simply use the sources as illustrative examples, ('source A says or shows...' etc) is, instinctively, what most candidates do. It confines candidates to Band III and below. Candidates who know they should evaluate, reference as far as they can, keeping the former for a separate section at the end (as they tend to in question(a)). They invariably resort to 'stock' points, completely unrelated to the question. It has become the new 'bolt on'.

- **Testing a claim.** Some really struggle with this because their concept of what to do is simplistic and their approach therefore mechanical, with many unhistorical or otherwise dubious statements e.g. '*Source A proves....; the writer was not there so this is unreliable; the writer is biased*'. All this is without any supporting evidence or analysis of the sources themselves. Centres need to practise this by using past papers in the classroom, rather than leave their candidates to struggle in the foothills of the Himalayas unaided. When it comes to reaching a judgement, let alone a reasoned one, candidates find it difficult to identify criteria for arriving at this and rarely take a sufficiently analytical approach. This is less of a problem where the question asks about relative success. It is apparently more difficult where the claim is causal. Again, Centres need to think about providing some simple pointers. The Civil War Q4(b) on 2581 was a causal question requiring criteria for assessing the main factor whilst Q7(b) on 2582, Nazi Germany, asked candidates to assess relative danger, the criteria being what constituted danger. Such skills are, and should be, transferable from the Period Studies, 2583-86.
- **Clear structure, argument and judgement** are vital but there are signs of improvement here. Although many lose their way, most return to some sort of focus at the end.
- **Careless reading of the sources.** As in question (a) this can create huge problems and examples are mentioned in the comments on individual questions. All too often candidates content themselves with just one point per source and thus miss much of importance, not least the differing interpretations that arise. The sources are central to the question. It is a careful reading of their view that candidates are asked to assess.
- **Sequencing** (ticking off one source after another) is to be discouraged as it prevents evaluation, linking and cross referencing. All are crucial to the higher Bands. It also impedes the examination of these and the grouping involved in assessment.
- **Evaluating the view of an historian** continues to create difficulties for candidates who resort to stock evaluation of the worst type. The key is to evaluate the view itself (is it economic, political, religious; are there any noticeable gaps; does it appear reasonable in relation to own knowledge etc?).

### Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2580

We were very pleased to see a considerable jump in the number of medieval candidates, up 137 from 696 last year to 833 this summer. They also out performed the other two document units. On the whole standards remain high, especially on the establishment of provenance and the evaluation of sources. The Crusades remain the most popular option but this summer Alfred may well have pipped the Normans into second place. No letters of complaint were received.

### The Reign of Alfred the Great 871 – 899

- (a) This produced some effective comparisons, aware of changes of method over time and the significance of Alfred's reform in the 880s. However, not many picked up on the importance of the different dates mentioned in the sources from the 890s preferring instead to run through tick-box work on provenance and the reliability of Asser. Poor Asser remains prone to the stockest of stock evaluation, he is damned for being too close to the King, damned for daring to be rewarded and damned for having written at all. Some candidates talk too generally about Alfred's handling of the Viking threat missing the focus on methods, the context of operation and the wide ranging tactics of the King. Some tried to see a false similarity between the fortress of Athelney and the late burghs whilst a few were confused as to the type of ship Alfred built (D refers to long ships not the 'tubs' referred to by some candidates).

- (b) Some candidates struggled with various aspects of this question, less with the 'careful planning' than to what might constitute 'military strength' (size and availability of armies, sea power, garrisons, military alliances, experience etc.). Some misinterpreted the question, seeing Alfred's 'successful leadership' as a third quality to be weighed-up against planning and military strength (it could be usefully subsumed either under planning or strength). The key point with the sources concerns their dating. Politically, militarily and personally the world of the 890s is fundamentally different from that of the 870s. The AB/CD split should have been picked up by candidates but surprisingly few did. Much of the threat of A and B is to see military strength in terms of bravery, charisma and leadership before the planning, following victory, could take effect. A fair number failed to pick up that Wilton was a failure, instead seeing it as the first of many Alfredian victories.

### **The Normans in England 1066-1087**

This question was the least successfully tackled on 2580. Perhaps the topic, although mainstream, was less secure for candidates. It was less understood and learnt.

- (a) This was the more effectively answered of the two questions. Weaker candidates seem uncertain about the relationship between York and Canterbury and could not see the memorandum on the primacy for what it was, a victory and assertion of power by Lanfranc. They read it to mean both Archbishops agreed and were harmonious and could not see that it represented a double humiliation for York, Thomas' own consecration having been withheld. More surprisingly some glossed over or ignored the problem raised by Norbert in D – allegations of forgery on Lanfranc's part. Only very good candidates were able to use Norbert's qualification ('this has been debated') as a provenance point strengthening Norbert as a source. This issue of 'force' in D was picked up well enabling some to rescue themselves from a question on unfamiliar territory. The royal might behind Lanfranc was well grasped by most.
- (b) Answers here were the weakest on this paper. Most candidates were familiar with the Normanisation of England and managed to focus their answer around this but much fewer knew anything about reforms of the English Church, despite the plentiful information supplied in the sources. The few good answers were able to see the connections between the two – that the Normans had proclaimed God's backing for their cause, that they perceived the Anglo-Saxon Church as corrupt by reformed Norman standards and that a key means of effecting reform was via partial if not considerable Normanisation. Even fewer candidates could focus on purely secular motives, despite the very obvious hand of William behind much of what Lanfranc did, or deployed their own knowledge to discuss how the Church was used to extend Norman control. The sources, especially B and C, could be interpreted either way depending on the slant or value given to them by candidates but few ventured into such Band I or II territory. Most wrote imbalanced responses which preferred to focus on simplified or unexplained views of Norman control. The steer to source C, 'Lanfranc's great energy and actions', made some candidates needlessly wary of the source's reliability.

### **The First Crusade and its Origin 1073-99**

- (a) This was reasonably well done by most with some excellent point by point comparison on why there was such strong support for the People's Crusade. Candidates picked up on tone, on the common use of the word 'divine' to describe Peter's effect and the role of his preaching. However, candidates were noticeably weaker on provenance. Most had little to say on Guibert in A despite the helpful steer in the introduction for those who didn't recognise him. Many cast doubt on his evidence given his Frenchness, missing the pointers on education and knowledge of the first crusade. Very few could see the problem for both Guibert and Anna in dealing with the People's Crusade, an embarrassing failure, before the victory of the First Crusade.

More surprisingly many also struggled with Anna's agenda and motive. Either she was dismissed as writing long after the event or considered a devious Byzantine. Candidates would do well to remember how important and authoritative much of her evidence is. Her account here is very careful and non committal, even when referring to her father's advice to Peter.

- (b) Almost all candidates pursued the line taken in the question, that the People's Crusade failed primarily because of lack of an effective military organisation. However, only better candidates could unpack what an effective military organisation might constitute (leadership, logistics, strategy, tactics, diplomacy etc.) and how for the People's Crusade lacked these. Some were able to cross reference material from the First Crusade very effectively. Weak answers simply talked about the First Crusade. There was plenty in the sources that could be used to demonstrate this line of argument. Candidates were much less able to focus on the other aspect involved, popular enthusiasm, either from a positive or negative perspective. The latter was picked up by some, taking their cue from source D's reference to anarchic attacks on Jews en-route, and using own knowledge on the Byzantine reaction of moving them on but hardly any could see the positives. Sources A and B gave plenty of examples as should own knowledge. Virtually all candidates discussed the Crusade as having no military expertise or organisation at all. There were details in the sources that could be used suggesting there was at least a modicum of military organisation. Anna refers to 'weapons, horses and other military equipment' along with 'soldiers' whilst Grabois mentions 'poor knights'. As a result candidates found it difficult to mount a counter argument unless they used, as many did, own knowledge on the Byzantine contribution, this reaction of the Turks and logistical problems. Source C was often underused and yet was a very useful source of information on Turkish tactics, the lack of leadership and Byzantine reaction. The useful steer was almost completely ignored.

### **Comments on the Individual Questions: Unit 2581**

Although not such a high standard as 2580 the candidates for 2581 performed well. The order of popularity remained unchanged with Q2 and 3 absorbing the bulk of the candidates, Q4 maintaining a reasonable share and possibly increasing it, and Q1 and 5 remaining minority interests, Q1 substantially so. There were 4608 candidates, a slight increase. Two letters of complaint were received on Q3(b).

### **The War of the Roses 1450 – 85**

- a) This produced a mixed response. Most had no difficulty in recognising that both sources portray York's hostility to Somerset. Fewer noticed that Source B provides reasons for this hostility whilst source D merely states it. Fewer still noted that neither source gives any evidence for Somerset's view of the quarrel. Better answers contrasted the partisan nature of source B (York's own account of his motives in 1452, an authorship that was missed by some) with the neutral, descriptive tone of source D. However, the mention of D as an anonymous foreigner led many into stock evaluation on reliability ('he probably misunderstood' or 'could not be well informed despite the detailed and factual information he provided'). Few made much of the differences in dates or incident being described. Source B is reliable evidence for the kind of propaganda York was putting out against Somerset. It is not 'unreliable because it is biased'. The question after all is to consider the sources as evidence for relations between the two men. The following is an example of genuine comparison.

*Firstly, sources B and D are written at different times and about different events. Source B refers to Richard duke of York raising forces at Dartford in 1452 against the King, but source D refers to the battle of St Albans in 1455. This therefore could mean that relations could have changed between Richard and Somerset. Source B states how Richard is 'determined to proceed against [Somerset]' and this is supported by Source D, whereby*

*Richard is standing up to Somerset once more. Another point of corroboration is that in source B Richard describes how Somerset 'works continually to ruin me in the king's eyes'. And source D directly supports this by saying the Duke of Somerset... 'persuaded the King to advance against [Richard]'. This shows that Somerset had a grasp over Henry VI and he could control, often, what the King did. In terms of provenance, source B is reliable. It is written by Richard himself at the time of the said events. It is unlikely that Richard would have twisted the truth or written falsely seeing as he was prepared to raise an army over such an issue. It is likely to be biased, as Richard is writing to the citizens of Shrewsbury, possibly for support, however his motives are likely to be true and indeed this source shows well the feelings of Richard towards Somerset. Source D is also likely to be accurate as the writer was anonymous and therefore would not have a vested interest to lie or be biased. It is written within few weeks of the battle as well, and this supports it more.*

*The way in which the sources differ is that source B concentrates much more on Richard's feelings towards Somerset, and how he had caused 'damaging of honour through the loss of Normandy'. Source D says however, nothing of this but rather concentrates on Richard's actions and motives before the battle of St Albans. It doesn't mention Somerset as being one of the 'traitors who were with the king' but this can be implied. Overall, source D shows that Richard's feelings in source B, were correct and that he did indeed, "proceed against" Somerset and the Lancastrian faction surrounding the King. Therefore, both sources show that Richard was willing to raise an army in response to the Duke of Somerset.*

- (b) Most candidates had good subject knowledge of what caused unrest in the 1450s. Focus on 1455 was weaker, but the humiliation of losing the lands in France, factional struggles, Margaret of Anjou's role and the mental state of Henry VI were all frequently cited. The Yorkist slant of three of the sources provided a good route into evaluation for some. Apart from sequential discussions (which causal questions like this can be prone to) the principal weakness was failure to give sufficient attention to the defeat in the wars in France, the question's focus. Of course candidates are expected to discuss other factors but they must give due weight to the suggested main cause even if they disagree with the statement. Some were able to link defeat in war with other factors such as Henry's failure as King and particularly his favouritism. Own knowledge of Henry's replacement of York by Somerset in command in France and the failure to pay York for debts incurred in the King's service was effectively used by some to support this argument. Some candidates had difficulty fitting the useful source C into this argument, though most saw it as furnishing evidence for the role of Margaret of Anjou in creating instability. Others used it to support the common line of argument that the root cause of civil strife was Henry himself. Weaker answers did not venture from this initial list of causes, including 'Bastard Feudalism' as an apparent force on its own, separate from the point about overmighty and quarrelsome nobles. As always better candidates could appreciate this link between the various factors.

### **The German Reformation 1517 – 30**

- (a) The different focus of the two sources presented some difficulty and led many candidates to paraphrase and explain the individual sources or to make overly general comparisons. Candidates kept losing the focus on the response of the Church to criticism. Many simply wrote about criticism of the Church assuming both sources to be similar in this respect. They failed to note that the two sources describe opposite responses to criticism. Many referred to Hus as an example of the Church's harsh treatment of heretics, as charged by Erasmus, without realising that his execution was a hundred years earlier i.e. 'in the past'. There was some understandable uncertainty about what Erasmus meant by 'a second rate scholar' (unlikely to be Luther, more probably Tetzel). Only a few candidates noted that the sources are addressing very different criticisms of the Church. Erasmus was discussing Church reaction to Heresy, theological or doctrinal, whereas Adrian was talking of corruption in an institutional and personal sense. Provenance was uncertain territory for

many. Some evaluated the date and authorship of source A well but many were unclear as to Erasmus' status. There have often been extracts from him on previous papers so his standing, views and reactions to Luther could have been better known. He was variously labelled a heretic who was burnt, someone outside the church (perhaps not clergy?) etc. Far more got into difficulty over Adrian VI, despite the strong steer in the introduction. They did not realise that a pope is a pope, so the provenance information confused them ('ruled for less than 2 years'). They assumed that when he spoke in 1523 at Nuremberg he was no longer Pope or had been dismissed. In particular, the significance of addressing an apologetic report to an Imperial Diet at Nuremberg in 1523 was rarely appreciated. If candidates had focused on the question (church response) they would have been secure on comparative focus blaming over-reaction on heresy in A, whilst admitting fault institutionally and promising reform in D.

- (b) Candidates understood what was required by the question. Their main problem was that many were convinced that there was no possibility of compromise between Luther and the Church and so a significant number side-stepped the question. Instead they provided an explanation of why there was no compromise, arguing a hierarchy of causes, rather than discussing whether or not compromise was possible, and on what issue, at any given moment between 1519 and 1523. This question also illustrated the importance in (b) answers of grouping and evaluation of the sources. Better answers analysed the sources in two groups: A/B (compromise not possible given papal and Lutheran attitudes) and C/D (compromise possible). Some grouped C with A and B on the arguable ground that, despite the apparent conciliatory tone, the key phrase is 'I neither can nor will forsake and deny the word of God'. The important point is that recognition of this contradiction, however it was incorporated into the argument, was part of evaluative process which distinguished the better answers. Again, source C (Adrian VI) threw many and was an excellent opportunity missed to evaluate a source on the grounds of typicality. The brevity of Adrian's tenure was important in the question's evaluative process as it went against what most candidates understood about the papal stance. However, as in A, many assumed he had been deposed for his reformist stance. A fair number of candidates use the dates of the sources to argue that the course of events raised the prospect of compromise under a reforming Pope, while others used their knowledge to suggest that developments in 1520 – 21 meant that Adrian's recognition of faults in the Church came too late. Others argued that Adrian's willingness to root out corruption did not signify acceptance of Luther's teaching. What followed is a band 1 answer.

*There are two sides to the argument that deals with the compromise between Luther and the Roman Catholic Church and Papacy. The first is the view that the reconciliation of Luther and the Papacy was impossible, because of the heresy of Luther, and this is the view shown in sources A and B. Conversely, sources C and D proffer the view that compromise between Luther and the Papacy was possible as long as both sides made some concessions.*

*The main factor that points to the fact that there could be no compromise between Luther and the Papacy is that Luther's ideas were heretical. The charges with regards to what was considered heresy are outlined by Erasmus in source A, but with Luther the accusation of heresy was very serious, since he denied the authority of the Pope (something Luther himself explains in source B). At the Leipzig Debate in 1519 he denied the authority of the Pope and General council in public and publicly allied himself with the notorious heretic. There was after this public alliance with heresy, no other option for the church but to excommunicate Luther because they could not be seen to be condoning heresy.*

*The fact that the issue was made so public also meant that it was not possible for Luther and the Pope to reach a compromise. Luther's pamphlets, such as the one in source B, stirred up controversy and began to appeal to national sentiment in Germany. The use of printing by Luther was very important in stirring up support – he contributed to a quarter of*

*the total publishing output of Germany at this time – and his many pamphlets meant that the issue became heightened and very much in the public eye. This made it more difficult for the Papacy to ignore the problem as it was such a popular topic.*

*German national sentiment also became an obstacle to compromise. Luther, through his pamphlets and many woodcuts, became a figure of German pride alongside people like Von Hutten, leader of the Imperial knights. He was seen as a “Champion of German Liberty” and the national sentiment of Germany began to expand the problem to an anti-Italian level (as many Popes were Italian and the Papacy was seen as Italian). The problem became almost too big for a compromise as it started to encourage social revolution in Germany – especially with Luther’s “Priesthood of all Believers” concept that he introduced in the August 1520 pamphlet “to the Christian nobility of the German nation”. Luther’s own insistence that he would not recant, or accept the authority of the Pope, also meant that there was very little possibility of a compromise with the Papacy. In source C, Luther states that he cannot “foresee and deny the word of God” and he will not recant because he cannot accept that the Pope “alone” has the right to interpret the “Pure Word of God”. Luther’s refusal to recant is also mentioned in Source B as he states that “to be subject to his rule [the Pope’s] is to be made a slave”. Luther’s denial of the divine authority of the Pope was directly contradicting Church doctrine and therefore the Church could not condone him or compromise if Luther was unwilling to accept Papal authority. Source D offers a factor in support of compromise because it states that the Church was willing to deal with abuses and reform. Church abuses had been the origin of Luther’s complaints – most specifically with the concept of indulgences which he attacked in his “95 theses” of 1517. The corruption in the Church was one of Luther’s main qualms, and if the Papacy could have been seen to be addressing these abuses, in the manner of Adrian VI in source D, Luther may well have settled for a compromise.*

*However, source D only mentions reforming and removing “corruption” in the Church. It does not deal with the issue of Papal authority which is the biggest part of the heresy accusations against Luther. It could therefore be concluded that even if Adrian VI had put into practice the reforms suggested in Source D, no compromise could have been reached because Luther would still deny the divine right of the Pope to interpret the Bible and therefore still be going against the central doctrine of the Church.*

*The main argument to suggest that a compromise could have been reached from 1519 to 1523 is if there had been more behind-the-scenes negotiations between both parties. If there had been negotiations between Luther and the General council, for example, perhaps a compromise (out of the public eye) could have been reached. Luther even alludes to this possibility in source C, stating that he should be allowed to “defend” himself against the “enemies” of the Papacy, such as “Eck” and therefore suggesting that a compromise could be reached as he has no qualms against the Pope ‘personally’. It is possible, even, that if the Papacy had kept a dignified silence, the furore might have died down and a quiet compromise (such as the reforms suggested in source D) could have been reached.*

*To conclude, it would have been impossible for Luther and the Papacy to reach a compromise by 1523 because of a variety of factors. The issue had taken on such huge proportions due to its being played out in the public eye, and the adamancy (sic) of Luther not to recant made it impossible for the Papacy to back down. Furthermore, Luther gave the Papacy no opportunity to forgive him, as he exploited the printing press to distribute his views and kept denying Papal authority, therefore going against doctrine. Some quiet negotiating may have saved the situation, but overall the stubborn attitudes of both sides meant this was impossible.*

## Mid Tudor Crises 1540 – 1558

- (a) Whilst there were some very effective answers the overall standard was disappointing. The content needed careful reading, so served to show up the failure of very many candidates to do this. Comments on the dates were often 'stock': 'the sources were both written soon after the rebellions so the authors would not have forgotten and would have known the true causes...'. Most candidates picked out greed as the common feature, but after that comparisons of content were often incomplete. Both sources attribute blame to both gentlemen and common people yet many answers mentioned one but not the other. Some noted both sources refer to disobedience but then failed to contrast their views of who was disobedient. There were legitimate differences of opinion as to whether either source placed more blame on one class or the other; what mattered was not which view was taken but whether it was backed by evidence from the sources. A common (and valid) view was that source D's reference to 'these greedy men' implies that Crowley blames the rich for rebellion. Better answers that took this line were those that also linked this view to the fact that Crowley was a commonwealth writer. Provenance linked to the sources' common Protestantism was similarly undeveloped. Some picked up that D was a protestant clergyman but thought C was not. If their common Protestantism was noted only a minority developed it relevantly, most commonly by arguing that this accounts for their failure to mention religion as a cause of rebellion. Some made the perceptive point that the provenance accounts for the focus on greed, a moralistic approach. These are some examples of observations which showed some thought about the nature of the Sources.

*'The sources are broadly similar in their explanation of causes for the rebellions. Both are written by Protestants, and so completely ignore religion as a cause of the rebellions. Another similarity is that they both describe a class conflict between the peasants and the gentry as a main cause of the uprisings...;*

*'...the difference comes when the Commonwealth writer shows his beliefs as a Commonwealth man, who aimed for social reform. He states that the gentlemen are ruining the lives of the poor, a typical view of a commonwealth man. However, Latimer was a leading clergyman, who has a responsibility for keeping social order, hence explaining his relative conservative (in comparison to Crowley) view on the nobility.'*

*'These differences are likely to occur because of the audience which they are written to and what the person wants out of it. Source C is written to persuade people that the view of the greedy oppressors isn't the right one so something is done, whereas source D is merely commenting on what he believes were the causes of the rebellion...'*

Some pointed out that neither source was really a reasoned economic analysis.  
*'...They can be read to suggest that despite being of different backgrounds, people are innately the same – greedy and violent. It is therefore of no surprise that the criticism in both documents stems from Protestant clergymen.'*

- (b) This produced some very good answers but overall the standard was disappointing. A surprising number diverted into religion as the main cause of a social economic problem. There was a point to be made here but for it to dominate was a mistaken approach. Others went in a political direction, continuing with the 'rebellion' emphasis in Q(a). The focus is a social and economic one. The most common fault was to ignore the focus on commentators at the time and instead simply discuss whether enclosure was the main cause of social and economic problems. Few had significant knowledge of contemporary commentators although the best did judge the source in the context of wider knowledge. The sources gave plenty of relevant material for discussion. All four were contemporary, three of whom refer explicitly to enclosure (and the fourth implicitly) and all of whom also advance other explanations. Basic grouping was achieved by most (enclosures versus

greed of some sort) but only the better answers discussed the differences in the sources' treatment of enclosure. Most of the best answers, however, supported their argument more by cross referencing than by grouping the sources. Source B presented problems in that there were a range of views, so it was difficult for the candidate to identify what Smith thought. Some decided that as the author himself was a knight the knight's views were more likely to reflect the author's. Many failed to distinguish at all, simply writing 'source B says that...' a clear indication that we are in for a bout of referencing. Others dismissed B because 'the people are imaginary'.

There was much laziness about Somerset's policies in relation to sheep and enclosures. It would have helped if candidates had attempted to define enclosures. Few did and fewer still concentrated on enclosure of the commons. It was permissible to mention modern emphases such as population rise, provided it was tied in to comment on how much of this could have be known to people in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century. Relatively few mentioned debasement. What follows, whilst having some limitations, is a good example of sticking to the question and showing an awareness of some other contemporary commentators.

*There is indeed evidence to suggest that commentators at the time mostly blamed enclosure for these problems. However, it is known that there were other causes, of which some commentators were not unaware.*

*Source A cites enclosure as a way to 'oppress the King's subjects', and Bacon emphasises the serious effect on the people, leading to the possibility that they 'will die of cold or starve to death'. In source B, the small farmer blames enclosures for ruining people, and suggests that they are damaging to agriculture because people cannot afford to farm. In source D, Crowley's 'poor men' blames the fact that the gentlemen 'enclose our commons' for rebellion. This links enclosure to serious social unrest, and is indeed valid. Kett's Rebellion of 1549 began with the tearing down of enclosing fences. Generally, enclosures provided a scapegoat for socio-economic problems, particularly with the encouragement of the Commonwealth Men and the perceived anti-enclosure feelings of Protector Somerset (1547 – 1549).*

*On the other hand, other causes were put forward by some commentators. In source B Smith suggest that enclosures have a positive effect on cattle, and that inflation is the real problem by saying that 'all things are more expensive now'. In the remainder of his discourse, Smith also puts forward valid arguments about other issues, such as debasement. In presenting the views of many different social strata, he deals with multiple economic issues and presents them quite fairly, not blaming the problems on a single cause. In source C, Latimer blames general 'greed' for rebellion. While the idea of enclosure could be, as in source A, associated closely with greed, it is not identical. As some commentators were aware, rack-renting was a major problem for tenants, and was a popular target of complaint. Source D, as well as mentioning enclosures, refers to mistrust of the peasants. However, this is not as great an issue. In some cases, the poor were blamed for social unrest, but this was not targeted as much as the actions of the landowners. Nonetheless, enclosures were not universally viewed negatively; the work 'Five Hundred Points of good Husbandry' even spoke in their favour. However, this was not very common.*

*Overall, it appears to be largely true that commentators, such as Sir Thomas Smith, ventured other arguments, some very valid. Enclosure was indeed one of the most popular scapegoats for problems of the time.*

## The English Civil War 1637 – 49

- (a) This was generally well answered, particularly the comparison of content. Most recognised that Cromwell's contribution was being praised in both Sources. Thereafter only the best recognised that there were differences in the way in which Cromwell affected the outcome of the battle, that A focused on his actual leadership in battle whilst C made much of the effect of his arrival on morale. Comments on provenance were a little weaker. Some noted they referred to different battles but few made much of the authorship beyond the fact that since both were parliamentarians they were biased in Cromwell's favour. Some candidates made too much of the dates of writing to impugn their reliability. Some made the mistake of saying that Baxter was present at Naseby, clearly contradicted by the last sentence in Source C. Others that John Hutchinson later became a royalist, presumably an inaccurate reference to his retirement into private life in disgust at the introduction of the Protectorate because of his republican ideals. One oddity was that many candidates quoted 'that Cromwell' (Source A) as though 'that' is an adjective indicating Cromwell's importance! Others thought it a disparaging reference to 'that Cromwell' by Lucy Hutchinson. The following, in varying degrees, show how thoughtful candidates tackled content and provenance.

*'Cleary Cromwell is a great leader and is able to turn battles around by another mark of great leader is the respect of the soldiers. Both A and C show this. Source A say "restored the other fleeing parliamentarians". Only a truly respected general would be able to save the force from rout. Source C agrees wholeheartedly. Richard Baxter says, "this sudden and timely arrival, with the great reputation he had among his soldiers, made a sudden joy in the army".'*

Some felt obliged to say that because they were both Parliamentary sources they were both biased and could not be trusted. Some considered this further.

*'...both were on the Parliamentary side, and therefore it could perhaps be suggested that the sources may be slightly biased, but this is unlikely – even Royalists would have to admit what a good leader Cromwell was'.*

*'...Marston Moor was Cromwell's first victory and his reputation was hardly blooming yet. Hutchinson may therefore be praising Cromwell in hindsight of his other victories to come. Source C is after the creation of the new Model Army in 1645. Therefore Baxter is writing about a more well-known Cromwell, who has helped craft a winning army'.*

- (b) Most responses to this were sound. It was clear this was a question about the reasons for parliamentary victory in the first civil war. Some took this as an opportunity to present well researched essays on the topic. The danger was to become over reliant on own knowledge forgetting that this is a document paper with the main focus of answers to part (b) on using the sources to evaluate the proposition and knowledge to extend and evaluate the sources. It should be subordinate. The other weakness was a failure to locate the reorganisation of the parliamentary forces accurately. Thus many misunderstood the relevance of Source A, which pre-dates the reorganisation. Very few were convincing in their judgement as in their concern to list reasons for victory they lost sight of the criteria for reading a judgement. Factors were addressed with scant regard for chronology – the King's mistake in failing to march on London after Edge Hill was often the only example given of his mistakes. Many demonstrated a lack of care in reading the sources, sometimes with serious consequences for reaching a judgement (such as the attribution of victory at Marston Moor to the New Model army). Many missed the tense of the verb in Source A. Lucy Hutchinson's judgement was that Marston Moor was 'the most complete victory that **had** been obtained in the whole war. She is talking about 1644. It did not mean that this unreformed Parliamentary Army's victory at Marston Moor would be judged the most complete by 1646. In source D some misunderstood 'volunteers' assuming these soldiers fought for no pay, thus making a nonsense of the earlier point in the source of regular pay.

### Louis XIV: France 1661 – 1693

- (a) Most answers correctly identified the contrast between the two sources. Better answers attempted, with varying degrees of success, to explain this by reference to the information given about provenance. The most successful did this by pointing out that they describe conditions in different regions of France and by comment on authorship, noting Locke's concern to point to smooth relations whilst not disguising some negativity about the fate of Huguenots. Few candidates developed their comparison to the full, even to the extent of not noting the religious affiliations of the writers. In view of the frequency with which Locke has appeared in this topic it is odd that no comment was made on the differences between his remarks on this occasion and the normally hostile comments of foreign protestant travellers. As regards Source A, some candidates seemed to have no knowledge of the nature of an ambassador's report and almost none knew that Savoy was an independent Italian State and so described him as a French courtier. Very few noticed its unusually early date. At first sight the differences between the two sources are striking but few commented on this. It would be good to see candidates bring a sense of 'what is going on here?', rather than just 'A says..... but B says....'
- (b) This was soundly answered by many candidates. Many found evidence to support the proposition in the last sentence of Source C and in Source D. Better candidates, however, noted that praise from a Catholic bishop does not show that Revocation was 'necessary'. They also argued that, whilst Source C, along with Source A, can be used to show that Louis regarded the Huguenots as a serious problem, the Revocation itself was unnecessary because pressure on the Huguenots had already solved it. A number of candidates diverted into irrelevant discussion from own knowledge of the effects of the Revocation or into discussing the economic value of the Huguenots. Candidates could also be careless, answering the question as 'serious threat' rather than as phrased, 'serious problem'. What follows is an effective answer to the question.

*The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes has been seen as one of Louis XIV's greatest faults, where he let his own views take over the benefit of the nation. However Louis and many of his contemporaries certainly believed that the Edict of Fontainebleau was not only necessary but a great victory for unity in France.*

*First they believed that the Huguenots did present a serious problem to the French monarchy because they caused disunity. Sources C and D certainly display that disunity could cause problems in France, as Louis describes the 'troubles' caused by the Huguenots and Bossuet suggests that Louis had 'defended Christianity' by revoking the Edict of Nantes. It is true that there were some problems created by disunity as bishops viewed the Edict of Nantes as an embarrassment. However the claims that revoking the Edict prevented war is not necessarily justifiable - the Edict had actually worked well to promote unity. As Louis and Boussuet are both likely to defend the Revocation because of their importance in French society and loyalty to the crown their views must be questioned. However even the Marquis of Saint Maurice in Source A agrees that disunity caused problems. Although the writer does not suggest that revoking the Edict of Nantes would be correct, he does suggest that the Edict had already become unnecessary as Louis had already defied the Edict by 'abolishing the law courts'. It is true that persecution of the Huguenots had already begun before the revocation but Louis and his ministers would argue that the revocation was still necessary as Huguenots still presented a problem - they were still a significant minority in France with an estimated 1 1/2 million still worshipping.*

*Even Source B presents that the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was necessary in some ways as the cost of converting people was having an effect on the state. Locke describes how 'those who become Catholics are mostly persuaded by ... money if they are poor'. Louis did grant tax exemption for three years to those converting to Catholicism - this was risky at a time when the country was already financially strained and the taxation system was ineffective. The revocation was therefore necessary to get rid of the Huguenots at a faster pace.*

*Despite this I believe that the argument that the revocation was necessary because the Huguenots presented a serious problem to the French monarchy is futile. Louis XIV may have imagined that they posed a threat to his kingship but in reality the Edict of Nantes had worked well.*

*This can be seen from Sources C and A but especially B. Locke displays that the Edict of Nantes had worked well, with Huguenots living on 'friendly terms' with Catholics. Perhaps this may be because Locke had only visited the South of France but it is true that there were no religious wars on the scale of those before Henry IV. In fact the revocation actually caused more rebellion than the Edict of Nantes! Some Protestants even dared to start up a protest.*

*Certain evidence even suggests the Edict was completely unnecessary; it was just formed because of Louis' fear. In Source A the Marquis of Saint Maurice suggests that Louis XIV 'did not love them and feared them even less'. This emphasis on the lack of fear displays that the Huguenots presented no serious threat. As the Marquis of Saint Maurice was an ambassador at the court he may have a clear idea of what Louis' feelings towards the Huguenots were. Even in Source C Louis seems to be portraying a lack of fear about the 'false religion'. He describes it as 'evil but also as a 'confusion''. However as this is an official document its claims must be questioned, especially as Louis' view that 'most Huguenots have already become Catholics' defies the evidence. There were still more than 1 million Huguenots - so many in fact that Louis felt it necessary to revoke the Edict in order to persecute them further. Bossuet certainly suggests in Source D that the Huguenots did not present a threat to the King - even calling it a 'poison'. This suggests that there was a real fear among bishops and ministers that the Huguenots would present a serious threat to the King.*

*Overall I therefore believe that although the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was not necessary because the Huguenots did not create serious problems, Louis certainly believed that they did. As a strong Catholic King he wanted religious unity which meant that any form of heresy must be stopped. Indeed Louis actually created more problems for his monarchy by revoking the Edict. The sources display that there were different views on this issue even at the time. Louis and Bossuet certainly saw it as a success for France but Locke and the Marquis of Saint Maurice may have been more critical. Despite this the sources do portray that the 'problem' of the Huguenots did vary between areas in France and even after the Revocation Huguenots in areas such as the Midi continued to practice their religion.*

## **Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2582**

There was a small increase in the number of candidates taking this paper. The total entry was 12,704. This pattern of questions opted for remains the same with a massive predominance of Q7 on the Nazis. The least popular are Qs 1, 2 and 5 with the latter (Parnell and Ireland) having the least take up. Stronger answers were, on the whole, found on Q1 and Q3. Weaker answers were found on Q2, 6 and especially Q7. No letters of complaint were received.

### **The Origins of the French Revolution 1774 – 92**

- (a) This was reasonably well done by most. Content and focus in relation to the king was handled competently. Some rather needlessly struggled to find similarities (that illuminating the Tuilleries and going to the Opera were examples of blunders and thoughtlessness, combining extravagances and elitist forms of entertainment!). More commonly candidates struggled with the provenance of both sources, often having little to say on either. Some did not seem to be clear on the role of an ambassador. The favourable view from the US and the less favourable from Britain were attributed almost entirely to the American war of Independence. Few picked up on the dates as a likely explanation (and much happened in a short period in the Revolution) with references to the Flight to Varennes (invariably miss-spelt) abounding. Some assumed it explained the difference between C and D despite Varenne occurring before either (in June 1791). Few suggested that the British ambassador might be closer to events and better informed. Some resorted to stock comment – both are foreigners and are either impartial or ignorant of French affairs.
- (b) Most candidates did not believe that the Constitutional Monarchy had much chance of survival and were able to mine the sources for relevant supporting material. Fewer tried to evaluate them. Most had some trouble in making an argument that it could have worked, largely because of their poor opinion of Louis XVI. There was a clear awareness that all but source C supported the statement and most grasped the sources accordingly. However, many candidates failed to read the question carefully enough. Some interpreted it to be about Louis personally rather than the political debate in general. Perhaps they were ignorant about what the Constitutional Monarchy was (some went back to 1789). Others preferred to write about why it failed rather than whether it was bound to fail. Knowledge could be impressive, dangerously so when it threatened to relegate sources to the occasional illustrative point. In some cases it was inaccurate, especially given the 5 month time span of the sources and uncertainty about the groups involved (who were the radicals, who sat in the Assembly?). Solemn(ly) was not a familiar word for some in C. It was variously interpreted as meaning Louis did not want to accept it or alternatively that he was forced to accept it, either of which did not help the analysis.

### **The Condition of England 1832 – 53**

- (a) This question was rarely well done by candidates who were clearly nonplussed by the statistics in Source A and found it difficult to explain the points raised there in their answers (relatively high level of offences on some issues indicating a persistence of traditional attitude, combined with effective enforcement if the conviction rate was anything to go by). They also found difficulty in comparing two pieces of information from the same person, Horner. Many could not see that the purpose was to measure Horner's assessment to Parliament against his statistical findings. Few noted that he was himself a businessman or that in B some of his claims for changing attitudes were based on Yorkshire whilst the statistics were for Lancashire. There was an obvious opportunity for raising points of typicality and region that very few picked up on. Some struggled with the attribution of A, not understanding what 'adapted from the reports for the half year ending' meant. This was an unnecessary diversion for those that discussed it. Weaker answers simply used the Sources as an opportunity to make general remarks about the working of the 1833 factory Act. It is vital on many issues of this topic to be precise about terms and categories. Those candidates who found themselves able to make precise comparisons between the two sources, on education, employment, certification, nightwork, age and health did well. Those who were vague or loose failed to connect the information in both sources.

- (b) This was much more successfully handled by most. There were some excellent answers by those who knew the period well and could evaluate the sources. Even weaker candidates could explain the issues and reference the sources, though some simply trotted out what they knew about the development of educational provision in the period, failing to argue a case for which was the most important factor in it. Most either agreed that Factory Reform was the key or argued that religious concern and the work of the National and British and Foreign Schools were just as important if not more so. Only a minority could see beyond Factory Reform to ask themselves who was educated by it and what the motive was behind promoting it. A closer attention to the sources provided the answer – in C the motive for proceeding with Factory Reform is clearly fear of law and order breaking down ('recent events in the manufacturing districts') whilst in source D it is to bring 'independent' children into line just as earlier in the source there were private initiatives to wean working class children away from 'working-class habits'. Whilst weaker candidates failed to see how useful source D was to their answer, preferring to focus on A and B, far more candidates failed to use Source C effectively. Indeed many failed even to refer to it, thereby losing an opportunity to use own knowledge to qualify its evidence. Graham's Factory Bill of 1843 failed precisely because of its educational clauses and was a good example to use if one was arguing for religion as a limiting rather than promoting factor. As with all the questions, candidates need to read the material very carefully. Source D provided many examples of error.

### Italian unification 1848 – 70

- (a) Most candidates handled this reasonably well with very little sequential comparison. They were more confident about the content than the provenance. Generally Orsini's role was well understood, sometimes too much so as his background and fate were discussed at length. The context of the source was well known and the significance of the dates picked up. There was a tendency amongst middling candidates to compare everything rather than focus exclusively on the source as evidence for the role Italians expected France to play. Relatively few could highlight this difference with real clarity (Orsini's romantic, revolutionary nationalism wanting a united Italy and seeing France as an obstacle who simply needed to be neutral for it to succeed whereas Cavour is a Piedmontese nationalist and diplomat who wanted French military intervention to achieve a North Italian kingdom and was prepared to pay the price of continued Papal sovereignty plus Nice and Savoy). Even good answers rarely made mention of the last point, Article 3, in Source B whilst quite a number failed to recognise the difference in the scale of ambition expressed in the sources (A the whole of Italy, B only the north). On the provenance relatively few candidates grasped with real precision the distinction between a letter and a treaty, or the precise significance of this particular letter, later used as a reason for Napoleon's ensuing action in Italy and written whilst in prison awaiting execution. Weaker candidates found problems in using the Treaty in Source B; indeed many thought it a paraphrase rather than the actual treaty. They proceeded to paraphrase it.

*Source A is a letter by Felice Orsini, the man who later tried to blow up Napoleon III for the nationalist Italian cause, leading to a change of mind of Napoleon. Source B is a list of the terms of the Plombiere Treaty. Source B was written in January 1859 and is a very formal, also in language, list made up of 6 articles, stating the terms of the agreement. Source A is a very sentimental letter by Orsini, written almost one year earlier than Source B on the 11 February 1859. The difference in tone is the most notable difference between both sources, whereas Source B is written in the formal, non-emotional language appropriate for such a treaty, Source A is written in a very emotional way, shifting between anger, "you have destroyed liberty in my country" and despair "I beg you to give Italy again the independence..."*

*Both sources differ not only in language but also in content. Whereas Orsini is asking Napoleon to stay out of the struggle between Austria and Italy and to make sure there is no other interference between the two, source B is asking for direct help by France in the*

*form of an alliance between Italy and France, waging war against Austria to liberate Italy, in case of a war caused by Austrian aggression. Source B aims to have French troops fighting in Italy, to liberate it from Austrian occupation. This is very much in contrast to Source A which states that it doesn't demand the French to shed their blood for an Italian cause. Differences not only exist in means, but also in aims. Source A demanding the liberation and reunification of the whole of Italy by the whole of Italy, is opposed by Source B's wish of the creation of a Kingdom of upper Italy (north) by means of Piedmont and France, rather than Italy as a whole. Further Source A even blames Napoleon for the state of his country, whereas Source B is willing to give Savoy and Nice to him, as well as paying for the war expenses.*

*The only point of agreement is the shared consciousness, that Napoleon III and thereby France, are crucial factors, for the liberation of Italy, be it by remaining passive, or taking direct action in war.*

- (b) This was well done by most, provided own knowledge did not completely take over relegating the sources to illustration only. Most candidates were well informed and able to cope with the sequence of events between 1859 and 1861. Most grouped the sources effectively, usually A and C to demonstrate Napoleon as an obstacle and B and D to illustrate his positive role in unification. The more sophisticated were able to use some sources for both, recognising that A and B especially provided evidence of Napoleon both as an obstacle and as a positive force. Many failed to use the sources in an evaluative way, surprising given what many clearly knew about Orsini from their answer in Q(a). They continue to find information in treaty form difficult to apply and were unsure how to treat the historian in Source D. The cartoon was evaluated more successfully than in the past, although there was much gratuitous comment on moustaches, the resemblance of Mr Punch to Napoleon, the relative size of the crown and the papal tiara reflecting their power, the greater girth of Napoleon etc. Nonetheless it elicited more evaluation than any other source on this question. What follows is an example of an answer that received Band 1.

*Both the sources displayed here and the remaining available evidence demonstrate irrefutably that Napoleon's complicated involvement in the process of unification simply cannot be satisfactorily reduced to a crude assertion that he was either an obstacle or an indispensable participant. He was, as the sources indicate, both. Source C eloquently exposes one of Napoleon's obstructive actions, his behaviour and Villafranca, supported by sources B and D. Sources A and C emphasise his similar behaviour over Rome. Yet, by contrast, sources A, B and D demonstrate the critical significance of Napoleon's aid, especially in 1859. Unsurprisingly therefore, any legitimate conclusion is nuanced and ambivalent.*

*Source C eloquently portrays Napoleon's betrayal of Italy at Villafranca in July 1859. The depiction of Italy manacled, and her head covered by Napoleon himself by the Papal crown, emphasise his own responsibility and the nature of the betrayal, whilst Punch, as a newspaper in a country where Italian unification was exceptionally popular, because of its similarity to the liberal constitution prevalent in Britain, might be somewhat biased towards the indignation expressed in the cartoon. The view that Napoleons behaviour at Villafranca constituted an obstacle is strongly supported by evidence. As source B makes clear, Napoleon promised 'To create a Kingdom of Upper Italy' that was intended to encompass Venetia (hence the reference in B to ending Austrian occupation).*

*That Napoleon not only violated this condition, but also contravened the Treaty's declaration that either side will make peace without the agreement of the other' compellingly demonstrates that he betrayed Piedmont, and as she was the drive behind unification, obstructed that process. B is particularly formidable evidence of this since it is an official treaty document and therefore accurately summarises what Napoleon had consented to. Napoleon's behaviour after Villafranca particularly his signing of the Treaty of Zurich in November 1859 that deprived Piedmont of both the Central Duchies and the fortresses of Mantua and Peschiera, along with his advocacy of a European congress at*

that time, which would have damaged Italian hopes of Piedmontese expansion, also indicated that he impeded the process of unification.

Sources A and C illuminate another area in which Napoleon represented a formidable obstacle to unification. A refers to the fact that 'Frenchmen helped Italy to lose' freedom in 1859 and to Napoleon's having 'destroyed liberty' in Italy. This is a reference to Napoleon's dispatch of 20,000 men, commanded by Marshal Oudinot, to dispose of the Roman Republic, which having landed at Civitavecchia they achieved on 3 July 1849. By destroying a revolutionary state committed to Italian unity, Napoleon undeniably hindered the Italian cause. Orsini, as a Mazzinian radical, similar to viewpoint to those who established the Republic, might admittedly tend towards a hyperbolic description of Napoleon's deposition of it, but the other sources reinforce his arguments. Napoleon's motive in demolishing the Republic was the promotion of Papal interests to mollify French Catholics at home, and both sources B and C reinforce the impression that Napoleon, obstructively, placed this political interest before Italy. B includes the article that 'the interests of the Catholic religion and the sovereignty of the Pope shall be maintained'. One might be tempted to dismiss this as a pious phrase with limited practical significance if it were not for C's symbolic instance that Napoleon, in impeding Italy's liberation, was motivated by pro-papal concerns. His use of the papal crown, 'supported' by Napoleon and blinding Italy, undoubtedly conveys this view. Admittedly a cartoon may simplify and exaggerate the message, especially in this case given its origin in Protestant England, but Napoleon's occupation of Rome until 1870, and his reinforcement of the city after Garibaldi's attempt to capture it in 1867, demonstrate his long term commitment to sustaining the Pope, as does, of course, his behaviour in 1849. Napoleon was ultimately responsible for the division of Italy from its spiritual capital for over a decade.

However, despite all this compelling evidence, all the sources ultimately reveal that French assistance was crucial to the partial unification achieved by 1859. Source D, most explicitly argues that the Piedmontese got more than if Napoleon had stayed at home, while, quoting Garibaldi, the historian argues 'Do not forget the gratitude we owe to Napoleon III'. This is especially valuable as evidence since it comes from a famous nationalist – precisely the sort of person who would be most inclined to condemn Napoleon for his betrayal. Source B also powerfully emphasises Napoleon's usefulness. That the Piedmontese considered it necessary to contract an alliance with France 'to liberate Italy from Austria occupation' eloquently suggests that the Italians believed themselves incapable of achieving this alone. The French performance at Solferino and Magenta in 1859, and the Piedmontese disasters at Custoza 1848 and 1866 and Novara c.1849 suggest that this view is justified. Even source A, though written by a devout Italian nationalist hostile to French intervention, declares that Napoleon himself 'can decide whether Italy is free or not'. That Orsini, having attempted to assassinate Napoleon, felt compelled by the Frenchman's power to plead with him in this way demonstrates his absolute centrality to the achievement of unity. Other evidence supports this – not only did Napoleon provide 200,000 troops in 1859, he agreed to the Italian annexation of Venetia on 4 October 1865 facilitating this.

To conclude, source C powerfully emphasises Napoleon's obstruction of unification at Villafranca, and the evidence of Napoleon's obligations found in B powerfully reinforces this point especially as it is an official, authoritative document. Napoleon's obstruction through his defence of the Pope, both in 1849, as described in A, and in 1859, as recognised in B and denounced in C, along with his subsequent occupation of the city, is further evidence of this obstructive behaviour. Yet the crucial importance of his military and diplomatic aid, encapsulated by the very existence of B, powerfully argued by both a historian and a nationalist in D and expressed in A, cannot be ignored. Napoleon therefore, was both an obstacle and an invaluable asset.

### **The Origins of the American Civil War 1848 – 61**

- (a) Most compared effectively here but a significant number talked about slavery in general or even just the North and South. The question asked about the effects of slavery and a surprising number failed to pinpoint the focus on humanity, morality, religion and dignity in Source B with the purely economic viewpoint of Source D. Even fewer could trace D's belief that economic utility had bestowed dignity upon the slave, so attempting to counter the point about degradation made in B. Those who tried to contrast the rise of Slave Power in B, studiously avoided in D, frequently failed because they misunderstood Slave Power to mean the power of the slaves rather than their owners. This was a surprisingly common mistake. Provenance was well understood but few took it very far – the difference in date and context has an enormous bearing on their views and few could see the significance of Davis' message after secession had started. Some, failing to pick up on the reference to eighty years in Source D, seemed to think Davis was only referring to the 1850's.
- (b) Most answered effectively on this but it was rare to see the higher bands. In part this reflects the common problem of the paper (failure to evaluate) but there were some particular failings here that applied to a fair number of candidates. One was a misinterpretation of some of the sources, C in particular. Indeed a surprising number of candidates seemed to think that both Sources C and D were evidence of a Southern desire to extend slavery beyond the 15 states. There is no evidence of this in Source C at all. It is the north that is seen as aggressive, wishing to extend abolition to the South. In source D there is similarly little to support this interpretation, and own knowledge would suggest a limit to a plantation economy. Much depends on how the last sentence of D is interpreted. It could be read as a desire to extend slavery ('the full development') but is more likely to be interpreted as referring to the previous 80 years in the South, especially given the use of the past tense, 'was'. Another failing was not to balance the answer by using C's accusation that far from the South having designs on the North the boot was on the other foot, the North seeking to impose abolition on the South. Many missed the excellent opportunity for evaluation here – are we really to believe Williams in Source B when he claimed that Slave Power controlled the National Government in January 1860? If this were so it would be difficult to explain how the Civil War broke out and the southern states seceded. Similarly A needed to be subjected to evaluation and was conveniently laid out for candidates in its enumeration of the accretion of southern power (securing the admission of slave states, keeping out free ones, Dred Scott etc.). Good candidates then extended their critique of the sources using own knowledge.

### **The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877 – 93**

- (a) There was a very mixed response to this question. A surprising number of candidates missed the provenance of Source A, that it was a letter sent to Parnell's mistress Kitty O'Shea, and would clearly seek to emphasise knowledge of how her affair with Parnell was having little effect on his electoral chances. Instead candidates preferred to focus on the 'eyewitness' aspect, accepting all that was said, despite the over-exaggerated tone. Similarly Healy was little known, despite the strong steer in the introduction. It seemed to come as a surprise that a Home Rule MP could be so critical of Parnell. Again many eschewed the obvious comparative route of point by point (starting with the 'carefully organised torchlight procession' in B so obviously and spontaneously portrayed in A). Agrarian issues were rarely picked up as in factor in support; something made much of in Source B (Parnell as Landlord) but not referred to in A. Some also failed to see the sectarian side of this - Parnell as Protestant in B, Parnell as universally loved in A and again a divisive issue not referred to. Weaker candidates misread Source B to mean that Parnell had widespread support as opposed to merely thinking he had.

- (b) Answers were a little better here although some candidates found it difficult to balance the various factors contributing to the Home Rule split. It seemed for some that the Sources were almost too rich in what they offered. Nonetheless most managed a workable grouping of the sources that saw A, B and D as minimising the divorce as factor in the split, although the credibility of all three could and should have been questioned, whilst Source C considers it the main reason, or at least as the trigger for events like Gladstone's letter that pulled the carpet from under Parnell. Weaker answers struggled with Healy's position and were unable to reconcile his anti-landlordism with the assertion that he had 'solid men' behind him. Indeed whilst some candidates could handle the religious issues involved, the Agrarian and 'class' ones defeated them - a serious blow given their provenance as a factor in Sources B, D and in part C. The relationship of the Home Rule Party, and of Parnell, to British parties and governments was also either omitted or misunderstood, especially Parnell's move towards the Tories and his more radical and demagogic stances of the 1870s and early 1880s (the plan of campaign studiously ignored in 1880 was revived in 1890 – 91). Interestingly better candidates disagreed quite a lot on how to group the sources, though most made an attempt to justify their choices. The most disagreement came over Healy's stance in Source B. Some seized on the 'adultery' comment to argue for the primacy of divorce. Others saw in it a marginalisation of this in favour of class, land and political issues. Both were acceptable, depending on how effectively they were handled.

### England in a New Century 1900-18

This is an increasingly popular topic but only a minority did it really well. What struck examiners above all was the lack of own knowledge on the main individuals involved (Lloyd George, the Webbs, Asquith, MacDonald, Bonar Law etc).

- (a) Many candidates seemed to find it difficult to compare these two sources for the progressive parties' approach to social reform. This stemmed from three things - one was unfamiliarity even with Lloyd George but particularly with the Webbs, sources from whom have often been set before. Their attitudes and affiliation are not well understood (they are assumed to be mainstream members of the party rather than clever, manipulative Fabian socialists who often came into conflict within the ILP and the LRC). Indeed the Labour Party was assumed to be monolithic and when terms like ILP and LRC were used they served only to distort candidates' response). A second failure was not to see in Lloyd George's comments a political and electoral approach to social reform, acknowledged by Webb in her comment about stealing 'socialist' policies. The implication was that Lloyd George didn't really believe in it. The final failure was not to see in Webb, Source B, a good summary of the differences in approach - the 'partial state responsibility' of the New Liberals and the 'complete state responsibility' of the Labour Party, glossing over divisions in both parties on this (which a consideration of provenance should, but rarely did, consider). Many candidates brushed over the motives and contexts of the two sources, failing to note that Lloyd George was addressing and seeking to persuade his own rather reluctant party of the need to reform, now that they are in government, and that Webb was writing 5 years later at the time of Lloyd George's National Insurance Bill. Few commented on the relative similarity of approach here - a somewhat cynical view by Webb dependent on the rise of sickness and rising insurance premiums for Labour to recover the initiative. There was much stock comment on speeches and diaries that failed to exemplify judgements by specific reference to evidence in the two sources. There seemed little awareness that they were dealing with a speech of a particular kind, made by a very subtle politician and gifted speaker, and the meticulous diary entry of a strong and highly organised mind who was a tireless lobbyist and social analyst.

- (b) Responses to this question were a little better, marred mainly by the failure to evaluate the sources critically. Some candidates failed to look at the dates in the question and ploughed on, irrelevantly, to 1918. Better answers gauged the Sources, mainly arguing that A and B saw Labour as the main challenge whilst C and D argued that they were at best a diversion for Liberalism and the real challenge came from a revived Conservatism. This enabled good candidates to stress change over time (from the Conservative debacle in 1905-06 to recovery 1910-14). However few were rigorous enough on this, a preference for proceeding source by source preventing possible cross referencing. If, for example, one looked at Lloyd George's concern for a New Liberal progressive agenda in Source A one could contrast this with the considered historical agreement that such an agenda did not necessarily win working class votes provided in Source D. That would also cover Source B where Webb harboured similar hopes for social reform and yet in D we find Labour losing in two by-elections to the Liberals. Source C posed difficulties for many. Even if they interpreted it correctly, it was clear that they seemed totally unaware of the Electoral Pact, knowledge of which would counter, or at least balance, the evidence of the cartoon. It remained a secret from candidates as it did from most contemporaries. Those few who referred to it seemed to think it had not survived the 1906 election. Most were simply unable to understand the concept of splitting the progressive vote and letting the Conservatives in. Attempts at explanation revealed only muddled political thinking. As a result candidates missed a fine opportunity to discuss the impact of the electoral system and national and local rivalry in contests.

In general Sources C and D proved the Waterloo for large numbers of candidates. The other main weakness was an excessive reliance on own knowledge, enter stage right Dangerfield in all his Edwardian glory. Candidates talked at length about industrial militancy, Ireland, the suffragettes, the Constitutional Crisis of 1909-11, and even the looming crisis in Europe. Concisely handled and above all related to political and electoral knowledge of the Liberal Party this was fine but as stand-alone mini accounts they added little. Ireland for example needed to be tied into the Conservative challenge, the suffragettes into its electoral effect on the Liberals and Labour. Few did this effectively. The New Liberalism as a key strategy was a much more effective focus for this question, especially as Sources A, B and partly D related to it but few seemed aware of it. Instead candidates provided some very unremarkable comments on the 'rise' of Labour, lacking awareness of its competing component parts and the essentially Trade Unionist or 'Labourist' agenda pre 1914 (hence the untypicality of Webb in Source B). Labour was not yet a socialist party, although most candidates were convinced it was.

### **Nazi Germany 1933-45**

Although many answers were weak both in Source skills and knowledge, a wider range was seen this year with some excellent responses. Virtually all had some grasp of key issues and mostly sought to answer the questions set.

- (a) Most candidates were able to spot both the similarities and differences in these two sources and stuck to the question on attitudes to the regime, although weaker candidates could not resist the temptation to sequence their response, failing to take as their cue the similarities in approach of both sources. Too many presented only very general comparisons with random references. Most picked up on tyranny and repression and were aware of the wartime context, although hardly any mentioned the new Western Front created a month before Source D. Similarly only a minority drew attention to the invocation of God in D and the absence of this in C. Much attention was given to the mention of Hitler himself in D, the Nazi regime in general in C. Although not necessarily a valid distinction this was rewarded, particularly if related to the Army's personal oath of loyalty in contrast to a youth group's idealistic political opposition to the regime in general. Most managed to say something sensible on tone and provenance and date, although few commented that they were both from minorities. Indeed weaker candidates assumed the

White Rose spoke on behalf of all youth, despite the reference to the Hitler Youth in Source C, whilst the majority of candidates thought Beck spoke on behalf of the entire Army. Better answers made much of the difference in how they intended to overthrow the regime (democratic non co-operation in C, an authoritarian coup in D. A common theme was that C was more extreme than D, which may be true in tone but in view of the Bomb Plot, isn't wholly valid. There were the usual confusions - again some misinterpreted 'to rally opposition' in the steer of Source C to mean the White Rose were addressing a public rally; some seemed to think that Beck's 'Appeal' in D was published; some thought the reference in D to armed forces and the police was praise of Hitler's creations and so different from Source C; Rosa Luxemburg was claimed to be the founder of the White Rose; Beck's 'Appeal' was seen by several as a newspaper; a fair few misinterpreted D thinking it supported the Nazi Regime mainly, it would seem, because of the phrase 'without hatred'. What follows is a high Band I response.

*Clearly both Sources C and D represent very negative attitudes to the Nazi Regime; Source C describes it as a "vile tyranny" and Source D speaks of an "unchecked reign of terror". For any groups to be making such overtly critical statements about the regime, it clearly suggests a severe lapse of support, as no one is likely to speak out and face persecution unless they hold extremely strong views.*

*However, these sources do not simply criticise the regime but both their authors are making direct attempts to overthrow it; Source C demands that people "fight and quit the party organisation" whilst the authors of Source D actually attempted to kill Hitler themselves.*

*Both the sources are fairly similar in their origins and tone; both produced by opponents of the regime after a major military disaster (Source C after Stalingrad in 1943 and Source D after the D-Day landings in 1944) and both of them directed at "the German People", to whom they are appealing for support.*

*One slight but significant difference is that Source D appears to have been prepared for distribution after the Military Coup and assassination had taken place, where Source C was a far more dangerous message to distribute, as it was inciting attacks on the regime at the height of its power.*

*Despite the difference of origin, and the fact that, whilst Source C was produced by students and Source D by high ranking military officers who one would have expected to be previous supporters of the regime, they are remarkably similar in expressions they use. Source D describes the state "destroying justice" and "moral standards", and Source C mentions the suppressions of "free expression" and even attempts to "brainwash" people. Even the structure of the Sources is similar; one paragraph describing the tyranny and failings of the regime, and then a second highlighting what is to be done.*

*Of course these are only two of many possible Sources, and cannot tell us how many of the people who read them believed their message, but they do both, nevertheless, provide definitive evidence for negative attitudes towards the regime by the end of the war.*

- (b) Again most candidates attempted to answer the question. The key discriminator was whether they attempted to assess how dangerous opposition was. Weaker answers, taking a hint from the Sources, merely described opposition; better answers assessed relative danger. Grouping here was not necessarily easy or beneficial, although many candidates usefully linked A and B when examining the Catholic Church, A and C on Youth and A and D on the Army. The most successful route was to proceed via groups and organisations (Communists and Socialists, Youth, Churches, the Army etc). The categories in Source A were a useful guide here and used by some as such. We were impressed by some of the comments which were very thoughtful about the difficulty of resistance in a totalitarian

state. Such candidates were able to pick up references to the regime and to use the Sources to stress the power of the Nazi State to deal with opposition. There were some very helpful distinctions made between passive day to day resistance (Source A) and outright opposition (in Source B, C and D). Again muddling to better answers usefully picked up on the war-time context of B, C and D. The main problem were those candidates who simply used the sources for information and illustration, pinning themselves into Band III and below. It also meant that they failed to put opposition into perspective or saw the sources as typical of all Germany - that all youth shared the attitudes of the White Rose, all Catholics (and Protestants) the views of Galen, or that all Norheim was a seething hotbed of unrest etc.

Mistakes were less than usual although spelling was often atrocious (the new 'Goebbels' are the Edelweiss Pirates, variously rendered as Idlevice, Angle-vice or Idle White). Far more serious was careless reading of the Sources, B in particular. Some saw the phrase 'hang the Bishop' and read no further concluding that Catholic opposition was not dangerous because the regime hanged Galen. Indeed a fair number through own knowledge thought this to have been the case. The reference in the steer of Source A to pre 1933 Nazi support led some to believe the source was pre 1933 and so make spurious comments about the Nazis not even being in power then. Some missed the dates in the question itself and wrote irrelevantly about how the Night of the Long Knives had reduced opposition (this could have been used relevantly as a possible explanation for why, in Source A, older Nazis were dissatisfied with the loss of 'true spirit', a reference almost invariably ignored). Some of the least effective evaluation was of Source D (indeed C and D were frequently glossed over at the end of an answer). Candidates claimed this was not dangerous because of the more moderate tone, apparently unaware that it was a plot to kill Hitler, despite the steer. Nonetheless most concluded that the army was the most threatening. Candidates on Source C and D seemed reluctant to use internal content, especially that relating to methods. There was plenty of scope here that was distinct from the slant adopted in answering Q(a). Own knowledge varied but was certainly more plentiful than in the past. It was at its most loose on youth where candidates offloaded material on student groups, apparently unaware of differences between those, the majority, who expressed cultural opposition and the minority of older university students found in the White Rose. Some were muddled on the Churches, where knowledge of the Concordat was a useful evaluative tool for assessing the extent of danger posed in Source B. Others assumed opposition was dangerous just because it was there. Some diverted unnecessarily into the war, including the Allies as the most dangerous opposition. These also saw the Jews as the most dangerous opponents and offloaded treasured material on Anti-Semitism. What follows is a high Band I answer.

*At first sight all of these Sources would appear to suggest dangerous opposition to the Nazi Regime. Source D probably represents the most threatening opposition as its authors made a direct attempt on Hitler's life in an attempt to overthrow the regime, and similarly Source C also advocates an attempt to seize power, although a group of Munich students are hardly a severe threat to Nazi power in the same way as top military officials.*

*Source B describes how a Catholic Bishop spoke out also against the regime, but here there is no suggestion that he made any subversive attempts to overthrow it; he was merely speaking out against some of the more inhumane of its policies.*

*Source A is different from Source B, C and D in that it is pre-1939 whilst all of the other Sources come from during the war. The Gestapo appears very concerned about opposition in this place, though in examining the Source more closely it can be seen that wishes to "purge to rid the party of its disreputable members" are not the same as wanting to overthrow the party, and indeed Hitler and many others may have favoured such a "purge". We also know that between 1935-1939 most of the communists and socialists mentioned as "still active" in 1935 were weeded out, and that the "Jewish shops" were*

closed down in 1938. Thus Source A can be seen to represent an early period when the regime had not fully consolidated its power, and even then this "small rural town" can hardly be seen as representative of all Germany.

The peak of support for the regime actually came in about 1939 after major foreign policy successes without war, but there are no Sources from this period to show such a lack of opposition. Instead Sources B, C and D are from during the war when Allied bombing was beginning to take its toll on morale, and the Sources show how, as the war progressed, opposition became more dangerous with speaking out (Source B) in 1941, distributing subversive pamphlets (C) in 1943 and finally attempted assassination (D) in 1944. Source D is actually the most surprising as the military had always been key supporters whilst the "White Rose Group", churches and "socialists" had opposed the regime from the very beginning.

In terms of how dangerous opposition was, we also have to consider how it was dealt with. Whilst the bomb plot of D was a major threat, in its aftermath over 5,000 people were executed, thus wiping out most opponents within the armed forces. Whilst Source C may claim rather ambitiously that the "day of reckoning has come", in reality such forms of opposition stood little chance of success and those responsible were no doubt swiftly dealt with. In contrast seemingly moderate critics like Clemens Von Galen could actually be more dangerous if they are protected by institutions like the Catholic Church. As Goebbels remarks in Source B it was "next to impossible to deal with" him due to his widespread support.

Overall the Sources provide evidence of a wide range of types of opposition, though the lack of Sources from 1936-1940 during the Nazi's most popular period does give a biased view. It is of course true that there was a great deal of opposition in the period, though most of it actually took the form of passive resistance or nonconformity such as groups like the Edelweiss Pirates. In the end you can only claim so much dangerous opposition existed as the final overthrow of the Nazis came not from any form of internal opposition, but by military defeat by the Allies.



## **Report on Units 2583 and 2584 in June 2007**

### **Principal Examiner's Report**

### **Units 2583 (Period Studies - English History 1042-1660) and 2584 (Period Studies English History 1780-1964)**

#### **General Comments**

These general comments apply to both Units 2583 and 2584. They have the same assessment objectives and are subject to the same grading standards.

The standards achieved by the candidates were very similar to those in previous years. A good proportion deserved high marks which translated into the higher grades for the Units. Apart from the necessary skills in, and knowledge of, history that are required, these candidates had obviously worked hard to be able to produce extended essays that could develop, compare and assess points. There was a proportion of the entrants who deserved low marks but there were very few candidates whose work was so poor that they showed no understanding and knowledge of their Study Topics.

There was an encouraging distribution of answers to the questions. All of the questions were attempted by sufficient numbers of candidates on which to base valid comments. Although the number of candidates who attempted questions on social and economic history in both Units and cultural history in Unit 2583 was comparatively small, they did reflect the fact that a worthwhile number of centres believe that their candidates benefit from studying these areas of history. Some Study Topics are very popular but, in contradiction to what is sometimes claimed by others, no Study Topic dominates in either of these Units. The spread of Study Topics reflects a healthy variety in history teaching in OCR's centres.

In order to gain the highest marks, candidates should pay attention to the key instructions in questions because these indicate how questions should be tackled. These are some of the most frequent instructions with guidance on how to organise answers:

'Assess the reasons why...'. This sort of question requires candidates to provide a series of reasons. Each of the reasons should be explained with an indication, or assessment, of their relative importance, including a justification. This relative importance should lead to the explanation first of the most important reasons.

'How far was ...'. These questions ask candidates to examine the importance of the stated factor and to indicate the extent to which the claim can be supported or contradicted. Examiners are looking for arguments in favour and against a factor, with an overall judgement.

'To what extent...'. These questions are another form of 'How far was...?' question.

'How far do you agree that...?'. Candidates might agree or disagree but the primary need is to examine the claim in the question, consider its strengths and explain its weaknesses, and come to an overall judgement.

'How important was...'. Candidates who answer such questions should explain and assess the importance of a stated factor. They might argue that other factors are more important and this is acceptable as long as the argument is well supported.

'How successful was...'. These are similar to 'How important was...?' questions.

'Which was more important / successful, A or B...'. The answers should be reasonably balanced between A and B but not necessarily equally balanced because it is justifiable to spend more

time on the more important factor. Answers should explain why one was more important/successful.

Some questions are based on quotations and the question often asks 'How far do you agree?' Candidates are not expected to be able to identify the source of the quotation. It is possible to agree or disagree with the quotation, as historians have diverse views about every topic in history. It is important to be able to explain what can be said in favour of the quotation and what might contradict it, giving the reasons why one view is preferred. It is sometimes believed that it is always preferable to challenge a quotation as evidence of lively and individual thinking but this is not so. For example, there was a quotation in Unit 2584 (Question 12a) that claimed that Tariff Reform was the most serious problem for the Conservatives at the beginning of the twentieth century. Answers that denied this but which were poorly organised and vague would deserve a lower mark than answers that agreed and made a strong case for the priority of Tariff Reform as a problem. Agreement with a quotation can lead as easily to the highest mark as can its contradiction. Quotations are expected to be fair tests and should be treated on their merits like any other form of question.

It follows from these comments that examiners do not require all candidates to reach the same judgement. Historians have different opinions and so should candidates. Examiners are aware of the importance of rewarding different explanations and are reminded of this in the Mark Scheme. But good historians explain their opinions and support them by factual knowledge, as should AS and A2 candidates. The knowledge does not have to be detailed at AS; sometimes knowledge that is too detailed can make it difficult for the reader to follow the argument and might become mere description. However, arguments without knowledge are mere assertions.

The comments on individual questions frequently refer to the importance of expressing a judgement about topics. Candidates should never sit on the fence. This safe option should be avoided. Another phrase to avoid is 'It is very difficult to decide whether...'. The reason is that this might be applied to many questions and does not help the argument. It is the task of working historians and apprentice historians at AS Level to struggle with their materials and to attempt to come to decisions. Examiners will give credit as long as the answers try to justify the judgements and decisions with valid knowledge.

It is worth repeating the advice that candidates should make brief plans because the examinations were entered by some new centres who might not have read previous Reports. It is a mistake to spend too long writing a plan; an effective plan can be sketched in a few minutes and the examination is long enough to allow all candidates to write an extended essay that is fully appropriate for AS Level. Above all, plans help candidates to organise their work. Sometimes answers fall short of their potential because they are poorly organised. Points might be repeated or elaborated later in the answer because candidates find that they need to give further explanation. Candidates sometimes worry unnecessarily about introductions. The best advice is to dive straight in! Avoid unnecessary background such as: 'Before I answer the Question, I must explain what went before...' If the background is relevant, it should be an integral part of the argument and it should never be included just to prepare the ground.

Many of the comments about individual questions refer to relevance. Examiners are patient readers who will sometimes try to work out how material can be linked to the question. Sometimes this is possible even when candidates do not themselves make the link. But it cannot be given as much credit as the answers that clearly relate material to the question. More rarely but still occurring are the examples of material, either arguments or facts, which even the most liberal reading cannot link to questions. Plans can be a check on relevance. It is unnecessary, even poor practice, to repeat the question at the beginning of every paragraph ('Another reason why Lloyd George fell from power is... 'Another reason why Lloyd George fell from power is... 'Another reason why Lloyd George fell from power is...'). However, every paragraph of section of an answer should be clearly framed within the question.

Most candidates found that the 45 minutes allowed for the examination was sufficient. Very few answers appeared to be unfinished although a few seemed rushed at the end. Answers that are almost complete will not be 'penalised' significantly because of signs of haste at the end although candidates are encouraged to prepare the brief plans that help them to allocate their time effectively. Some weak candidates apparently needed more practice in writing the longer essays that are needed in these Units. As previous Reports have noted, marks are not awarded merely because of the length of answers. Long answers can contain unnecessary or even irrelevant material. However, whilst cogent answers can be very effective cogency must be combined with range of explanation. Brief answers that make a few broad points, poorly supported with knowledge, cannot be awarded a satisfactory mark. There were very few rubric infringements; the number of candidates who attempted more than one question was minimal and they were almost always candidates who could not write successfully on any of the two or more questions that they attempted.

## **Comments on Individual Questions**

### **Unit 2583 Period Studies - English History 1042-1660**

#### **England 1042-1100**

##### **Q1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How effective a king was Edward the Confessor?' There were many sound assessments of Edward the Confessor that considered the aspects that were mentioned in the Specification: 'The personality of Edward the Confessor, the powers of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy, government, taxation, law and military organisation'. Many answers deserved high credit because they considered the problematic periods and issues in the reign and came to a considered conclusion. As indicated in the general comments above, candidates' conclusions were in themselves less important than their success in arguing and sustaining a case, but most were very sympathetic to Edward.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What part did the Godwin family play in the reign?' The Question was based on the reasons why the Godwin family was powerful and examiners read a good number of answers that contained the necessary analysis and explanation. A few concentrated narrowly on the events at the end of Edward's reign but many deserved marks in the middle and high bands because of their ability to take a wider view. Whilst the answers in the middle bands tended to describe events, the most successful were able to explain their significance.

##### **Q2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'Who had the most convincing claim to the English throne in 1066?' It was encouraging that most candidates went beyond a description of the rivalry between Harold and William in 1066. These were indeed the two most prominent figures in the succession dispute but many candidates deserved high credit because they were able to explain why they were involved in the dispute. They went further to consider other claimants such as Harold Hardrada. They also linked the succession dispute to Edward the Confessor himself.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How did William ... defend his English frontiers?' The Content in the Specification indicates the factors that candidates could use to answer this Question: 'his military success, the Harrying of the North, castle building, the

defence of the frontiers.' The general standard was good although some candidates were awarded a lower mark because their answers tended to be general, dealing with William's overall effectiveness as king instead of concentrating on the particular problems of the frontiers.

### **Q3 Norman England 1066-1100**

- (a) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'What issues affected relations between the crown and the church?' It was very relevant to spend much time examining the relationship between William I and Lanfranc. The discussion of the King's relationship with Lanfranc was often highly creditable. However, a good number of candidates went further by explaining William's wider attitude to the English Church. Some candidates deserved credit by considering both political and religious issues and they showed an awareness of the reasons why the Church was important to the King.
- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How far did ...William II change the government and law of England?' When awarding high marks, examiners were looking for an awareness of change and continuity because the Question asked 'How far...'. There were some good discussions of William II's relations with the nobility and comparison with the situation during William I's reign. There were also useful discussions of William II's methods of local administration. Most of the answers reached a satisfactory standard.

### **Q4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042-1100**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How far...did the social structure of England change from 1066 to 1100?' A number of very successful candidates were able to supplement their explanations of what might be meant by a manorial economy and society with discussions of its limitations. There were many parts of England that were clearly not 'manorial' and the term itself generalises what comprised different patterns and practices. A few candidates provided only vague descriptions of English society at the end of the eleventh century; they were outnumbered by those whose answers were well focused and relevant.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What effects did the Conquest have on English ...trade?' Moderate answers tended to be highly descriptive, only surveying patterns of trade and providing some examples. In contrast, there were some responses that deserved high credit because they put trade in the context of the wider economy. Although the standard of the answers was variable, a satisfactory proportion reached a good standard.

### **England 1042-1509**

#### **Q5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450-1470**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why had the Yorkists won the crown by 1461?' The lowest standard of response was the narrative account of the Wars of the Roses to 1461 that lacked explanation. Some candidates confined themselves to accounts of the reasons for the outbreak of the conflict. Fortunately, few answers showed only these characteristics. In the middle bands were answers that showed satisfactory qualities but were too unbalanced between the Lancastrians and the Yorkists. The highest marks were awarded, and were gained by many candidates, when the answers were reasonably balanced in their discussions of the two forces. They concentrated on

providing reasons for the frequent changes of fortune that seemed to promise a stalemate and indicated which were the most important factors. Among relevant issues that candidates discussed were leadership, the resources available to each side and the failure to deliver a knock-out blow. There were worthwhile references to some of the main engagements such as Towton.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How far had Edward IV restored royal authority by 1470?' The Question asked candidates to assess the claim that his handling of royal finances was Edward IV's most important achievement to 1470. They could agree or disagree with the claim. The determining factor when awarding marks was candidates' ability to support their argument with factual knowledge and their success in considering and evaluating alternative explanations. The Content of the Study Topic indicated factors that might have been considered in addition to royal finances: 'relations with the nobility, administration, problems with Clarence and Warwick'. It was valid to point out that the King was not completely successful and to explain the problems but the Question was about his achievements and care needed to be taken not to extend the scope of answers too far. The quality of most of the answers was encouraging. A high proportion of candidates wrote confidently and convincingly about the Question and deserved to be awarded high marks.

#### **Q6 The End of the Yorkists 1471-1485**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How able a king was Richard III?' The standard of most answers was sound and examiners read some very accomplished essays. Few candidates wrote irrelevant and scrappy answers. Although candidates could agree that Richard III was a complete failure as king, most properly did assess some aspects of success as well as failure whilst they differed in their assessments. Some were anxious to spend a long time either proving or disproving that he murdered the Princes in the Tower. This was a relevant issue because of its importance to the reign but candidates needed to beware of spending too much time on this one issue. Richard's failures were apparent in most answers. They included his fatal inability to defeat Henry Tudor. The more successful essays included assessment of some factors that might be considered successes, such as his attempts to improve trade, justice and his relations with Parliament.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why was there opposition to Richard III?' Candidates included a number of relevant issues in their answers, including the consequences of Richard III's seizure of the throne, divisions among the nobles and the personal ambitions of some nobles. The moderate candidates sometimes wrote general descriptions of the reign and left the examiner to extract the reasons from the description. The candidates who focused on analysis and assessment deserved higher marks. They also deserved credit when they noted that not every noble opposed Richard. He had sufficient support to make a significant challenge to Henry Tudor at Bosworth. The overall standard of the answers was satisfactory and a reasonable number of scripts deserved very high marks. Few answers deserved very low marks because they were completely unacceptable.

#### **Q7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485-1509**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What were Henry VII's aims and character as king?' It required candidates to consider the extent of change and continuity in government during the reign. Examiners were encouraged by the standard of most of the answers. Almost all candidates made a serious attempt to deal with the terms of the Question and avoided general descriptions. However, there were some misunderstandings. Henry VII did not invent the JPs. Some candidates could have given more thought to the ways in which the King governed the provinces, for example the

Council of Wales and the Marches and the Council of the North. There were particularly worthwhile discussions of the methods by which Henry handled the law and finance. Few answers were irrelevant or lacked a basic knowledge of the topic.

- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How dangerous to Henry's monarchy were the threats to his government, especially from the pretenders?' The Question was based on an assessment of the danger to Henry VII from the Pretenders. It asked whether they were the most serious threat to the King. This meant that the danger from the Pretenders needed to be examined alongside other factors. Some candidates wrote adequate answers that concentrated exclusively on the Pretenders, sometimes with detailed narrative. These could reach the middle bands but could not attain the highest bands because the assessment of the claim did not appear in the answer. Very high marks were awarded to some candidates who wrote about the Pretenders and other threats, especially Yorkist sympathisers. The Question produced some excellent answers that deserved much credit because of the quality of their explanations, knowledge and organisation.

#### **Q8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What changes affected the nobility?' In spite of the clear terms of the Question, some answers were limited to descriptions of the political role of the nobility, especially their involvement in rebellions. This was not inherently irrelevant because their social importance also gave the nobles political influence whilst political developments such as war and changes of regime had a direct impact on their social and economic roles. The more successful candidates made these links whereas the less convincing did not. There were some good appraisals of the pressures on nobles from the consequences of the Black Death although some prospered through involvement in trade. Discussions of the impact of the Wars of the Roses and the policies of Edward IV and Henry VII were sometimes very effective. A good proportion of candidates deserved high reward but some attained only low marks; there were fewer answers in the middle bands.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What were the most important changes to other social groups?' The more successful candidates did focus on the issues of change and continuity when discussing the lower orders at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. The less convincing answers tended to be too general in their descriptions. There were some useful references to enclosures although more could have been made of the regional differences. Some parts of England were almost untouched by enclosures during the relevant period. Other answers made interesting points about the impact on the lower orders of the decline of 'feudal' obligations in society.

#### **England 1509-1558**

##### **Q9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509-1529**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Who controlled English foreign affairs 1515-29, Henry or Wolsey?' It required candidates to provide an assessment of foreign policy during this period. The least successful candidates seemed uncertain about the chronology and their answers lacked the factual basis that was necessary for a good answer. In the middle bands were answers that were often factually correct but descriptive. They were able to survey developments during most of the period although there was a tendency for some candidates to be vague about the years after about 1525. Judgements about success and failure tended to be uneven. Sometimes events such as the Field of the Cloth of Gold were said to be successes without explaining why. Was it a

short or long term success? How did the outcomes indicate whether it was a success or failure? Similarly treaties such as the Treaty of London were described as successes or failures without further explanation. The most successful answers showed a good grasp of the salient period and expressed clear judgements about the success or failure of particular developments and came to an overall conclusion. They provided reasons to justify their claims. Most of the answers were very successful and some candidates deserved very high marks.

- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How successful was Wolsey in his domestic administration 1515-29?' The quotation suggested that Wolsey's domestic administration was characterised more by success than by failure. Nobody would claim that Wolsey was completely successful or a complete failure. Examiners were looking for an awareness of each alternative and an ability to give and justify an overall judgement. Most candidates took an effective approach and did focus on assessments. They dealt with a reasonable range of issues, including relations with the King and nobility, the law, social and economic issues and the Church. Additional credit was given when candidates attempted an overview to supplement the analysis and assessment of particular areas. The standard of most of the answers was very encouraging and examiners were pleased to read many well-informed and well-argued answers.

#### **Q10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529-1558**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How significant was the work of Thomas Cromwell?' Religion was excluded from this Question about Thomas Cromwell's achievements because there was another Question (11a) that allowed candidates to discuss Cromwell and the Reformation. It would be unfair on other candidates to allow an overlap if religion were not excluded from this Question. High marks required answers to demonstrate at least adequate knowledge and understanding of the reform of the Privy Council. The time devoted to this depended on the slant of the argument. Other issues that candidates discussed were Cromwell's use of Parliament and his strengthening of central government through the provincial councils. Most candidates were able to combine an appropriate level of factual knowledge and relevant explanation. Few answers were highly irrelevant and most candidates showed at least a basic ability to handle the Question.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What was the impact of foreign relations on domestic affairs?' Candidates needed to demonstrate an understanding of the main chronology of relations between England, Scotland and France but the main emphasis was on the domestic effects of the wars from 1543 to 1558. The reasons for the wars were not needed unless they were tied to the key issue of effects. The quality of many answers was pleasing and most candidates were able to deal with political and economic issues. For example, Henry VIII's wars proved expensive and were a drain on the King's finances. Somerset's fall can be attributed partly to the war with Scotland on which he embarked. Mary I's war with France resulted in the loss of Calais and was part of the reason for the Queen's unpopularity. A few candidates limited their answers to narratives of the wars but most approached the Question in the right manner and concentrated on their impact. Some excellent answers were read.

#### **Q11 Church and State 1529-1558**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What was the nature of the Henrician Reformation 1529-47?' The most successful candidates gave weight to the 1540s because the question asked how far England was still a Catholic country in 1547. Most answers were very relevant and the best considered 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' aspects, coming to a judgement about which was most prevalent at the end of Henry VIII's reign. For example, they considered how far there might have been a conservative reaction after

Cromwell's fall, but contrasted this with the significance of Prince Edward's Protestant education and the King's marriage to Katharine Parr. The most frequent weakness that prevented the award of a very high mark was that answers ended in about 1539-40. Although it is unreasonable at AS Level to expect every aspect of a topic to be fully addressed, all questions have some issues that it is reasonable to expect candidates to consider if their answers are to be awarded very high marks. In the lower bands were answers that were very incomplete, sometimes ending in about 1536. These lacked an appreciation of change and continuity that was at the heart of the problem posed by the Question.

- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How far was England a Protestant country by 1553?' The quality of most answers was sound and it was encouraging to read some very effective essays. Whilst weak answers tended to be vague, almost all of the essays deserved some credit for relevance. Candidates used a variety of valid approaches to tackle the Question. Some used the reign of Mary I to confirm or reject the prevalence of Protestantism in England at the end of Edward VI's reign. This was acceptable as long as the necessary links were made. Some good candidates distinguished between the religious beliefs of leading political figures and popular opinion from 1547 to 1553. Credit was given when answers discriminated between the reforms of Somerset and the policies of Northumberland. There were sound assessments of the significance of anti-government risings, especially the Western Rising. Some saw this as evidence of major dissatisfaction, others as indicative of a particular region's concerns. Some answers would have been improved if they had been more specific about some of the reforms, for example the Prayer Books.

#### **Q12 Social and Economic Issues 1509-1558**

- (a) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How effectively did Tudor governments tackle economic... problems?' There were some interesting responses that showed an awareness of the limited powers of sixteenth-century governments to deal with economic problems. Higher food prices and low wages, partly fuelled by an increasing population, were outside the control of governments. The comparative failures of Wolsey and Somerset showed how difficult it was to deal with enclosures. Some of the more successful candidates attributed some of the responsibility for economic problems to mistaken government policy when the coinage was debased. Some answers were limited to general descriptions of the social impact of economic problems but most candidates showed an adequate understanding of the key issues in the Question and some reached a good standard.
- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How serious a problem were enclosures from 1509 to 1558?' The most frequent discriminating factor between moderate and good answers was that the former often concentrated on the reasons why enclosures were seen as a problem in the first half of the sixteenth century. This was relevant but such answers did not tackle the terms of the Question as exactly as did the better essays. These focused on the key issue of the reasons why they continued. Examiners read effective discussions that noted the powerful interests that favoured enclosures and the advantages that enclosures were seen to have. Good candidates explained why attempts to limit them were intermittent rather than continuous and why the occasional efforts of ministers such as Wolsey and Somerset enjoyed little success. Some answers deserved credit when they pointed out that the problem of enclosures in this period can be exaggerated because they affected a small proportion of the country and its population.

#### **England 1547-1603**

#### **Q13 Church and State 1547-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How successfully did Elizabeth tackle the Puritan challenge to her religious settlement?' Although the general standard was sound and examiners read some excellent responses, some candidates were unclear about basic elements of the Study Topic. Puritan is an elusive term and difficult to define exactly. However, some candidates wrote about Protestants and Puritans as if these were exclusive. Candidates in this Study Topic are not expected to have detailed knowledge of religious ideas and theories but a sufficient basis is needed to make sense of the Key Issues and associated Content. Some answers would have been improved if they had considered groups within Puritanism because this facilitated an explanation of the reasons why Elizabeth I opposed demands for changes in the religious settlement. On the other hand, the quality of a substantial number of answers was good and often very good. They were analytical and focused on the Queen and her reasons. They displayed a creditable awareness of the varieties within Puritanism, including supporters at court. Answers in the middle bands sometimes provided adequate explanations of Puritanism but only implied that demands for change were opposed by Elizabeth I. Some candidates referred relevantly to the 'Neale' debate and to Neale's critics. However, some only set out the respective claims and did not come to a conclusion. (This is not to hint that knowledge of historiography was needed in this Question. Historiographical references can be included voluntarily but are not a necessary part of any Study Topic in AS. However, if historians' views are mentioned, an attempt should be made to assess how far they are convincing. This is not different from the discussion of other types of explanation.) It was encouraging that most candidates were able to continue their explanation to the end of Elizabeth I's reign, for example including the Martin Marprelate Tracts at the end.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How serious was the threat from Roman Catholics to the Elizabethan Church and state?' It was relevant to include a very brief section on Catholicism in England after the death of Mary, Queen of Scots, perhaps as a short comparison to the main issue in the Question. The main issue itself, the threat from Mary, Queen of Scots, was focused on the period to 1587 and excellent answers could have been written without any later references. Some answers in the middle bands explained the general nature of Catholicism but they would have benefited if they had been linked to the degree of support for Mary and the danger that they represented to Elizabeth I. There were answers that deserved very high marks. These were focused and tried consistently to assess the danger. For example, they pointed out the danger of various plots but noted that they enjoyed little support from the general Catholic populace. There were effective explanations and appraisals of the extent of Catholicism in England. It was encouraging that the very large majority of candidates heeded the need to consider 'support within England' and did not write irrelevantly about the foreign dimension of Catholicism. This was occasionally pertinent, for example, the reception of the Papal Bull that excommunicated the Queen, but usually was not needed.

#### **Q14 Foreign Affairs 1547-1587**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'What were the main factors in Anglo-Scottish relations between 1559 and 1587?' A few answers went beyond 1587, the end-point that was stated in the Question. It was acceptable to mention briefly the accession of James VI but it was not appropriate to devote much attention to the later years of Elizabeth I's reign. Mary, Queen of Scots, was clearly an important factor in Anglo-Scottish relations but some answers stated this baldly and then spent too much time narrating the events of her time in England. Reasons took a back seat. However, most candidates did focus on the key issue in the question.

They explained convincingly the early crisis in Elizabeth I's reign (1559-60). They also connected Mary's stay in England with Anglo-Scottish relations as well as continuing concerns about French influence in Scotland.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key issue, 'What part did relations with France play in Elizabeth I's foreign policy between 1562 and 1584?' Most candidates were successful in demonstrating knowledge and understanding of the Content areas that are in the Specification, 'The le Havre expedition, the effects of the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion, the importance of the Dutch Revolt for Anglo-French relations, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, marriage negotiations with Anjou and Alençon'. Some moderate answers were content to describe developments but many candidates concentrated on the necessary assessment of problems. For example, they discussed the military, religious, political and strategic implications of these Content areas. Some answers would have benefited if the chronological basis had been stronger. Study of a time-line before the examination might have been helpful. On the other hand, there was a good proportion of thoughtful and clear essays that deserved very high marks.

### **Q15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How efficient was the government of Elizabethan England?' The Specification mentions as examples of Elizabethan ministers only Burghley and Walsingham and therefore it was fair that answers that identified only those could attain any mark. However, it was encouraging that some candidates could make wider references. Some moderate or even weak answers were anecdotal, relating stories but lacking examination of the role of ministers. On the other hand, there was a good proportion of thoughtful and well-informed discussions. Some candidates were aware not only of the responsibility and power of ministers but also of their limitations when compared to the Queen, who remained paramount. There was never an 'overmighty' minister. William Cecil's influence and role as a minister was curbed for much of the reign by individual or groups of rivals, or factions. Some candidates were aware that ministers sometimes took an independent line to promote their particular policies or to outwit rivals. Walsingham was seen as interesting because, whilst he was an adamant supporter of Elizabeth I, she distrusted his religious views and his preference for an active anti-Spanish policy. His role was therefore circumscribed by his relations with the Queen.
- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How far did the nature and role of parliament change?' Candidates could agree or disagree with the claim that parliamentary privilege was the most important cause of disputes between Elizabeth I and Parliament. Whatever line was taken, candidates needed to show some clear understanding of what is meant by parliamentary privilege, for example freedom of speech, freedom from arrest under certain conditions, and freedom of access to the Queen. Claims to privilege could then be compared with other factors such as the marriage and succession issues, religion, the fate of Mary, Queen of Scots, and monopolies. The Question did not ask how deep and dangerous to Elizabeth I were the disputes. This was not inherently irrelevant but answers that were based exclusively on this issue could not gain a high mark because they did not focus on the key issue. Some candidates who took this line of argument made the valid point that co-operation was much more important than conflict in the relationship between the Queen and Parliament but they did not then explain why conflict arose; the discussion was too general for a high mark. The majority of candidates did focus on the key issue and there were many answers that supported relevant points with appropriate knowledge.

### **Q16 Social and Economic Issues 1547-1603**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How far was the second half of the sixteenth century a period of trade expansion?' There were some effective answers that explained clearly, if briefly, why the collapse of the Antwerp cloth market had serious consequences for the English economy. High marks were deserved by candidates who were able to refer to attempted to find alternative markets by new trading companies, for example in the Baltic, Mediterranean and even Russia and the New World. The most successful answers were able to explain the reasons for the limited success of most of these ventures. These included poor organisation, under-funding and unrealistic hopes of trade opportunities. The continuing reliance on uncompetitive English wool was a serious problem. A few weak answers were limited to general descriptions of economic problems.
- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What were the main causes of rising prices in the second half of the sixteenth century?' The most frequent difference between weak and successful answers was that the former were often limited to accounts of the causes of inflation whereas the latter addressed the consequences, as the Question asked. The causes could be given some credit because they helped to explain the nature of inflation but they were insufficient to take answers to a good standard. On the other hand, examiners read sound answers that considered the impact of inflation on different sections of the population, most of whom suffered from the effects. (Credit was given when candidates pointed out that some, such as merchants, benefited.) There were worthwhile discussions of the problems caused to the crown and nobility, who found it difficult to increase their income without causing widespread unpopularity. The poor were hit by rising prices with a growing number forced into vagrancy.

### **England 1603-1660**

#### **Q17 Politics and Religion 1603-1629**

- (a) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How serious were religious divisions in the country?' Examiners looked for a reasonable, but not necessarily an even, balance between James I and Charles I because the relevant period of Charles I's reign (to 1629) was comparatively short. There was an encouraging number of highly successful answers that focused on the reasons for the attitudes of the Stuart kings to the Puritans. They examined the extent to which James I might have changed after the early attempt to reach a settlement at the Hampton Court Conference. Credit was given when candidates considered the links between religious issues and political factors, for example in foreign policy. It was helpful when candidates attempted to explain the nature and extent of Puritanism to provide a context for the assessment of the reasons why the Stuarts opposed them. Weaker answers sometimes narrated some events without comment or explanation.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'What part did foreign affairs play in the relations between the Stuart kings and parliament?' It might be argued that Charles I's aims in foreign policy were confused and unpopular, that his methods were uncertain and that the only results were failure. The reign began with the defeat of an army under Mansfeld in the Thirty Years' War. It was relevant to consider marriage to Henrietta Maria, which was unpopular. An expedition to capture Cadiz was unsuccessful whilst the French alliance was lost and the use of force at La Rochelle failed. Some might argue that the primary responsibility for the conspicuous lack of success was Buckingham's but this would ignore the fact that the King should have been in control of foreign policy.

### **Q18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629-1649**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did civil war break out in 1642?' The standard of most of the answers was sound and examiners read some excellent scripts. These were written by candidates who focused on the Question, organised their answers, considered several reasons, put them into an order of priority and supported the argument with appropriate knowledge. Some candidates would have been awarded higher marks if they had given more thought to the terms of the Question, particularly why Charles I went to war in 1642. Examiners read a number of essays that were dominated, sometimes exclusively, by developments to 1640. These long-term issues were relevant but they were not sufficient to merit a high mark. Neither Charles I nor his critics gave serious consideration to civil war in 1640 and good answers needed a clear explanation of the years 1640-42.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why was Charles I tried and executed?' Examiners were pleased with the overall quality of the answers. Understanding and knowledge of the period from 1646 to 1649 were often very sound. There were few irrelevant responses. Most candidates agreed with the claim in the Question about Charles I's responsibility for the failure to reach a settlement. The more successful also examined other factors and assessed the King's role in a wider context. Some answers deserved credit because of their references to specific proposals that were made by different groups, for example the Heads of the Proposals and the Agreement(s) of the People, to show how they encouraged or discouraged a negotiated settlement. There was a good awareness of the various groups apart from the King himself that were involved. These included Parliament, army officers and rank and file, and the Scots.

### **Q19 The Interregnum 1649-1660**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did Oliver Cromwell become Lord Protector?' Most candidates could explain either directly or indirectly why Cromwell became Lord Protector but some did not consider carefully the terms of the Question. Their answers were not irrelevant but they were too unfocussed for a high mark. The most successful candidates did organise their answers around the Cromwell's preference for the Instrument of Government to the Rump and Barebones. Credit was given when candidates showed some knowledge of the main terms of the Instrument of Government, to show the specific aspects that Cromwell favoured. This was an example of a Question that produced very different assessments of Cromwell. Some saw Cromwell accepting the Instrument of Government reluctantly after his hopes were dashed by earlier republican forms of government; others took the line that the Protectorate marked the logical end of Cromwell's search for power. Both approaches were equally valid as long as they were supported by appropriate factual knowledge and the better candidates were able to consider alternatives, whatever their preferred view.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How successful was the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell?' Examiners looked for the ability to explain a reasonable range of countries and regions with which Cromwell's foreign policy was involved. Most answers were interesting and contained justified explanations that were sufficiently broadly based. Among the aspects that were considered most frequently were the end of the Dutch war and the search for an alliance with the United Provinces, war with Spain and especially the Western Design, and relations with Sweden. Other developments might have been mentioned but these aspects were sufficient to merit any mark when they were explained well. Some answers would have benefited if they had tried to consider both successes and failures. Some candidates were prone to describe foreign policy as a complete success without considering the alternative. Very few judged it to be a complete failure. Among issues that candidates might have explained more clearly or accurately were the Dutch War and the alliance with France against Spain. These were not general

weaknesses. Some candidates might have noted that Cromwell did not launch England into the Dutch War. Some candidates might have explained more clearly why he allied with Catholic France against Catholic Spain.

## **Q20 Society and the Economy 1603-1660**

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why was there a growth in radical religious and political groups after 1640?' The quality of most of the answers was sound and examiners read some excellent essays. These considered religion as a reason for the growth of radical groups and also examined some other reasons. They went beyond the Levellers to discuss some other political and religious groups. The breakdown in censorship and central authority was examined as was the unpopularity of attempts to retain control. The effects of the civil war were assessed and the impact of a different kind of army that emerged. Some candidates would have improved their answers if they had been less vague. They described some of the aims of radical groups but gave little attention to the reasons for their emergence and growth, the key issue in the Question.
- (b) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How far was this a period of economic expansion?' There were fewer answers to this Question than to Question (a) and there were few highly successful answers. Most of the candidates who attempted the Question were more confident in describing the general condition of the economy than in assessing the particular importance of agriculture.

## **Unit 2584 Period Studies - English History 1780-1964**

### **England 1780-1846**

#### **Q1 The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783-1830**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'Why did Pitt the Younger dominate politics 1783-93?' A large number of candidates showed commendable knowledge and understanding when assessing Pitt's reforms. Few answers were vague or very incomplete. Sound candidates examined the importance of support from George III and Pitt's willingness to temper potentially unpopular reforms. The mood of many people after the defeat in the American war and later the outbreak of the French Revolution made easier the acceptance of reform. The relatively long period of peace in the intervening period strengthened Pitt's hand. There were some excellent candidates who considered issues such as these, supported their explanations with accurate knowledge and came to conclusions about their importance.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How and why was Lord Liverpool able to survive the Radical challenges of 1812-22?' It was relevant to consider the seriousness of the radical challenges when assessing Liverpool's success. Some candidates argued successfully that the governments' task was not very difficult because the radical challenge was probably exaggerated. Some answers would have been improved if they had not been limited to some brief descriptions of radical groups and events. In the weakest answers, government responses were assumed rather than explained. On the other hand, there were very commendable answers that explained the varied methods used by Liverpool and his colleagues. The combined sound knowledge and effective assessment. Some claimed that the authorities overreacted whilst others saw the justification for measures such as the suspension of Habeas Corpus.

## Q2 War and Peace 1793-1841

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How and why did Britain win such a long war with France 1793-1815?' Successful answers needed a firm factual base but some candidates limited themselves to narrative accounts of the Peninsula War, sometimes adding a mention of the naval campaigns and subsidies to allies. These demonstrated a basic understanding but they did not go further to show how individually or as a group the factors contributed to eventual victory. The most successful answers referred to the same issues but supplemented them by explanations that examined their importance in the struggle to defeat Napoleon. For example, some candidates pointed out that the navy saved Britain from defeat but could not deliver victory.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How effectively did...Palmerston secure British interests 1822-41?' Examiners were pleased with most of the answers that they read and some candidates deserved very high marks. They examined what might be viewed as failures as well as successes by Palmerston and came to a judgement about the balance between them. Moderate answers tended to be happier dealing with success than failure. For example, they considered developments in the Middle East, the outcome of the Belgian crisis and the maintenance of British interests in China. They were less able to examine the alternative case that emerged from his dealings with the United States and the unpopularity in some quarters of his policies towards China. Some answers contained a list of developments, accurate in themselves, but unexplained in terms of success or failure and without an overall judgement. The preparation of a plan, as suggested earlier in this report, might have helped these candidates to achieve a higher mark.

## Q3 The Age of Peel 1829-1846

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'Why was Ireland so important to Peel's career?' A frequent discriminating factor between less and more successful answers was the extent to which they dealt with salient issues throughout the period from 1829 to 1846. Almost all of the candidates mentioned the Famine in the 1840s but some answers were limited to this issue and were based on a slightly different question about the reasons why Peel repealed the Corn Laws. Such answers could not achieve high marks. Some candidates jumped from Catholic Emancipation to the Famine. These were more worthwhile but their limited range often led to a mark in a middle band. On the other hand, examiners were pleased to read many answers that dealt with a wide range of issues that were relevant to Peel and Ireland. They considered the stated factor of law and order and considered alternatives, indicating which was more important. As well as Catholic Emancipation and the famine, they examined Peel's attitude to Ireland in the 1830s and early 1840s through such issues as O'Connell and the demands for the repeal of the Union, land reform and religion.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why did Corn Law repeal lead to the collapse of Peel's government in 1846?' It asked whether the main obstacle facing Peel in repealing the Corn Laws was his own party. Most candidates agreed. Some agreed but did not consider any alternatives. Such answers that contained a sound justification and convincing knowledge could reach a high, but not the highest, mark band because they did not explain why the Conservatives were the main problem for Peel. For example, Peel did not wish to appear to be caving in to pressure from the Anti-Corn Law League. There were groups outside his political party that preferred protection to free trade. Peel's own reputation was at stake because, whilst he was instinctively a free-trader, he defended the Corn Laws in the 1841 election. The general standard of the answers was good and an encouraging proportion of candidates deserved very high marks.

#### **Q4 The Economy and Industrialisation 1780-1846**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'Why was Britain the first Industrial Nation?' The standard of most of the answers was encouraging and represented an improvement when compared with answers on this Study Topic in recent years. Examiners were pleased to read a good number of scripts that avoided general descriptions of industrialisation to focus on analyses and explanations of the key issue. Many candidates tried to put the relevant factors into some sort of priority although some based this on assertions - X was more important than Y- and not explain why this was so. Among relevant issues that candidates discussed were the availability of capital, geography, a growing population that provided labour and demand, generally favourable government policies and the role of inventions.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'What was the extent and nature of change?' A commendable number of candidates were able to explain why factories were important in industrialisation. They put this in the context of labour demands. The assessment that the Question was best served when candidates considered the limits within which factory labour operated by the middle of the nineteenth century. Credit was given when it was pointed that many parts of Britain still operated outside the factory system. Some candidates would have benefited if they had spent less time on general descriptions of industrial change, giving more attention to the study of factory labour as the Question required.

#### **Britain 1846-1906**

#### **Q5 Whigs and Liberals 1846-1874**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How were the Whigs transformed into Liberals over the period 1846-68?' It was encouraging that most answers reflected a reasonable range of points that are mentioned in the Specification, 'the wider social base of the party, support for free trade and laissez-faire, administrative competence, the roles and influence of Palmerston and Gladstone.' High credit was deserved by many candidates who could explain a variety on these issues. One of the features of the most successful answers was that they could distinguish between, and explain, the Whigs, Peelites and Radicals referred to in the Question. There were comparatively few answers that showed an unacceptable lack of knowledge and understanding.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'What was Gladstonian Liberalism?' Some answers were limited to Gladstone's first ministry. This was relevant but only part of a good response. Some interpreted the Question as an invitation simply to describe the reforms of the ministry and defeat in 1874. This deserved some credit but it ignored central issues in the Question. Fortunately, few candidates wrote such restricted answers and most were able to explain a variety of issues. They indicated what might be understood by Gladstonian Liberalism, for example its application to domestic reform, Ireland and foreign affairs. They assessed the personal influence of the 'People's William'. The best answers were successful in delineating the appeal to different groups whereas worthwhile but less creditable answers tended to refer generally to the social appeal of Gladstone's policies.

## **Q6 The Conservatives 1846-1880**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did the Conservatives secure the reform of parliament in 1867?' High marks were awarded when answers were reasonably balanced between the two issues of the need for constitutional change and political opportunism. Examiners did not require an exact balance because it was acceptable to spend more time on the factor that was thought to have been more important. However, answers that plumped for one and ignored the other could not deserve a high mark because the basis of the Question was a comparison. There were a number of commendable answers that combined explanation and knowledge and included valid reasons why one was more important. Some answers in the middle bands were very competent in explaining the two alternatives but lacked the ability to explain why one was more important. It might be argued that the desire to dish the Liberals and to win votes were a priority for Disraeli. The terms of the reforms tried to ensure that key elements of Conservative support would continue to be influential in voting. Changes in the franchise were not accompanied by other electoral reforms. On the other hand, pressure was growing from outside as well as within Parliament for an extension to the franchise and it was felt that an orderly introduction of reform would prevent possible disorder and future electoral unpopularity.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How popular was Disraeli's second ministry?' A number of possible reasons could be suggested for Disraeli's defeat in 1880. Candidates were asked to assess the particular importance of imperial developments. Although they did not have to agree that this was the major factor that affected the outcome of the election, high marks needed at least a basic explanation of this issue. Certainly Gladstone devoted much attention to imperial ventures, for example in South Africa and Afghanistan, in his campaigns. However, candidates were rewarded when they considered other issues, such as Disraeli's ineffective leadership during the election campaign, disappointment at the scale of Conservative social reforms and economic depression. The quality of most answers was satisfactory and examiners read many highly creditable answers that were clear and well-argued.

## **Q7 Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846-1902**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What principles governed policy in this period?' Many candidates demonstrated an understanding and knowledge of the aspects of foreign policy that are indicated in the content of this topic: 'the balance of power, expanding trade and empire, fear of Russia and limited support for constitutional states.' The Question suggested that fear of Russia was the priority but candidates could prefer other issues as long as they justified their arguments. The relevant period was long; the Question asked candidates to consider the second half of the nineteenth century. It was unreasonable to expect even the best candidates to be able to discuss all foreign policy developments in 45 minutes but examiners were looking for the principles that guided foreign policy, with enough supporting knowledge to make the arguments valid. There were some exceptionally successful answers that were able to combine range of explanation and very appropriate knowledge. A minority of answers were vague and very incomplete.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why was the policy of imperialism so popular in Britain between 1880 and 1902?' Some weak candidates could describe some examples of British imperial activity but were unable to discuss the specific issue of support by governments or the wider public although the content that might have been used is indicated in the Key Issue of the Study Topic. In the middle bands were answers that were able to explain governments' attitudes to imperialism well as public opinion. They were not as successful as answers that deserved the highest marks in assessing and comparing the weight of each opinion, then coming to a judgement about which prevailed.

There were a commendable number of these accomplished answers that added assessment to a clear understanding of the issues posed by the Question.

#### **Q8 Trade Unions and Labour 1867-1906**

- (a) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, ‘Why did the Conservative and Liberal parties lose support from the Trade Unionists?’ The more successful answers distinguished between the attitudes of Conservatives and Liberals to trade unions. Moderate answers wrote relevantly about government measures but often failed to make a distinction between the political parties. The least satisfactory answers included only surveys of trade unions that were not linked to political parties or the governments. There were some thoughtful essays that focused on the extent of the changes in views. Some excellent points were made about the attitudes of Liberal governments where a perceived need to cater for the demands and rights of labour contravened Liberal beliefs in free trade and laissez faire.
- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, ‘How did the Labour party emerge between 1886 and 1906?’ A satisfactory number of candidates could explain the contribution to the emerging Labour party of new political groups and trade unions. The most successful adopted a fully comparative approach that identified the roles of the elements named in the Question. They identified some of the major political groups such as the Fabians, SDF and ILP. They also examined why the trade unions were so significant. High marks needed a reasonable balance in answers between the political groups and trade unions. Marks in the middle bands were often given to answers that were very unbalanced, discussing one side of the Question and virtually ignoring the other. The least satisfactory answers were those that contained only vague surveys of the rise of Labour and lacked sufficient explanation and knowledge. Fortunately, these were comparatively few in number.

#### **Britain 1899-1964**

#### **Q9 Liberals and Labour 1899-1918**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, ‘What was the significance of the Liberal election victory of 1906?’ The Question offered the view that Tariff Reform was the main problem that faced the Conservatives from 1899 to 1905. Candidates did not have to agree with this claim and could offer several alternatives as priorities such as poor leadership, the consequences of the Boer War, and the more effective challenges from the Labour and Liberal parties. However, a high mark needed an adequate discussion of Tariff Reform and, if the issue was indeed seen as the major problem, a sound discussion of the factor. The most frequent improvement that might have been made to answers was in the explanation of the reasons why Tariff Reform proved to be a contentious issue. Many could refer accurately to fears of expensive food but few could explain why it divided the Conservatives if its disadvantages were so apparent. Why did Chamberlain and others press the party to adopt Tariff Reform? Why was the policy seen as advantageous and an election winner by some and disastrous and an election loser by others? The discussion of other factors was usually competent and often very convincing.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, ‘How serious was the crisis in England over Ireland from 1909 to 1916?’ It was relevant to explain the background to the Irish problem because the background provided the context to developments from 1909 to 1916. However, candidates needed to resist the temptation to write long surveys in order to focus on the specified period. The characteristic of the best answers was usually that they kept considering whether the Liberal governments mishandled Irish issues. Answers in the middle bands tended to contain accurate information about major developments that deserved credit but they lacked comments about they tell us about the governments. One

of the characteristics of good answers is that their candidates use their knowledge to tackle the particular question that is asked and they evidently focus on explanation. Some answers were weak because the candidates had inadequate knowledge and therefore could not frame satisfactory arguments.

#### **Q10 Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918-1939**

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'Why did Lloyd George ...fall from power in 1922?' Candidates could offer a variety of reasons to explain the fall of Lloyd George's government in 1922. The highest marks were usually awarded when the answers went beyond a list of factors to suggest some order of priority and particularly to offer a judgement about which the most important reason. Answers in the middle bands often contained satisfactory knowledge but used it less well to make judgements. There were no general weakness of understanding that should be pointed out but candidates from some centres seemed less confident about dealing with the end of the coalition, the result of a growing lack of confidence in the Prime Minister by the Conservatives.
- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How successfully did the National governments of 1931-39 deal with their problems?' The most frequent discriminating factor was candidates' success in dealing with social change in the 1930s. Less successful answers sometimes described social changes such as the popularisation of new forms of media, such as film and radio, the growth of car ownership and more varied retail shops but they could not explain how these might have helped to solve economic problems. Similarly, they described governments' policies but were unsure how far they contributed to an alleviation of economic problems. However, a commendable number of candidates could make the necessary connections between social change, governments' policies and economic problems. A valid alternative argument, that success was limited whatever was done until the end of the 1930s and rearmament, was offered by some candidates. Whilst many answers remained at a basically acceptable standard, some candidates produced responses that deserved high marks.

#### **Q11 Foreign Policy 1939-1963**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How and why did Britain reduce its Empire?' Answers that were awarded marks in the lowest bands sometimes made general assertions about Britain's policy of decolonisation after the Second World War; they lacked sufficient knowledge to support claims with examples. The reason why Suez was important was not understood except that it was a failure. Sometimes no other examples of decolonisation were mentioned. On the other hand, the impressive answers that deserved high marks did not necessarily agree that the Suez Crisis was the most important factor but they understood why it was significant to Britain and to other countries. They also considered other factors. Some were within the Empire, such as Indian independence and developments in parts of Africa. Some factors related to other foreign countries, especially the USA. Others were more domestic, a slow change in public opinion to which politicians responded to different degrees. The best answers were orderly and weighed the importance of issues, suggesting clearly which was the most important.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How and why did Britain become involved in the Cold War?' The most frequent discriminating factor that distinguished the more successful answers was that they understood the chronology of developments in the Cold War from 1945 to 1953. Some answers could have been improved if their basis in factual knowledge had been stronger. There was a tendency in weak answers to make claims without the necessary supporting evidence so that the responses were little more than assertions. In contrast, there were some very worthwhile answers that deserved high marks because of their combination of argument and knowledge. Candidates could

suggest other reasons for Britain's involvement in the Cold War, for example its inherent wish to continue the role of a major power, as one of the three countries that did most to win the Second World War, or its role as a world power with widespread commitments. However, Britain's relations with the USA needed to be addressed. Most candidates wrote adequate explanations of this aspect of the Question. There were some particularly effective accounts of Churchill's concern to link with Britain and the USA at the end of the World War. Other factors that cemented the relationship included economic interests and the development of nuclear weapons when Britain's preference for an independent deterrent became more unrealistic. The general quality of the answers was satisfactory.

## **Q12 Post-War Britain 1945-1964**

- (a) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did the Labour party...lose in 1951?' Candidates did not have to agree that Labour's internal divisions were the main cause of defeat in the 1951 election but a high mark needed an adequate explanation of this stated factor. Candidates could then explain other reasons for the outcome of the 1951 election and weigh their comparative importance. There were some excellent, even outstanding, answers. These did not necessarily agree with the claim in the Question; they sometimes preferred other explanations. However, a common feature of these essays was they were well organised, focused on an argument and could support their explanations with accurate knowledge. At the other extreme were answers that described some Labour reforms but did not address the reasons for defeat except for vague and unexplained references to divisions. These would have been improved if they had been more specific and if they had kept the terms of the Question firmly in view.
- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Why did the Conservatives remain in power from 1951 to 1964?' The standard of most of the answers was sound. Most candidates wrote relevantly and combined adequate understanding and knowledge. Some demonstrated high levels of competence. Their answers explained the issue of Conservative leadership and how far it was effective. For example, they contrasted the general success of Macmillan with the comparative failures of Eden and Hume. Although Churchill won the 1951 election for the Conservatives, he was not highly successful in his last premiership. The most successful candidates were aware of Macmillan's weaknesses as well as his strengths as prime minister. They also compared the importance of Conservative leadership and other advantages with Labour's weaknesses during the salient period. In the middle bands were answers that were reasonably convincing in their descriptions of major developments but were less able to explain reasons. There were few weak answers that lacked either understanding or knowledge of the topic.



## **Principal Examiner's Report**

### **Units 2585 (Period Studies – European history 1046-1718) and 2586 (Period Studies – European and World History 1789-1989)**

#### **General Comments**

The number of candidates entered for the Units continues to rise. This is obviously very encouraging, although the range of topics being studied does appear to be getting slightly narrower. On 2585 there has been a significant decline in the number of candidates answering on the seventeenth century, particularly once Richelieu, Mazarin and Louis XIV are discounted. A large number tackle either the Crusades or Ferdinand and Isabella, although there also appeared to be a larger number studying Exploration and Discovery. Meanwhile Unit 2586 is dominated by the Hitler option, although the Russia in the Twentieth century options attract large numbers, as does Mussolini and the Origins of the American Civil War. The report highlights areas where there are few candidates, making comments on some of the questions impossible. Centres are accustomed to the type of questions and candidates did not appear unsure how to tackle the paper, suggesting that they had been well prepared.

The overall standard of responses appeared comparable with last summer, although a number of examiners did comment that at the lower end there did appear to be more weak scripts. These weak answers were characterised by a lack of factual knowledge relevant to either the question set, or the actual topic. However, it was also noted that these weak answers suffered from very poor English, which inhibited a candidate's ability to express their ideas, even at a very basic level. Yet, at the top end there were candidates whose answers were outstanding and showed an excellent grasp of both the topic they had studied and an ability to construct a logical and balanced analytical answer. However, it was noticeable that the exciting introduction has almost totally disappeared, with hardly any evidence of snappy quotations or eye-catching comments.

It was noticeable that a large number of candidates appeared to have been drilled very thoroughly in the skills needed to achieve the higher bands. As a result their answers were almost formulaic as they tried to justify the importance or otherwise of a range of factors. Unfortunately, many fell down as they simply did not have the factual knowledge to support their assertions or, knowing that the prioritisation of factors and the establishment of links were important, they tried to draw together contradictory ideas and failed to convince examiners that they had established meaningful links. There were also still candidates who simply 'bolted on' their assessment at the end of the paragraph and once again this will not get them into the higher bands. Very often their comments earlier in the paragraph had not supported the assertion that this was the most important factor or any other evaluative comment they made. There also appeared to have been a growth in the number of candidates using counter-factual assertions: if X had not happened then...followed by an assertion. These are very difficult and some candidates seem to think that speculation is as valid as analysis. This may be a by-product of teaching about how to argue, but it can undermine more than help.

There also appeared to be a large number of centres who had provided students with essay plans which were then pre-learned by the candidates and reproduced as essays in the examination. This also caused many candidates difficulties as the question set was not exactly the same as the plan that had been learned and the students were unable to adapt to the specific demands of the question. Very often it appeared to be average candidates who were brought down by this and they would have been better without the learnt plan. Candidates need to be flexible when they get into the examination room and be able to apply their knowledge to the actual question set. All the questions naturally derive from the Key Issues and teachers should use these to identify debates that could form the focus of essay questions. Teachers who want to help their candidates achieve these top bands would be better advised encouraging their students to debate issues that are raised by the Key Issues in the Specification and through the

use of techniques, such as balloon debates, accustoming their students to justifying their arguments.

As a result of the apparent teaching of responses and phrases to be used, it appears that candidates are not reading as widely as they used to. There was little evidence of wider reading and the use of quotations from historians to support arguments. Although historiography is not a requirement of AS it is always pleasing to read an argument that is supported by reference to, or quotations from, more than tertiary texts. Wider reading would also help students see the narrow topic they study in a wider context and would help them to improve their written style, let alone enthuse them for the subject!

The command words used by examiners should, by now, be familiar, but there are still some centres and candidates who seem to be unaware of the demands made by these. Although detailed comments have been made in previous reports it is worth reiterating some of the more important issues. One of the more frequent command words used in the examination is 'assess'. When this is used candidates are expected to analyse a variety of reasons, not simply in the form of a list, but to consider their relative importance in the event under consideration. It is not expected that candidates will be able to analyse every reason in the time allowed, but a reasonable number must be considered so that the event can be fully explained. When it is used to help to explain an event, candidates should draw links between factors, but they must also explain those links. As mentioned in an earlier paragraph, candidates must not simply assert a factor is the most important; they must demonstrate or show how it is the most important if they want to reach the higher levels. The other frequent command phrases used are 'To what extent was X the most important reason' or 'How far was X the most important reason'. When faced with these command phrases it is expected that candidates will write at least a good paragraph on the named factor, even if they dismiss that factor as the most important and go on to argue there was another more important factor; they cannot simply dismiss the named factor and discuss others. It is also important that candidates use relevant material to support their argument. There were a number of instances this summer where candidates used information from before the period in question to support their answer. This was particularly noticeable on 2586 with the question on Italian Unification, where candidates argued that Austria was the most important reason for the defeat of the 1848-9 revolutions, but drew their information from the revolutions of 1830. This will not be credited as evidence demonstrating that Austria was the most important reason.

The problems with a clear chronological understanding of the period under study continue to be an issue with certain Study Topics. It was particularly apparent with the French Revolution, Napoleon and Italian Unification on 2586. Events were attributed to statesmen or rulers after they had fallen from power or, in some instances, after they had died. The same was true on 2585, particularly with the Dutch Revolt and Charles V and the Holy Roman Empire/Charles I of Spain. The length of period under study is relatively small and it is not unreasonable to expect students to have a good chronological understanding; without this they will also draw the wrong conclusions. However, it was pleasing to see that there was a decline in the number of candidates who confused hyperinflation of 1923 with the Depression of 1929. Yet, once again, it would be worthwhile for centres to design timelines for their period studies and get their students to learn them.

In some areas precise factual knowledge was lacking. Candidates were also drawing on a very narrow range of support material. This was particularly noticeable on some of the more popular topics where weaker students often considered only two events. The questions on Ferdinand and Isabella, particularly on religion, were often limited to the war in Granada and the question of the Moors, whilst the Nazi question on terror and propaganda was often confined to a consideration of the Jewish issue and the role of the Gestapo. Such a narrow focus, no matter how good the analysis, will not allow a candidate to access the higher levels.

It is also worth noting that it appears as if some centres do not teach the whole of the study period or place little emphasis on certain aspects. This was noticeable for example on the questions on the League of Nations and Mussolini's foreign and colonial policy, where many candidates drew their examples from only the 1930s. Once again this does not allow candidates to present a balanced assessment of the issue under consideration. A similar picture could be seen on 2585 where, for example, candidates who answered on the Renaissance in Florence and Venice frequently struggled to write more than a few sentences on Venice. Although examiners were not expecting a 50:50 split it is not possible to make an effective comparison if the answer is so badly slanted towards one area. Centres do need to study all the issues as questions can, and will, be set that cover more than one of the Key Issues.

Examiners were very forthright this year in expressing concern about the continued decline in the standard of both written work and handwriting. This is a common theme raised in these reports, but it did seem particularly noticeable this year. There were occasions when a lack of command of the language actually prevented examiners from understanding what a candidate was trying to say; obviously the candidate cannot be rewarded when this happens. It was also noticeable that some candidates were even inventing words as we saw the emergence of 'unsuccess' in an attempt to analyse the failings of a ruler's foreign policy. It must also be noted that this is a formal examination and candidates are expected to write in formal prose; this means that the very familiar use of abbreviations must be avoided. Punctuation and spelling also remain areas of concern. There were some essays where you could read a side without encountering any punctuation. The semi colon is a dying breed and the use of the paragraph is also in decline. Spelling of key names and concepts was often poor, even if the term appeared in the actual question. There were a large number who could not spell Ferdinand or Mussolini or Versailles.

### **Comments on Specific Questions:**

#### **Unit 2585**

It must be noted that there are a large number of questions on this paper that are answered by very few candidates and, as a result, it is often difficult to make comments.

- 1a) There were very few answers to this question, but most were able to explain some reasons, although the depth of analysis was often limited.
- 1b) This was more popular than 1a, however a number of candidates wrote extensively about comparisons with other orders and this detracted from the precise focus of the question, even when it was argued effectively. It was expected that candidates would focus on reasons for the loss of appeal of the Cluniacs, and the growth of other orders was only one reason.
- 2a) There were some answers to this question, but many were characterised by a poor knowledge base and a poor focus on the actual demands of the question. Candidates frequently appeared to be trying to answer a question focused on the reasons for Frederick Barbarossa's failure, so at best they were showing only implied focus.
- 2b) This was a more popular question and saw a range of approaches. Candidates often showed a good knowledge of the various theories, but whilst the best answers were able to incorporate these within candidates' own knowledge and use the information in a focused way, less focussed answers did little more than describe the theories and often at the expense any factual knowledge of events. There was also a tendency among some candidates to drift from the actual focus of the question set and examine the general factors which allowed for the strengthening of the French monarchy.

- 3a) This was a less popular question than 3b and although the question lent itself to a factor based approach there were many who simply described events. In other instances candidates appeared to have chosen this only as a fallback option, resulting in a large number of weak answers. Many showed a very narrow focus or described events from the crusades or confused periods. However, there were some very good answers where candidates were able to draw on a wide range of factors.
- 3b) This was a popular question and at the top end there were some excellent answers, showing a good balance in the discussion of success/failure and focus on the key word 'total'. Many high level responses took the line of considering success against the difficulties faced. However, some otherwise quite strong answers found it more difficult to discuss the idea of failure in any depth, limiting the answers to references to the failure to capture Jerusalem. Most analytical answers were more successful in considering issues that could be considered successful. In the lower bands candidates either described the events of the Third Crusade or wrote about why it failed. This question also provided a clear example of candidates who had pre-learnt a slightly different question-Why did the Third Crusade fail? - and tried to adapt it to the actual question set; the result was usually unimpressive and should provide a clear warning against this approach.
- 4a) No answers to this question were seen
- 4b) No answers to this question were seen.
- 5a) The Renaissance continues to be a popular topic and 5a was certainly much more popular than 5b. The best answers tended to focus on the connection between economic and political factors, and then broaden the answer out, using precise examples of individual families and cities. Most of the better answers were able to link economic factors with issues of patronage and again provide good examples, however at the lower end any link was limited to the sweeping phrase that culture costs money! Many did find it difficult to remain focused on the question and provided stock answers on the causes of the Renaissance and simply included economic factors as part of the generic answer. There were also a significant number of candidates who just wrote about the economy of the Italian states and did not link it to the development of the Renaissance.
- 5b) The discriminator for this question was the quality of comparison that candidates were able to achieve. At the lower end candidates were limited by a lack of knowledge on Venice and were unable to consider even Titian. As a result there were many answers with an excessive focus on Florence. Unfortunately there were candidates who had reasonable knowledge about both states, but relied on a descriptive approach or, if they did analyse, often did so without comparing and slipped down the mark bands.
- 6a) This was a popular question as Ferdinand and Isabella remains one of the most popular topics. Many answers described what Ferdinand and Isabella did to control the nobility and then bolted on a sentence at the end of the paragraph asserting that this was either a success or failure without any evidence to support the comment. It was surprising how narrow the focus was of many answers, with little consideration of the Civil War and the military victory at Toro, or the War in Granada as ways of bringing the nobility on side. There were very few candidates who looked at the latter years of the period and considered the problems that Charles would face as this could have been used to argue that if they did succeed then their triumph was personal. Many answers took the view that their handling was an unqualified success, but answers in the higher bands took a more balanced approach and put the idea of compromise between the monarchy and nobility at the heart of their answer.

- 6b) This was the most popular question and as a result there was a very wide range of answers. It was noticeable that many confined their answers to a very narrow focus, with the Granada War featuring prominently in most. There were problems for weaker answers in differentiating between Jews and Conversos and Moors and Moriscos, whilst even some of the better answers did not seem to have a clear grasp of the concept of *limpieza de sangre*, which underpinned attitudes to all religious groups. Candidates also seemed unsure about the policy of *convivencia*, being uncertain whether it was being encouraged or dismantled. At the higher levels answers often distinguished between the religious aims of Ferdinand and Isabella. These answers were also usually more wide-ranging and involved a detailed discussion of issues such as church reform, which was often lacking in the lower bands.
- 7a) There were very few answers to this question and those that did tackle it struggled with the period limits and wrote about Suleiman.
- 7b) There were not enough answers on this question to be able to comment.
- 8a) There were a large number of answers to this question and they covered the whole ability range. The question did lend itself to an evaluation of the relative importance of factors, prompting some very focussed responses around God and gold. Better answers rose to the challenge and were able to bring in other motives against which to judge the importance of the named factors. However, at the lower end there were many descriptive responses, but it was surprising how many chose to ignore Columbus as this would have provided a linking factor between God and gold. Some candidates had the Spanish searching for Prester John, when the Portuguese had already buried that myth before 1490! It would also be worth noting that there is a difference between motives and factors, and candidates who drifted in to writing about factors that allowed exploration, such as technological developments, did themselves a disservice.
- 8b) This was a less popular question, but it still produced some high quality answers. The problem for weaker answers was that candidates did not know enough about Da Gama to sustain or balance their answer and therefore drifted into general descriptions about the voyages of discovery. However, at the top end candidates were able to assess the importance of the voyages of both individuals and often concluded that Da Gama built on the earlier success of Diaz. Many answers also brought in the contribution of Henry the Navigator in encouraging exploration and this was perfectly valid.
- 9a) This was more popular than 9b and at the top end there were some excellent answers, which showed a clear ability to present a balanced argument. Most of the better answers started from a clear understanding of the structure of the Empire and then went on to show how Lutheranism impacted on this. These answers showed clearly that Charles' power did not continually decline, but that there were instances when it did appear as if he was going to be able to strengthen his position. However, there were a large number of candidates who lacked sufficient evidence or detail to sustain an argument and finished up making sweeping assertions about the state of Imperial authority. Many spent a great deal of time writing about Charles' wars and then went on to say that this kept him out of Germany so his power declined, but were unable to go beyond this. In attempting this question candidates did require a good knowledge of the structure and institutions of imperial government and this was often lacking. For the higher bands a balanced answer was expected and therefore it was disappointing when candidates simply argued that his position at the start was weak and it just got weaker.
- 9b) There were fewer takers for this question and some of the answers were very weak, but there were some outstanding efforts which were characterised by an ability to draw on a wide range of examples of economic factors.

- 10a) As with the question on the economy and the Holy Roman Empire, this question drew a number of weak responses as the candidates lacked specific details to support any argument that was put forward. Some resorted to describing reasons or simply describing agriculture and industry. However, better answers were able to challenge the question and frequently pointed to industrial developments in the north of Spain.
- 10b) There were more answers to this question than for 10a. The weakest responses failed to distinguish between the different areas of the monarchy and therefore jumped backwards and forwards between his policies as King of Spain and Emperor. These answers frequently considered Eastern Europe, although better answers brought this in and argued relevantly that it was a distraction. However, most were able to write about Charles' policy towards France, the Mediterranean and the Turks.
- 11a) The focus on 'master of Italy' caused some candidates difficulty as many found it hard to identify other possible factors that influenced foreign policy. However, better answers suggested that breaking the encirclement of the Habsburgs was more important. Even the better answers found it difficult to explain why France might want to be the master of Italy. Despite this, there were candidates who, by examining and differentiating between the aims of the different kings were able to give themselves a straightforward way of achieving an evaluative response. Weaker answers frequently drifted into a narrative of the wars Italy.
- 11b) This produced a wide range of responses. The key to the higher levels was an ability to focus on political problems and many simply wrote about any problem they could think of. When candidates did address the question many discussed the political ramifications of religion and foreign policy, finance and the nobility. Most answers spent much of the time considering religion and focused on the spread of Calvinism, disputes with the Sorbonne and Parlement, but when answers did not link this to the political problems created they drifted from the focus.
- 12a) There were many good answers to this question as candidates showed a good knowledge and understanding of the widespread effects of artillery on warfare and its knock-on effects such as costs. However, whilst many attributed increasing costs to increased expenditure on men and weapons, there was little indication that this was also linked to the changed nature of warfare in the long drawn out wars of attrition which the developed artillery and hence fortifications necessitated. There were some weaker answers which slipped into a description of the changing battlefield or showed difficulty in explaining the decline of chivalry and the cavalry.
- 12b) There were fewer answers to 12b than 12a, but as with 12a many candidates displayed a very strong factual knowledge and the better answers were able to assess the issues and provide both a ranking of factors and linkage. However, at the bottom end candidates simply described the changes that took place during the period.
- 13a) This was not a popular question and the candidates who did attempt it found it challenging. Most answers focused on ranking the causes or reasons for why it spread across Europe.
- 13b) This question drew a wider number of answers. It was noticeable that many candidates were unwilling to give Trent much credit and preferred to focus their praise on the Popes. It was important that candidates were able to distinguish between what was decreed at Trent and what was implemented. At the lower level candidates simply described what Trent did.
- 14a) This question was done poorly with most candidates not really getting to grips with the demands of the question. Many answers were descriptive of the Edict of Nantes or candidates simply did not know enough about the Edict to be able to weigh it up against other factors.

- 14b) Although not a particularly popular topic, this question brought a wide range of responses from candidates. There were some answers which simply described the work of Sully and demonstrated quite a sound knowledge of his work; others dismissed his work in a very brief paragraph before considering other factors. The question required a balanced response where the work of Sully was weighed up against other factors in the strengthening of royal authority.
- 15a) This question attracted a full range of responses as candidates were invited to consider a wide range of factors. Some candidates focused their answer on the situation at the start of Philip's reign, others considered his unpopularity throughout the period; either approach was acceptable and what determined the bands was the quality of assessment. Most candidates displayed a good knowledge of the topic. However, candidates do need to be aware that Calvinism accounted for only 10% of the population at the beginning of the period and that this was mainly in the south, which led candidates to emphasise religion as opposed to liberties.
- 15b) There were some outstanding answers to this question as candidates were able to explain a wide range of reasons and draw clear links between the factors. However, the issue of 'military superiority' was often the weakest of the factors that was considered. Although it could be dismissed as the most important factor candidates did need to write a reasonable paragraph on it and they could have considered issues such as the reforms of Maurice of Nassau in the creation of smaller units, improved discipline and the use of waterways in gaining success. The better answers frequently argued that it was Spanish commitments elsewhere and financial problems which allowed the Dutch to have military superiority.
- 16a) This question highlighted the need for candidates to read the question carefully as some answers went on through his whole reign, missing the focus on inheritance. There were very few answers that went beyond listing the problems he inherited and many just described them.
- 16b) There were very few answers to this question.
- 17a) This is quite a popular option and nearly all candidates tackled this, rather than 17b. Most candidates tended to focus on the aims he set down in the 'Testament' and this resulted in the focus of their answer being on achieving his aims, rather than the actual question set. Many answers drifted into the area of foreign policy without making it relevant to the actual question; others wrote about absolutism without showing a clear grasp of the term. Candidates must also ensure that they do not take an uncritical approach to his achievements. Better answers remained well focused and addressed the issue of 'to what extent'.
- 17b) There were very few answers to this question and those who did attempt it did not know enough about the terms of Westphalia to be able to offer a sound response. In order to tackle this question successfully candidates needed a much better understanding of French aims in the 1630s.
- 18a) There were no answers to this question.
- 18b) This question attracted very few responses.
- 19a) There were no answers to this question.
- 19b) There were no answers to this question.

- 20a) This question was more popular than 20b. The format 'assess the reasons' is a standard command and requires a supported hierarchy of factors and, as some candidates demonstrated, was achievable. However, too many candidates found themselves struggling with ideas, particularly when trying to handle the religious dimension to the answer. Whilst most recognised that this was a factor, many were unable to show any real understanding of the Churches' motivations, and very few could distinguish adequately between either witchcraft and heresy or Protestant and Roman Catholic. There was also a general weakness in chronology with many not seeming to be aware of the gap in time between the Reformation and the Thirty Years War.
- 20b) This type of question often draws sweeping generalisations, and this year was no exception. Most answers wrote very vaguely about either political or social issues. Candidates must, even on the social questions, support their arguments with specific examples and not make sweeping assertions. Many answers drifted into general descriptions of the policies and popularity or otherwise of Richelieu and Mazarin.
- 21a/b) There were very few answers to these questions.
- 22a) This is the most popular of the seventeenth century topics and this question attracted most answers. There were fewer simply narrative accounts of the wars than has been seen in the past, but many candidates did find the idea of 'aggressive' quite difficult and certainly could not sustain their focus on the idea of 'more aggressive'. Some candidates found the concept of the Dutch War as a turning point quite challenging and although they could assess whether Louis' policy was aggressive or defensive they found it more difficult to keep focused on the specific demands of this question.
- 22b) There were very few answers to this question.
- 23a) This question was challenging for many candidates who were unhappy with the term 'separatism' and either considered it synonymous with separation or dismissed it and moved on to other factors. Many answers had a tendency to describe aspects of and effects of disunity and separatism and not widen their treatment sufficiently.
- 23b) This question was not very popular. However, the answers were generally better than those for 23a as candidates were able to bring out the differences between the two rulers effectively.
- 24a) There were very few strong answers to this question, but what candidates did produce showed that it was possible to produce high level responses. The relationship between trade and fishing, and the growing wealth of merchants were areas which were clearly understood, but those between merchants and war were less well demonstrated, with some candidates assuming that trade with Spain was to the disadvantage of the Dutch.
- 24b) There were very few answers to this question.

### Unit 2586

- 1a) Answers to this question overall showed a good level of both knowledge and understanding. Many answers agreed with the statement, but were still able to argue that there were other factors that brought about his downfall; these factors were often the war or the *sans-culottes*. Most candidates had plenty of material on Louis and the extent to which he could be blamed. It was pleasing that most answers did not spend too long examining events before 1789, although some weaker answers were weak on events between 1789 and the flight to Varennes. However, one noticeable development, which was particularly apparent on this question, was a tendency for candidates to assert that factors were linked without actually demonstrating how. Thus links were stated with two

unconnected or opposite factors with no effort to find a common thread. There were obvious ways in which issues such as Louis, the war and the *sans-culottes* could have been linked and these must developed for the highest bands.

- 1b) There were some good answers to this question, although it was less popular than 1(a). Most answers were able to consider events up to 1793, but tended to be less convincing on the period from 1793 to 1795. The key to a good answer was the candidate's ability to examine the role of the people of Paris in a variety of events; weaker answers often had a very narrow focus. Better answers were able to compare the people of Paris with other elements in order to reach a balanced conclusion.  
It is clear that there is still confusion about the peasantry and the nature of the *sans-culottes*, which needs to be clarified in the minds of candidates.
- 2a) Most candidates knew a great deal about the reforms of Napoleon, but weaker answers tended to list the reforms without any evaluation of how they affected the people of France. Unfortunately some candidates did not see that the point of the question was to assess whether, and to what extent, order and stability were the most important effect, or whether it was something else. Answers frequently simply agreed that the reforms did indeed enhance order and stability, rather than considering whether it was the main effect. There was also a tendency for candidates to assert that order and stability were important without actually supporting their argument with precise evidence and this resulted in answers remaining in the lower bands. Some answers did get into a rather circular argument suggesting that Napoleon wanted to consolidate his power and to do so he had to create order and stability which his reforms did! Better answers referred to Napoleon's need to create order and stability following the chaos of the previous years, whilst others made the point that order and stability were code words for repression and dictatorship.
- 2b) This was a popular question which brought a wide range of responses. The most common weakness was the inability to deal with the given factor. At the lower end there was a distinct lack of precise knowledge of the coalitions against Napoleon and many were unable to make any evaluative comment upon the role of his enemies. As a consequence many spent much longer examining Napoleon's abilities and assessing his successes; when they did touch upon his enemies they were often reduced to very sweeping statements, such as they were 'incompetent and divided', the enemy was 'backward looking and old fashioned' or 'the coalitions could not agree'. Questions on Napoleon's military success do require a good knowledge of the battles and campaigns, but many failed to cite battles or campaigns as examples, and events after 1807 were often completely neglected; few had a secure sense of chronology and would benefit from a clear timeline of the campaigns. Without this specific knowledge candidates sink into a complex web of confusion over different battles, tactics and strategy. There were answers which appeared to be pre-learnt, but focused on a slightly different question and this was a trend that appeared even more prevalent this summer. Once candidates were able to get onto other factors they were much happier; they were able to write well about Napoleon's qualities or the strength of the Grand Armee. Better answers did display an excellent knowledge of events and were also able to distinguish between 'incompetent' and 'divided'. These answers were able to establish links between factors, rather than simply assert.
- 3a) This question appeared to throw a number of candidates, so although the knowledge of causes of the revolution in 1830 was often sound the quality of analysis of long term/ short term was often very weak. Candidates were often unsure as to what constituted short term and some saw it as starting in 1824, others in 1829. Most disappointing was the lack of specific knowledge of events of the last year of Charles X. Very few were able to point out that even as late as 25 July 1830 it could have been possible for Charles to save himself if he had been prepared to concede quickly.

- 3b) This produced a variable set of responses. Weaker answers were descriptive or were very uneven with an over-focus on just a couple of events, whilst others made too much of domestic areas and issues affected by foreign policy. However, at the top end good answers were judicious, balanced and knowledgeable with an ability to identify Louis Phillippe's aims and weigh up his policy against them.
- 4a/b) This is not a popular topic and as a result there were very few answers to these questions and no overall pattern emerged.
- 5a) Italian Unification is a very popular topic and this question was much more popular than 5b. However, although there were many very good answers, this question did highlight some very common problems on this paper. There were many candidates who did not have specific knowledge of the precise named factor and were unable to write in any depth about the actual fighting and events of 1848-9; mention of the actual battles was frequently ignored. Candidates also ascribed the Austrian recovery to Metternich, despite his fall from power in early 1848! Other candidates ignored the dates 1848-9 and wrote about Austria in the period 1830-48. This often meant that the named factor was virtually ignored and they found themselves only able to access Band III or lower. Candidates must focus on the actual question set and once again turning out pre-learnt answers to a slightly different question is not going to achieve a high level. In the same vein over preparation of answers stifles responses and results in mechanistic responses which unfortunately often turn into a repeated shopping list of causes with learnt evaluative or analytical comments. Some candidates found it difficult to do anything but agree with the statement, but must provide evidence to support this view and even where this was the case they could still have considered other factors. However, there were a large number of good answers; frequently there were suggestions that the lack of foreign support was crucial, as was demonstrated in the later period when Austria was defeated. Answers at the higher levels were able to examine a range of factors including the role of the Papacy, internal divisions and the weak leadership of Charles Albert.
- 5b) This question was much less popular. At the lower end candidates found it difficult to produce balanced arguments and focused almost entirely on the view that Italy was not united. As a result candidates found themselves limited to Band III as a maximum. These answers also tended to be quite narrow in focus with concentration on the lack of geographical unity, considering areas that were not included in 1861. There was very little consideration of the centralisation of government, local government, economic reform or education. However, the better answers did produce more balanced comments and some very good answers argued very strongly against there being any evidence of real unity, attributing other explanations to factors such as plebiscites and the constitution.
- 6a) The biggest problem for candidates who tackled this question was a lack of understanding about the meaning of the word 'diplomacy' and they were therefore unable to create a credible response. However, even when some did know what the term meant there was a tendency to describe the diplomacy, but candidates were unable to explain how it helped to create a unified Germany, or if they did try to illustrate it were limited to Ems. The third problem for candidates again appeared to be the learnt response to a slightly different question and as a result there was a focus on the Zollverein and economic developments. They often knew a great deal about this and seemed determined to say it, even though the question did not require it! Many spent much longer on war and military factors. Although some found it difficult to say whether one factor was more important, others changed their mind half way through, which does little to convince an examiner about clarity of thought! However, better answers were able to show how the factors were interwoven and this allowed a clear passage into the top bands.

- 6b) In order to produce a good answer it was vital that candidates had a good knowledge of Bismarck's foreign policy post 1871 and unfortunately there were answers which were characterised by factual inaccuracies or sweeping generalisations. Other weak answers ignored the dates in the question and went on to blame Bismarck for the outbreak of the war in 1914! However, better answers were able to engage in a balance discussion; they were able to set out Bismarck's aims and then judge his successes and failures against the aims. Many of the better answers argued that successes were short term, but longer term there were failures and pointed to Bismarck's personality or the problem of tying Germany to the weak Austria-Hungary.
- 7a) There were not many answers to this question and most were able to suggest or argue that Napoleon's policy was a success to 1860 and a failure thereafter. More worrying was the lack of factual knowledge that pervaded many answers.
- 7b) There were very few answers to this question and no pattern could be discerned.
- 8a) The main problem for candidates who tackled this question was a tendency to describe the opposition groups and not explain how serious a threat they posed for the Tsars. Some weaker answers actually discussed the Crimean War as 'opposition' which made some of their discussion irrelevant. However, most were able to make reference to the Decembrists and Poles when discussing Nicholas I and the People's Will and the Narodniks when considering Alexander II. In the top bands candidates did discuss why there was so little opposition and were able to examine the role of Orthodoxy, the use of repression, the lack of mass support, illiteracy and localism of the peasantry.
- 8b) The main problems with this question were that candidates either wanted to write about all the reforms of Alexander II or did not know sufficient about the issue and terms of Emancipation. Unfortunately many answers that did engage in discussion were not balanced and focused on the limitations of Emancipation, rather than considering any successes.
- 9a) This was a popular question and many identified the election of Lincoln as the trigger factor, whilst the slavery issue sits in the background, which most agreed was the most important factor because without it Lincoln's election would not have brought about the war. Better answers were able to focus on the immediate consequences of Lincoln's election as well as the underlying tensions within American society. It was particularly pleasing to see the clear understanding of the constitution in terms of Congressional representation of the slave and no-slave states with the growth of the Union. However, in some answers there was a tendency to spend too long examining the background causes or long term causes of the war and this left some candidates short of time to consider the main focus of the question. Some candidates did need to display a clearer understanding of the perceptions of Lincoln. There were a significant number of candidates who simply produced a list of reasons for the causes of the Civil War, but showed little attempt to evaluate their relative importance, despite the main word being printed in bold type. However, the best answers were able to discuss the impact of events and ideas on the outbreak of the war and judged the relative importance throughout the answer.
- 9b) This was a popular question and there were many good answers. The given factor allowed candidates to present a clear and evaluative argument. Many were able to argue that the North won because of superior resources, but the fact the South were able to last so long and had a real hope of not losing allowed an interesting debate. The best answers often linked resources with military success and often concluded that resources were the most important factor. Other good answers were also able to question whether the North actually had superior generals. Many candidates had a good military knowledge and were able to compare the generals of the north with those of the south. However, there were others whose knowledge was confused: Lee leading the North and Davis commanding the

Union at Gettysburg. However, once again there were candidates who appeared to be attempting previous questions, particularly why the south lost. There were also a considerable number who just presented a list of factors and did not evaluate their importance and as result remained at Band III.

- 10a/b) This topic does not attract many candidates and as a result not enough answers were seen to allow any general comments to be made.
- 11a) There were not many answers to this question. At the lower end candidates had learned what caused the developments in transport and so did not focus on the precise demands of the question or failed to address the full range of the period. Another failing was seen where candidates simply considered the issues of transport and communication. However, better answers were well supported with a good range of precise examples and were able to bring in other factors.
- 11b) This question attracted a number of weak answers for a variety of reasons. Some candidates had a good range of knowledge, but were unable to analyse or draw links; others focused heavily or even entirely on the Native American problem and narrated the course of the Indian wars. However, better answers were able to discuss issues such as land, settlements, the Indians and law and order. Most importantly, the candidates at the top level were those who addressed the issue of 'how successful'.
- 12a) There were some answers to this question. Some candidates simply produced a list of reasons and failed to assess the importance of factors and therefore limited themselves to Band III. However, many were able to distinguish between economic, social and political issues.
- 12b) This question produced a wide range of responses. At the top end good candidates were able to produce a thematic answer, examining social, political and economic issues with comparisons and contrasts. In particular, good answers often compared the situation in 1877 with 1900 -1912. However, others fell into a number of traps. Some just focused on the idea of 'worse position' and considered only the Jim Crow laws, vigilantes, the Federal Government and voting rights; as a result little attention was given to the idea of 'better position' and they sacrificed the chance to achieve a balance and move beyond Band III. There were other candidates who wrote almost entirely about the period of Reconstruction and had obviously not read the question carefully.
- 13a) This was a popular topic and saw answers across the whole mark range. There were a number of reasons for weak answers. Some candidates wrote about the causes of 1905 or the events and did not relate their knowledge to the question. In some cases candidate's knowledge of the events of 1905 was very shaky and did not go beyond Bloody Sunday and the October Manifesto, with no knowledge of October and the general strike or the Moscow Rising in December. There were other candidates who believed that the peasantry rose in 1905 - they did not. There were a large number of candidates who were unable to produce a balanced answer and did not see the situation as serious, almost dismissing this view and suggesting that the Tsar was easily able to overcome the threats. Very few candidates considered the almost total breakdown of central control for several months. Significant numbers misunderstood the concessions made in the October Manifesto and explained the concessions as a sign of strength from the throne, rather than attempts to defuse the situation. However, at the top level there were some excellent answers. The question made candidates think and it showed the advantage of not being able to simply reproduce a well-prepared list of factors. Better answers were balanced and although many emphasised the role and importance of the loyalty of the army and the 'divide and rule' strategy followed by Nicholas they related this to the idea of 'serious threat'. Many better answers used the period 1905 -1911/1914 to assess whether the position of the Tsar was seriously threatened.

- 13b) This was a very popular question and at the top end there were some excellent answers that were able to prioritise factors and draw links between them. The key to a good answer was to focus on 'continuation' and not write about the war in general and the failings of the Tsar; candidates needed to focus on 1917. Too many weaker answers focused on the general issues of inflation, food shortages and low morale and then simply said that this meant that the masses were open to revolutionary ideas. The better answers were able to focus on the crucial events of June, July and August 1917, with specific reference to the Kerensky Offensive and the Kornilov Revolt. It was surprising how many candidates knew very little about the difficulties the Provisional Government would have faced *a propos* foreign allies if they had dropped out of the war and the threat that Germany posed. Many of the better answers were able to link the Provisional Government's decision to continue the war to rise of the Bolsheviks and, in particular, the April Theses. However, there were some candidates who believed that the Bolsheviks were the largest party and others knew very little about the tactics of the Bolshevik party during this period and were unable to comment on the role of either Lenin or Trotsky. As always with this type of question there were candidates who simply listed reasons and got stuck in the multicausal rut. The better answers usually engaged in a sophisticated debate about the continuation of the war and the policies of the Provisional Government and were able to set it against other factors, rather than a general essay about the Bolsheviks coming to power.
- 14a) This question saw a very wide range of answers, from the outstanding to the very weak. At the bottom end candidates failed to understand the demands of the question and did not appear to understand the phrase 'military strategies' with the result that their knowledge appeared to have been gained from Blackadder and little else. However, there were some excellent answers and the question appeared to encourage real thought and candidates had the opportunity to display flair, rather than reproduce a turgid list of factors.
- 14b) On the whole, this question produced many disappointing answers, with many not progressing beyond GCSE. Many answers lacked a depth of understanding and knowledge necessary for an analytical discussion. Many simply wrote about what Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd George wanted rather than the reasons why they wanted it. Most were able to say something relevant about Clemenceau, but knowledge of Wilson was patchy and very few gave any indication that Britain wanted an end to Germany's navy and Empire. However, even those who wrote in some depth about France were often unable to support their arguments with facts and figures. The most common answers described the different attitudes and aims of the Big Three rather than assessed the reasons for the differences.
- 15a) This was quite a popular question, but the most common feature was an inability to write about the 1920s. As a consequence many answers lacked balance and saw a heavy focus on the invasion of Abyssinia and subsequent relations with Germany. There were a number of descriptive answers, but the most common approach saw candidates simply go through events in a chronological order and at the end of each paragraph write a sentence asserting whether it was a success or failure. The key to a good answer was an ability to identify his aims in the introduction and then assess events against the aims. Unfortunately, when discussing his aims many were unable to go beyond the idea of 'respected and feared'. However, where there was wider coverage of events the better answers were able to contrast the apparent statesman of c1925-1934 with the war-maker of 1935-1940. These answers frequently considered the changing relations with Germany, which went from the success of 1934 to the disastrous alliance that would ultimately be damaging for Italy. It was surprising how few candidates took the opportunity to discuss Mussolini's relationship with Britain and France, whereas many were quick to dismiss his foreign and colonial policy as a failure and not look in any depth at the propaganda triumphs that they produced. Perhaps most worryingly were the number of candidates who

believed that they could write about anything that had the word Battle in it and therefore we had coverage of the Battle for Grain, the lira and Births!

- 15b) This question was more popular than 15a, but it also resulted in many weak answers as many were unable to identify Mussolini's political aims and simply saw the question as an opportunity to write about everything and then assert that this was an aim. As a result we had lengthy paragraphs about his policy towards women or the young. Although examiners were open-minded in their understanding of the term political aims the better answers tended to be those that identified them in an introduction and then evaluated Mussolini's actions against them. Many stated that he wanted to establish a dictatorship, but then launched into a narrative of what Mussolini did, rather than focusing on whether it was achieved. There were certainly some candidates who did not appear to know anything beyond his rise to power, whereas others had little grasp of the complex chronology of his road to dictatorship from 1922 to 1926. It would certainly be beneficial for candidates to have and learn a timeline of these events so that they can support their arguments with precise examples. Better answers considered a range of aims, such as dictatorship, totalitarianism, a fascist state or simply the establishment of personal power, but there were some who spent too long writing about his foreign and colonial aims. In order to achieve the top bands a balanced discussion was expected and in order to achieve this many of the higher level answers were able to weigh up short term versus long term success or differentiate between propaganda and real success. However, even at the higher level it was surprising how many failed to consider the Lateran Treaties or the power of the King.
- 16a) This still continues to be the most popular topic and more candidates attempted this question than 16b. As a result of the large number of answers the full mark range was displayed on this question. The two most common features were the candidate's lack of precise knowledge about the contribution of Hitler and the omission of the Depression as a factor. When considering Hitler many were not able to go beyond offering generalisations about his oratory skills and this factor was often the weakest area, even in answers that offered a list of reasons. It was very surprising that many answers failed to mention the importance of the Depression, despite the fact that the Nazis went from 2.5% of the vote beforehand to 37% in 1932, although it was pleasing to note that the number who confused 1923 with 1929 appeared to have declined! However, even when candidates considered the Depression there were a large number who were unable to explain how it helped the Nazis and simply stated that it created unemployment, yet this should have provided an ideal opportunity for developing a link between factors. Unfortunately, there were a significant number of answers that seemed to assume that the Nazi party grew throughout the 1920s and this may explain why they did not consider 1929 important. On the positive side it was pleasing to see the increased number of candidates who were able to write about the political intrigue of 1932-3 and see this as vital, particularly given the decline in Nazi votes in the November 1932 election. Better candidates were able to take this further and link it to Hitler's abilities and show how he was able to exploit this in his dealings with the elites. There appeared to be fewer than usual answers that focused on the early years of the period, although the Munich Putsch and Hitler's subsequent trial and change of tactics was given significant attention when illustrating Hitler's abilities. Most were able to write relevantly about the weakness of Weimar, but the explanations of the importance of Versailles in bringing about its downfall do need thought; if it was so important why did Hitler not gain support at an earlier date or why did Weimar survive so long? There were some candidates who ignored the date in the question and spent time writing about the Night of the Long Knives or about the terror and propaganda that followed the securing of power.

- 16b) This question produced a large number of very ordinary answers and very few high level responses. Knowledge was often very sketchy and did not go beyond basic GCSE standard and a list of what the Nazis did. There was a tendency to focus on Nazi policy towards the Jews or on the Gestapo, where it was apparent that many were aware of the limits to their power. There were few candidates who were able to focus on the four elements mentioned in the question: terror, persecution, propaganda and indoctrination and then relate these to the issue of control. Many answers were simply descriptions of what the Nazis did and were unable to analyse the factors. There were many who focused on terror at the expense of persecution and propaganda at the expense of indoctrination. When candidates did try and argue they frequently failed to address the issue of more important and simply stated that both were important. Very few were able to evaluate the factors, but when it was achieved there were some very good answers that were able to draw links between the factors and showed that they were two sides of the same coin in controlling Germany.
- 17a) This question brought a wide range of responses, but most tended to be at the weaker end of the spectrum. There were candidates who simply went through describing the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. There were very few who picked up the significance of 1923 and most failed to deal with the issues of hyper-inflation and the invasion of the Ruhr. There was little evaluation of whether the effects of the Treaty were exaggerated by Germany and there was virtually no discussion of whether Germany could possibly pay the reparations. The better answers saw candidates evaluating the long and short term impact of Versailles or evaluating a range of factors such as economic and political.
- 17b) This was more popular than 17a and saw a wide range of responses. The most common weakness was a concentration on the 1930s, with reference largely to Manchuria and Abyssinia at the expense of other issues. If candidates did deal with the 1920s the majority considered only the Corfu incident, yet if they have studied this at GCSE they will have considered a much wider range of events. There were some answers that were able to write about the work of the agencies and were able to use the successes in these areas to balance against the failures. The most common argument saw candidates emphasising the League's success in dealing with relatively minor matters in the 1920s, but being unsuccessful when dealing with the bigger problems of the 1930s.
- 18a) This was a popular question which produced a wide range of responses. The better answers identified the aims of the Plans and then candidates related their knowledge back to the aims. However, there were many who focused on their own feelings about the plans and their disastrous human impact and therefore concluded that they were a failure, ignoring any discussion of whether the plans met their instigator's aims. It was also surprising to see how little specific knowledge there was about the plans, many simply lumped them together and there were very few who had any statistical evidence to support their arguments. Knowledge about collectivisation was better than the Five Year Plans. However, there were candidates who were able to analyse the successes of the plans, drawing attention to the increased production, the survival of the Soviet Union in the Second World War and the contribution they made towards the cult of Stalin's personality. It was more surprising that few examined the counter arguments such as the falsification of production figures, poor quality products, the impact of the purges on factory managers, let alone any scepticism based on what Russia might have achieved if she had continued with NEP. There were few that simply described the plans, although some did not get much further than explaining the aims of the plans.

- 18b) There were many good answers to this question as candidates did try and assess a variety of issues. Candidates were usually able to examine the immediate impact and then look at the human cost, economic dislocation, the impact on Stalin's position and the emergence of the Soviet Union as a super-power by the end of the Second World War. It was pleasing to see that many candidates were able to support their argument with specific examples from battles such as Stalingrad or Kursk.
- 19a) There were two common problems for candidates who attempted this question. There were those who had very little knowledge of the Conferences and others who got bogged down in details of the Conferences. There was a minimal grasp of other events that could have been considered and many got little further than mistrust generated during the war or ideological differences. It must be stressed that candidates who take these later options will require just as much knowledge as those studying the nineteenth century, but this was rarely seen.
- 19b) In many ways the same comments for question 19a could be applied to 19b; candidates simply did not know enough. It was a question that invited an examination of the inter-relationship between a variety of factors, but very few got beyond a fairly undeveloped list.
- 20a) There were some very good answers to this question and it certainly drew a higher level of responses than 20b. Many candidates knew a large range of factors, although some were unable to explain, or even mention, the immediate cause and what happened. Almost all candidates were able to discuss containment and place the invasion in context for the USA, but very few considered the policy of containment. However, assessing the relative importance of factors was a greater challenge. At the lower end some candidates did confuse Vietnam and Korea.
- 20b) This question appeared to be challenging for many candidates and there were answers that focused entirely on the causes of the crisis, rather than examining why it was resolved peacefully. It did lead to a large number of answers that narrated events from 1959 -1962. Those who did try and focus on its resolution often described how it was resolved, rather than the actual demands of the question. Most were clear on the context of the dispute, but struggled to go beyond the motives of Kennedy and Khrushchev in building their line of argument. Many answers were limited to the view that both sides were afraid of nuclear war, but were unable to develop the idea.

## Report on Units 2587, 2588 and 2589 in June 2007

### Principal Examiner's Report

**Unit 2587 (Historical investigations 768-1216)**

**Unit 2588 (Historical investigations 1556-1725)**

**Unit 2589 (Historical investigations 1799-1955)**

### General Comments

The June session for these units saw the removal of the two part Passages question in favour of a single question evaluating all the Passages. Examiners certainly welcomed this change and candidates seem to have appreciated it too. Most of them clearly took advantage of the opportunity to read the Passages carefully and to structure their answers more effectively. Very few instances of difficulty in the management of time were reported. Candidates also often performed more evenly across the two questions than on previous papers. There were some candidates who did not use the extra time so profitably. Some spent too long on extraneous knowledge, while others wrote lengthy plans which they could not then fulfil. Some did not divide their time well and were rushed on the essay.

In the Passages question the most frequent example of poor technique was, yet again, to disregard the Passages and the views expressed therein to concentrate on writing a mini essay on the area of debate. Candidates should be encouraged to group the Passages and the best introductions are those which outline the views in the Passages (and do not simply copy out the steers) as opposed to those which delineate the general debate on the topic, often referring to historians other than those used for the Passages. Alternative interpretations are useful for evaluation, but the main focus should be the views expressed in the Passages. Contextual knowledge should be related to the arguments in the Passages. If several factors are put forward in the Passages as possible explanations, further factors are not needed in the contextual knowledge

In the essay questions, the main fault remains the avoidance of the focus in the question. The comments on individual essay questions often mention a range of ways in which candidates managed not to answer the question set. Practice in the essential skill of adapting knowledge for a particular purpose is never time wasted and the mastery of this art will stand candidates in good stead whatever subjects they go on to study and indeed in employment.

The quality of written English remained very variable, but most examiners felt that it had not improved, with candidates continuing to make errors in the spelling of words central to the topic they were studying such as Puritan, Parliament or Bolshevik and also in words which appeared on the question paper. Some candidates needed to be more careful in their use of tenses, diverting at times into the present tense. The use of the first person is not considered appropriate at this level and some candidates waste words in their assertions that they believe this and it is their view that, or they say Haigh argues, and I agree with him, or a similar subordinate clause. Nor can the fact that the candidate agrees with a view, be taken as proof that the view is valid. Examiners also find the use of the subjunctive, as in revisionists *would* argue x or y, very irritating. Revisionists either argue for a view or they do not. Some candidates were careless about numbering their answers correctly and filling in the grid on the front of the booklet. Standards of handwriting did not improve either and centres should consider whether special provision needs to be made in extreme cases. Centres should also use the appropriate booklet for these papers, namely the 12 page booklet. Use of the 16 page booklet is wasteful and leads to higher postal charges.

Examples are included for each topic of good responses given Band I marks. These are not outstanding responses and none are perfect, but they show what can be achieved by candidates who keep the question constantly in view and write relevantly with sound evidence. They all show an ability to write with some fluency and to express ideas clearly. None argues using the first person.

### **Unit 2587: detailed commentary on questions**

There were 490 candidates, one third answering on Charlemagne and two thirds on King John. No letters of complaint were received about this paper.

#### **Charlemagne**

- 1 Candidates were able to group the passages effectively for this question with A and D seen as opposed to B and C. Many candidates saw the need to define what a great ruler implied but some spent too long on this and the definition could form an introduction which was not referenced again. Better candidates had plenty of contextual knowledge although some expounded at great length with details of Charlemagne's conquests. There were mentions of these in A, C and D but the focus of the passages was more on government. The evaluation was variable with surprisingly few candidates recognising that Einhard was distinctly favourable to Charlemagne. Some candidates preferred to bring in other historians such as Collins, France and McKitterick and explained their contributions to the debate, often at length, but not necessarily relating this clearly to the views in the Passages given. At times the Passages were ignored and the quoting of other historians made to sound as if they were the authors of the set Passages.
- 2 Candidates often had plenty of knowledge about Charlemagne's coronation in 800 but were not all able to relate their material well to the question set. Hence there were responses which omitted much reference to the coronation itself and others which barely moved away from the events of 800 and the debate about how far Charlemagne was aware in advance of what was to occur. A sound structure is to argue for one view and then for the alternative view, but in this case candidates who took the interpretation that the coronation was not important to Charlemagne first were the better advised, as the events they used, such as the Divisio in 806, preceded the evidence for the opposite view from the crowning of Louis in 813. Too many candidates saw the date 800 and wrote about decomposition, while others made cultural and religious reforms the main evidence for their arguments and mentioned few other aspects.
- 3 This was a less popular question but often answered well. Candidates were fully supplied with relevant knowledge of the debate and could write about the nature and extent of military activity after 800 using events in Spain, the campaigns in the Mediterranean and the defence against the Danes. Some did divert too much into the reasons for the ending of expansion, accounts of the conquests before 800, the theory of decomposition and the development of cultural and religious reforms.

#### **An example of a good answer to Question 1**

*All four Passages provide viewpoints as to whether or not Charlemagne can be classed as a great ruler. Passage A and Passage D can be interpreted in support of Charlemagne being a great ruler, whereas on the other hand, Passages B and C may be suggesting that there were significant problems during his reign that mean that Charlemagne was not necessarily a great ruler.*

*Passage A, written by Charlemagne's royal biographer Einhard, can be interpreted to be in support of the notion that Charlemagne was indeed a great ruler. Einhard states that*

Charlemagne did all he could to protect and enlarge his kingdom. This is significant because Charlemagne was a very successful military campaigner who almost doubled the size of his empire during his reign and experienced successes in Aquitaine, Saxony and Lombardy, to name but a few. Einhard also holds that Charlemagne built a cathedral at Aachen and King can be used to support this point, as he states that due to the new building at Aachen, it soon became known as a second Rome. Also this coincided with Charlemagne setting up his Palace School at Aachen, where, according to Ellis-Knox, he imported scholars such as Alcuin of York, Paul the Deacon and Theodulf of Spain to come and teach there. Thus it can be said that the testimonies of Einhard from passage A do give evidence to the view that Charlemagne was a great ruler in both a military sense and in promoting culture and learning throughout his kingdom.

Passage D, similarly to Passage A can be used to support the view that Charlemagne was a great ruler. King writes that Charlemagne was a mighty conqueror, and this can be backed up by the evidence of Collins, who holds that Charlemagne experienced military success throughout his reign, such as Aquitaine in 771, Barcelona in 801 and against the Bohemian Slavs in 806. King also implies that Charlemagne was a great ruler because he introduced many capitularies that were designed to promote law and order within his kingdom. The Programmatic Capitulary of 802 is one such example as Charlemagne reformed his use of the *missi dominici* and sent them out in constant waves throughout his empire. Bryce holds that the *missi dominici* were the bond that held the empire together, thus showing how importantly and well Charlemagne managed his government administration. Therefore it can be said that King, in Passage D, also supports the view that Charlemagne was a great ruler.

The renowned critic of Charlemagne, Fichtenau, implies that Charlemagne was not a great ruler because he never really united his own empire. He writes that there was frequent evidence of the corruptibility of public officials. This is significant because it can be used to enforce the statement that the *missi dominici* were only interested in personal gain. Ellis-Knox supports this view, holding that Charlemagne made the *missi dominici* go round in pairs with loyal churchmen to promote law, order and justice and curb corruptibility. In Passage C Fichtenau also suggests that Charlemagne failed to solve this problem in the long-term and therefore he should not be deemed worthy of the accolade great ruler. Loyn's interpretation can be used as evidence to back up this viewpoint. He said Charlemagne's government of such a vast and complex empire proved cumbersome and only partly effective. This is significant and suggests that Charlemagne did not manage his governmental administration effectively and so therefore should not be regarded as a great ruler.

Passage B to an extent supports passage C in the sense that Charlemagne was not a great ruler. Ganshof writes that following the imperial coronation right up until his death in 814, Charlemagne's rule was overrun by disintegration in his empire and Ganshof states that this is *Une Decomposition*. Ganshof, similarly to Fichtenau, holds that there was a malfunctioning of public services indicating that the *missi dominici* may have been ineffective at promoting law and order in Charlemagne's administration. Furthermore, Ganshof states that there were acts of collective violence. This is significant because it can be used to support the fact that there were many Saxon revolts, such as in 785 under Widukind, 802 and 804 which suggests that there was disunity in Charlemagne's empire. Additionally Ganshof implies that Charlemagne's introduction of capitularies such as the Programmatic Capitulary and the Oath of Loyalty in 802 shows that the empire was not united. There was opposition to Charlemagne and crime was rife within the empire. Therefore Ganshof holds in passage B that Charlemagne was not a great ruler.

There are further examples of views that show Charlemagne to be a great ruler. McKitterick, for example, holds that the introduction of the county system benefited law and order and aided Charlemagne's administrative apparatus. Furthermore, the development of Caroline minuscule, still used today, between 771 and 780, shows that Charlemagne was helping to promote culture, learning and Christianity throughout his empire. However, Riche cites cultural and language

differences within Charlemagne's empire such as in Bavaria and Aquitaine, which disunified the people.

In conclusion, it seems that Charlemagne was certainly a great ruler in a military sense, where he experienced success and almost doubled the size of his kingdom. However, in an administrative sense, he did not introduce reforms to promote law and order fully. The fact that he received the imperial title in 800 helps to ensure he can be regarded as a great ruler.

### King John

- 4 Candidates failed to pick up some of the references for comparison between the Passages. Passage A was rarely fully evaluated and the date of the Annals was rarely noted. But candidates did often note that the generally hostile chronicler admitted John enjoyed support. In Passage C the phrase *saving his royal rights and liberties* was misinterpreted by some as meaning the commissioners were preserving John's rights. In Passage D the reference to Innocent doing *what law and custom demanded* and being *prudent and realistic* was often missed although his residence in France was used more often to justify John's attitude. Some candidates wrote too generally about aggression shown by John or Innocent and made much of the way John treated churchmen and the Church. Some preferred to consider why the quarrel lasted so long or based their entire answer on the work of other historians not quoted in the Passages such as Painter, Knowles, Barlow and Warren. Some told the story of the quarrel with a wealth of detail. Although the question contained the word aggressor, its correct spelling was not always achieved.
- 5 This was less popular than question 6 but answers were often better. There was scope for candidates to reach different conclusions so some felt John was a good strategist but a poor tactician or a good general but a poor leader of men. A wide range of evidence was used from campaigns in Ireland to his use of the navy. The argument that John was the victim of circumstances he could not control was sometimes less fully developed with geographical factors, the power of Philip Augustus and financial constraints all in a single paragraph. There were some very general answers which at worst were barely distinguishable from answers to question 6. *Phillip* and *Bouvine* were common errors.
- 6 The focus of this question was clearly after 1204 but earlier factors such as Arthur and the Lusignans were described with detail and in extreme cases this was most of the answer. Arthur's murder was relevant as an example of John's unreliability and bad behaviour which led to increasingly poor relations with the barons but later examples such as the de Braose family were better. The best answers were aware of John's planned campaigns from 1204 to 1214 and the problems in financing them, although not many were clear that the 1206 campaign in Poitou was financed by proceeds from the church. The ultimate failures in Poitou and at Bouvines were taken as the main cause of deteriorating relations by many. The financial pressures were sometimes seen as arising from John's wish to recover his lands and sometimes as a separate factor and sometimes as both. Other factors were usually focused on John's shortcomings, especially his use of mercenaries and his lust. Some blamed his quarrel with the church and reiterated material from question 4, while others argued the barons were not much concerned about the church. The clauses of Magna Carta were used to provide evidence on factors causing relations to sour and some good answers were centred on the clauses to explain and evaluate the reasons for deterioration. *Phillip* and *Bouvine* were again common errors.

## **An example of a good answer to question 6**

*Historians have blamed the deterioration of relations between John and his barons on several different factors, a good number of which, such as high demands for scutage, can be seen as directly resulting from John's determination to recover his lost lands in France.*

*The nineteenth century historian William Stubbs blamed the deterioration of relations on John's character; he claimed that he was the worst of our kings. This view is also supported by Kate Norgate who claims that John possessed superhuman wickedness. There is some evidence to support this. John was certainly prone to occasional acts of cruelty; his murder of his nephew Arthur is a good example. However, in the main John cannot be described as inherently evil. He was a pious alms-giver to the church and founded several monasteries as at Beaulieu. Furthermore, the stories on which Stubbs and Norgate base their arguments, such as John crushing the Archdeacon of Norwich under a cope of lead, are based on unreliable chronicles. Therefore John's character can only be blamed in a minor way.*

*A more feasible argument presented by Norgate is that the barons tired of John's arbitrary rule and financial exactions. There is a great deal of evidence to support this view. Throughout the reign John called barons to his peripatetic household to hear their legal claims, rather than having a set place (the Common Bench) as Henry II had done. This was a great annoyance to the barons and was rectified in Magna Carta. His arbitrary pursuit of barons such as William de Braose also greatly dented his relations with the barons. More than half the barons who gathered to hear John's version of events following de Braose's exile and death were to be amongst those who rebelled. These are factors that are unrelated to John's attempts to regain his lost lands, yet they are significant.*

*However, more vital was John's financial exploitation of the barons, a policy that was inextricably linked to his attempts to regain Normandy. Maurice Asley argues that it was John's high scutage demands which were the main cause of the breakdown in relations. John's scutage demands were certainly far more than either his father or brother had claimed. John demanded scutage 11 times in 15 years while Richard levied it only twice in 10 years and Henry 8 times in 35 years. Such a hugely increased financial burden on the barons, who already had been bled dry by Richard's expensive wars and vast ransom, was not received happily. Furthermore John used other methods such as customs duties which hit trader barons such as Eustace de Vesci hard. He was to be a leader of the rebels.*

*While it is clear that John's financial exploitation of the barons to fund his wars in France was a vital factor in the deterioration of relations, this argument does not explain why relations broke down to the point of civil war in 1215. J C Holt offers an answer. He argues that the barons became divided in their loyalties by John's system of ins and outs, where some barons were openly favoured and others were shunned. This seems a strong argument; throughout his reign, figures who supported John, such as his loyal mercenary captains Fawkes de Breauté and Savarie de Mauleon were rewarded with land, money and lucrative offices. Furthermore, many barons, notably in the north, which was to be the centre of the support of the rebels, were denied offices which had been traditionally held by their families and were denied justice. A contemporary chronicler wrote that to some the king would not even sell justice. The fact that the two sides in the civil war almost instantly disintegrated and co-operated on John's death further supports this argument.*

*This system of ins and outs, although a very important factor in the deterioration of relations was unrelated to John's attempts to regain his lost lands. Holt argues that the final trigger for the breakdown was the failure of John's campaign in 1214. He writes that the road from Bouvines to Runnymede was direct, short and unavoidable. The barons had no reason to follow a disgraced king who had squandered so much of their money and then been defeated.*

Therefore it was John's policies relating to his attempts to regain his lost lands that were the crucial factor in the deterioration in his relations with his barons and his final failure which seemed to bear out the gibes of Softsword and Lackland.

### Unit 2588: detailed commentary on questions

There were 3214 candidates for this paper; 557 for Philip II, 1788 for Elizabeth I, 594 for Oliver Cromwell and 275 for Peter the Great. One letter of complaint was received about question 4.

#### Philip II

- 1 Candidates had plenty of information on which to draw and the best answers were able to argue that Philip did or did not deserve his reputation or whether he followed his own or Spanish interests first. These answers were also able to cross reference the Passages well in their evaluation. Less successful answers were diverted into a discussion or description of the debate about the Inquisition and often ignored the debate about the effectiveness of the Tridentine decrees. Some wrote too much about foreign policy in evaluating the claim that Philip was no crusader. Passage A was interpreted by some as showing Philip could not have been a Catholic champion because the Inquisition was so oppressive and by others as showing, despite the bias of Motley, that he was a Catholic champion because he was so determined to wipe out Protestantism.
- 2 Many candidates were well informed and had up-to-date knowledge of the views of historians. Philip's personal weaknesses could be widely defined to include working practices, finance and factionalism as well as his character defects and blaming him for the outbreak of revolts or more narrowly with reference to the *Paper King*. Motley was used to stress his objectionable personality and Braudel to show there were factors far beyond his control. The workings of the Spanish government confused some. The less good responses listed factors without much discrimination, ignoring the word *main* in the question and concentrating on a narrow range of evidence. Others discussed whether Philip was absolute, a different debate, or drew too many examples from the Netherlands
- 3 This question was slightly more popular and candidates were able to argue confidently both for and against *aggressive imperialism*. Some examiners felt that *aggressive* was addressed more successfully than *imperialism*. Others that *aggressive* was set against *defensive* and *imperialism* neglected. Other motives such as defence of Spanish interests or reputation or religion were also assessed. Effective answers which were structured around different motives or around different geographical areas were seen. Some argued that there was a chronological break, before which Philip was less aggressive and after which he was more so. The Turkish policies were well known but the useful examples from the equivocations of Philip's policy in France in the 1590s escaped some. The Netherlands was too often used as an example of foreign policy, although events there were relevant in discussion of relations with England. Spelling of *aggressive* and *Philip* were frequently inaccurate.

#### An example of a good answer to question 1

*One view of Philip's reputation concerning religion comes from the Black Legend. This portrays Philip as above the law, using tyrannical methods to enforce Catholicism. Historians such as Motley have elaborated on this view, claiming Philip was more concerned with power than religion. This is shown through Motley's description of the Inquisition in Source A. By describing the inhabitants of Spain as secretly false to the Catholic faith, he is attacking the idea that the Inquisition was a means for religious reform, and sees it as rather a tool for political control and power. This means that Philip was not a true champion of Catholicism. Furthermore, Motley*

describes the Inquisitors as in every village and at every fireside. If this were true it would indicate that Philip was a Catholic champion but the truth was far from this with there only being 44 Inquisitors at any one time. This implies a bias in the source, typical of Protestant historians who base their opinions on the propaganda of William of Orange's Apology and other Black Legend sources.

Passage D also shows Philip to be more concerned with power than religion. He is described as seizing any opportunity to control the Jesuits which implies his powers in Spain were of paramount importance to him. His antipathy to the order arose from their primary allegiance being to the Pope and was despite the fact that the Jesuits were set up by a Spaniard, Ignatius Loyola. He similarly restricted the power of the Pope in Spain, leading Sixtus V to describe him as using religion as merely a pretext. Thus this is emphasising his preoccupation with secular power as instanced by both Motley and Rawlings. This suggests he did not deserve his reputation as the champion of Catholicism.

Passages B and C are much more suggestive of Philip deserving his reputation. Kamen, a revisionist historian, shows much more sympathy to Philip asserting that he revolutionised Spanish Catholicism through the Council of Trent. As a result of these decrees the Roman Missal and Breviary were introduced to impose a unified form of service. Another example of Philip reforming Catholicism in Spain is through his establishment of new dioceses in Aragon. He also recognised the need to appoint fresh, better educated priests to revitalise Catholicism and 20 extra seminaries were set up to train priests. However, it is true that, as with most decisions, Philip checked over the terms of the Tridentine decrees with the letrados to search out any infringements of his powers. This also suggests that religious reform was secondary to his secular position and that he was not a true Catholic champion. There is also debate as to how effective the Tridentine decrees were, with superstition remaining prevalent especially in remoter areas.

Williams points out that Philip had a deep devotion to the Roman Catholic church and it is impossible to dispute Philip's personal piety, through his daily attendance at Mass and projects such as the Escorial. He even attended 5 autos-da-fe. Williams also points to his active commitment to the war against heresy and his intervention in the French civil wars and against England backs this up. Such policies were costly and illustrate the strength of his feeling. But Williams does mention that he retained a cool calculation of what his interests were as king of Spain, which suggests that in the last resort his secular concerns were pre-eminent.

It could, however, be argued that, despite an understandable devotion to the promotion of his political aims, Philip's undoubted efforts to maintain and extend Roman Catholicism in his monarquia deserve to be remembered as the actions of a champion of Catholicism. The Pope may have urged Philip to continue the war against the Turks, rather than accept a truce in 1578, but the Pope was not going to finance the campaigns and Philip was. He was, as Passage C states, no crusader, but a realistic politician who could do more for the Catholic church by concentrating his efforts on reforms within Spain and instituting profound differences.

The most likely view remains that of Williams. When faced with a choice, Philip was always going to protect his interests as king rather than pursue a reputation as a champion of the Roman Catholic church. But the Black Legend accusations that religion was a cloak for despotism are an unfair assessment of Philip's genuine religious belief and his continual pursuit of policies to promote those beliefs, which can be seen as justifying his reputation as a champion of Catholicism.

## Elizabeth I

- 4 Examiners had differing reactions to the answers to this question. Some felt there were few problems, but others reported that it was answered badly. Candidates could compare the Passages and many concluded that they all argued that gender was vital, whether the role was a female or male role. Some stronger responses suggested that kings had many of the same problems with their image, comparing portraits of Henry VIII with those of Elizabeth I. But the incorporation by Elizabeth of masculine characteristics in her image confused some and she emerged as a queen who spent her reign acting like a man. The *two bodies* concept in Passage B was rarely fully understood and this passage was often omitted from the evaluation. Portraits were often used in the evaluation and some candidates described them at excessive length. Passage C gave problems to some candidates. There was some evaluation reflecting the personal views of candidates. *It states that Elizabeth showed off the fact that she was feminine. I would disagree with this claim. After a troubled beginning to her reign, Elizabeth pledged herself to her country and cut off her hair and covered her face in white paint. This does not sound like a great way for her to show off her femininity.* There were pitfalls which some candidates did not manage to avoid. They diverted into discussion about how Elizabeth coped with the challenge of being female, whether the image was an illusion or a reality, how successfully Elizabeth controlled her court and council, how far the image was manufactured by the council and why Elizabeth remained single. Most of these issues have figured on previous papers and it cannot be stressed too strongly that candidates need to be able to adapt their knowledge to the set question, rather than reiterate a previously learned response. Spellings of Haigh, although the name appears on the question paper, suggested candidates thought he was related to the Shadow Foreign Secretary or to a well known World War I general.
- 5 The answers to this question were often poorly focused. Some wrote about how far Elizabeth was challenged in Parliament or how far Parliament co-operated with her or about how successful the challenges were. There was much reference to the Neale debate and the famous pamphlet which comprised the majority of the answer in some cases. The knowledge could be very detailed but its use showed candidates had not thought carefully about what the question was asking. This material could be disposed of in a single paragraph as it showed the strengths or weakness of the opposition at an early stage in the reign and then there was scope to analyse other factors. But other candidates were able to put forward a variety of reasons and the best answers could prioritise them in a supported way, but even more modest answers could argue that Elizabeth had all the advantages. Some candidates could have improved their performance by referring to a wider range of examples. Some asserted she was never successfully challenged but the better answers pointed out that she conceded on the monopolies issue but in a gracious manner and used this example, often in their conclusions as the exception that proved the point. There are still candidates who do not know the difference between the two Houses or between Parliament, the Council and the Court.
- 6 Candidates hoped for a question on the threat to Elizabeth from the Puritans and many answered it, even though it was not set. Even worse were candidates who argued that the main threat came from the Catholics. Those who did focus on support for Puritan ideas often slipped into analysis of the extent of the threat. On the other hand there was some good assessment with candidates arguing that instances like the Vestiarian controversy showed support as a number of ministers stood firm, or limited support as many gave in. Similar different interpretations were made about Grindal's stand over people prophesying. Answers could be well structured around different groups and the level of support within them, such as the Council, Parliament, the bishops, ministers, Presbyterians, Separatists and the people in the pews. Candidates do need an understanding of basic terminology; Protestants were sometimes seen as distinct from Puritans. Some candidates spent too long, often in their introduction, defining groups within Puritanism and then made no further

reference to these divisions, while others treated them as a single, homogenous sect. The Neale debate appeared here and could be pertinently used to show real discussion about the level of support but often it was simply described. Some of the opposing views were not fully understood and candidates asserted there were only ever at most four Puritan MPs or even that there were only four Puritans in the entire country. Some candidates failed to reach a clear conclusion and surprisingly few mentioned the Puritan revival after Elizabeth's death. This is obviously not part of her reign but is a sound evaluative point.

### **An example of a good answer to question 5**

*It has been argued by traditional historians, especially Neale, that Elizabeth was not able to control Parliament due to a strong opposition group in the Commons. This view, however, was challenged by the revisionists, notably Elton, who argue that, on the whole, parliamentary challenges to Elizabeth were generally unsuccessful. This could be attributed to a number of factors, such as Elizabeth's use of the Privy Council to control Parliament, or to the general lack of support for those who challenged Elizabeth.*

*Perhaps most important was the fact that Elizabeth was an absolute monarch and so had the power to summon and prorogue Parliament, as well as appointing ministers and giving out patronage. Significantly Elizabeth was able to control the appointment of the Speaker of the House of Commons. The Speaker controlled the debate and business in the commons and so indirectly Elizabeth could ensure that opposition was not given any opportunity to collude against her. She used the system of patronage to her advantage, as those who wanted political advancement and positions had to remain loyal to her. Thus they were deterred from supporting those MPs who challenged her and defied her commands.*

*Elizabeth ruled as an absolute queen and made her own decisions. Even when under huge pressure from a united Commons, Elizabeth asserted herself, for example in 1566-7 over the succession and in 1572 over excluding Mary, Queen of Scots from the succession. Christopher Haigh, however, argues that Elizabeth alone was not able to suppress Parliamentary challenges but that it was the work of the Privy Councillors who sat both in the Lords and the Commons, which ensured that challenges failed. Haigh uses evidence such as the speech made by Sir Christopher Hatton which crushed the Admonition to the Parliament in 1572 and diminished any support it may have had. In addition the Privy Council used prominent MPs such as Thomas Norton, for instance in 1572 to rally support in the Commons for the execution of the Duke of Norfolk. Thus challenges were largely ignored and unsupported by most MPs.*

*By contrast, Neale takes the view that challenges were successful, due to the existence of a Puritan Choir. Whilst he acknowledges that this was a small group, he sees them as largely successful. One example he gives is in the 1601 Parliament when the question of the legality of monopolies was raised. However, this has been criticised by Graves and the revisionists, who argue that this was not necessarily an organised challenge, but more a spontaneous response to common grievances.*

*The revisionist view exemplified by Elton offers another argument to explain why parliamentary challenges were generally unsuccessful. He maintains that there was little backing for Neale's Puritan Choir as shown by the events of 1587 and Wentworth's speech against Elizabeth and her curtailing of freedom of speech within the commons. Where Neale argues that Wentworth was an heroic figurehead of Parliament's struggle, which implies he had popular support in the commons, Graves suggests Wentworth was foolhardy, impetuous and politically inept. The fact that the commons themselves sent him to the Tower is evidence that he had little or no support.*

*In addition Sir Walter Mildmay, a prominent MP, spoke out against Wentworth, reminding the commons of the difference between liberty of speech and licentious speech. Further evidence to support this interpretation comes from the lack of parliamentary backing for challenges such as Cope's Bill and Book and Field and Wilcox's biting attack in the Admonition to the Parliament.*

*The extremism of the latter with its description of the Elizabethan Prayer Book as an imperfect book...picked out of the Popish dunghill alienated moderate opinion in Parliament.*

*Elizabeth was in control of the Commons. She asserted 'Your bills can have no effect without my consent and authority.' She banned speeches which she believed encroached on her prerogative, demanding that henceforth no bills concerning religion are to be discussed, and she scored out the record of her promise to marry when it was tacked on to a subsidy bill in 1566. She played with the emotions of MPs with her 'answer answerless' and the rhetoric of her Golden Speech. As a result, Parliament knew their place and their role, which severely challenges Neale's view.*

*It can thus be seen that the Privy Council certainly played a part in the failure of parliamentary challenges, as evidenced by the fact that trouble arose in the later reign when former strong members of the Council had died, and indeed that the elevation of Burghley to the Lords in 1571 had made the Commons harder to control. But the most significant factor was Elizabeth's assertion of her authority and the subsequent reluctance, for a variety of reasons, of the MPs to issue a real challenge. In any case, for many MPs attendance was an onerous and unpopular duty and the sooner they could return home, the better they were pleased and so was the queen.*

## **Oliver Cromwell**

- 7 There seemed to be a greater tendency in these answers to summarise the Passages or to use long quotes from them, rather than analyse them. Some candidates lacked sufficient contextual knowledge to support their arguments. But the better responses could bring in treatment of the Levellers, Cromwell in Ireland and the Nayler case or even claim Cromwell was a hypocrite. These answers generally recognised that religious toleration had different connotations in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.
- 8 This was a successful question as candidates could assess a range of explanations with evaluation as to their importance. Religion and the army came out as joint favourites for the most important reason. There were those who made a list with little differentiation, a few who wrote an account of events up to 1657 and even some who based Cromwell's reasons on his early life but they were not many.
- 9 Some candidates had excellent detailed knowledge of a relatively short period and were able to use it in an effective analysis. They considered how far there was a real or apparent change in Cromwell's attitude to Charles I. But others explained why Charles was executed in 1649 with more emphasis on Charles than on Cromwell and disregarded the phrase *having fought the Civil War to limit the King's power*. Others saw this phrase and wrote accounts of the War. A few were vehemently anti-Cromwell seeing him as an ambitious hypocrite and dismissing Divine Providence as a convenient fiction. These answers may have lacked balance but they had conviction.

## **An example of a good answer to question 9**

*In January 1649, King Charles I was executed at the instigation of the Rump Parliament and Oliver Cromwell. The decision was made and carried out by a minority group and was not only deeply unpopular in England but also widely condemned in Europe. Cromwell had not gone to war with the aim of executing the king, so why was he so eager in 1649? There are a number of possible reasons which include his religious convictions, his political motivation and perhaps his personal ambition.*

*The First Civil War was fought for the freedom and religious liberty of England. Cromwell believed that parliament's victories were signs from God that they were acting in accordance*

*with his will and saw the army as God's instrument. The final victory was further proof of the role of Divine Providence. During the search for a settlement with Charles I, Cromwell wanted an agreement which would keep the king on the throne but limit his powers. He had no intention at this stage of executing what many believed to be a divinely appointed monarch.*

*However, when Charles I began the Second Civil War after turning to the Scots, Cromwell was angered calling it a more prodigious treason. He believed that Charles, against whom God had witnessed by his defeat in the first war, was defying God's clearly expressed will. Again Parliament went to war and again they were victorious. Two defeats in a row hinted to Cromwell that God was displeased with Charles and at this point his mind began to change. He needed to do more than limit the king's power. As usual, when faced with a problem to which no immediate solution presented itself, Cromwell waited on God. The answer for which he was searching came during the Windsor Prayer Meeting in 1648 when a group of his advisors met to pray to discover God's will. They consulted the Bible and were directed to a passage which included the phrase 'the man of blood must be brought to justice.' Cromwell interpreted the man of blood to be Charles I and realised that divine providence was pointing to his trial and inevitable execution. After the Windsor Prayer Meeting there was no doubt in Cromwell's mind. All Parliament's victories, all the king's crushing defeats had culminated in this. He had many evidences of Divine Presence going along with a righteous cause. Cromwell proceeded to purge the Rump, put the king on trial and sign his name third on the death warrant. His motivation was clearly for religious reasons. God had witnessed against Charles and Cromwell, as God's instrument, could do nothing but act in accordance with God's will.*

*However, there are other possible interpretations for the reasons behind Cromwell's eagerness for the execution of the king. Cromwell was a conservative country gentleman concerned with the good of the country as a whole. After the Second Civil War he realised that the king would never agree to any settlement which limited his authority and therefore there could not be any hope of peace from a settlement which involved the king. Cromwell had seen the devastating effect the two civil wars had had on England and was determined that such events should not be repeated. The only hope of restoring peace and liberty was to execute Charles, and the only way to do this was to put him on trial. As late as December 1648 Cromwell was seeking a compromise solution but Charles was adamant that he would make no concessions. Moreover there was much feeling within the army that even if Charles did agree to a settlement, he could not, in view of his past behaviour, be relied on to stick to his word. Hence an alternative political solution seemed highly unlikely and in Cromwell's mind the refusal of Charles to recognise the will of God and make a settlement showed God had abandoned him. In these circumstances it was the duty of the god-fearing to put the king on trial. In this way religious and political motives became conjoined.*

*But Cromwell may have been spurred on by personal ambition. He was commander-in-chief of the New Model Army in a position of power. He could see himself as the natural successor of Charles and to take on this role, the king must be removed and execution was the safest way to achieve this result. The army supported the execution and Cromwell was, by this time, a shrewd enough politician to recognise that the army was his securest power base. If he wished to extend his power he could rely on the army to back him up in executing the king. He certainly also had the ability to act with great political cunning.*

*It does, however, seem unlikely that personal ambition was the spur. Cromwell could not possibly be sure that he would be put forward as the successor to Charles and if the army of honest serving men supported the execution this would have seemed to him to be further confirmation from God that this was the correct course of action. It is easy to suggest that Cromwell acted as he did for reasons of ambition given knowledge of what transpired in the next few years. But Cromwell did not have this knowledge. He therefore acted in accordance with what he saw as God's will and perhaps also in the interests of the country.*

*In conclusion, the most probable reason for Cromwell's eager support for Charles' execution is that he eventually came to believe that it was in accordance with divine providence. The king had constantly and stubbornly rejected God's will and there was no room for compromise. It had become necessary to cut off his head with the crown on it.*

### **Peter the Great**

- 10 The key words in the question were *slowed down* and *speeded up* and good answers took account of this and structured their assessment of the views in the Passages accordingly. They were able to make a balanced argument. Weaker answers paraphrased the Passages.
- 11 Most candidates focused on *achieved* and equated achievements with greatness. This could simply become a list with each paragraph ending along the lines of 'This shows Peter was Great.' But other candidates balanced *attempted* and *achieved*. Some referred to the transient nature of some achievements which limited greatness. Plenty of contextual knowledge was used by most candidates. There was also a good deal of reference to schools of history.
- 12 Knowledge of Peter's foreign policy was stronger than on some previous papers and there was good discussion of how serious the threat was from Sweden or how necessary Peter's hostility to Turkey and Persia was. Some candidates did not include much about events after Poltava.

### **An example of a good answer to Question 11**

*Peter attempted a vast range of reforms and changes in Russia. In 1700 he issued 32 decrees while by 1721 he was issuing 160 in a year. He dealt with most affairs personally and made great efforts to achieve success for Russia. His greatness can be judged to some extent by the broad scope of his reforms but some historians argue that his limited success means he was not truly great and that his attempts were sometimes misguided. However, in comparison with previous rulers he did achieve a great deal in many aspects of his policy.*

*Militarily, however, he conquered less territory than Ivan IV but the territory he gained around the Baltic was of lasting importance. This was only possible because of the modernisation of his army and his determination. He improved the training of his troops, making them more disciplined in action, giving them a functional uniform and recruiting a standing army of 200000 regular troops. When his artillery was captured he created a new artillery section from scratch using English guns as models and then manufacturing his own, which was very successful in later battles. Foreign diplomats remarked on the skilled use to which he put his artillery. This is a clear example of an achievement. Similarly his defeat of the well equipped, well trained Swedish army of Charles XII at Poltava, even after being defeated at Narva in 1700, was another achievement, accomplished in just 6 years. Some of his later campaigns, at Pruth in 1711 and the war with Persia in 1722 enjoyed less success, but, despite some problems with desertion and the quality of the officers, the Russian army had become one of the leading European forces. In this instance the achievement was more important than what he attempted.*

*Economically Peter enjoyed similar success. His aim was to update the creaking Russian economy particularly as he believed money is the artery of war. His industrial development led to a great increase in the production of pig iron and in the number of manufactories. Russia eventually became the major iron producer in Europe. He attempted to improve relations with China and to boost trade with the west. The creation of the port of St Petersburg assisted a good deal here. The ending of reliance on the ice blocked port of Archangel was a great advance and led to a fourfold increase in trade in his reign, a clear achievement. In taxation, necessary to finance his army and navy, he introduced new taxes, such as the soul tax in 1718. He financed*

*the building of a new fleet and a new capital without resorting to foreign loans. These were all worthwhile achievements but some of his attempts to tax the long-suffering peasants more and to regulate industry were self-defeating and limit the degree to which he can be said to be great. But, given the low base from which his reforms started, his achievement was considerable and enough to be called great.*

*In his efforts to create a more efficient system of government, his attempts were not all marked by success. He planned to eliminate inefficiency in government which was a laudable intention but hard to achieve given the defective central government structure as became only too clear during the conflict with Sweden. He failed to establish coherent local government and his structures were often over complicated. He set up 8 gubernia in 1708 which were huge divisions responsible for everything from tax collection to conscription, replacing the 44 prikazy. Initially these were successful but in 1718 he established military sections across Russia with the task of looking after the army. He made matters worse in 1719 when he tried to divide Russia up into judiciary sections further nullifying the previous reform. To this extent the reform was a failure but it shows that Peter was constantly attempting to improve the government. It could be argued, however, that greater consistency would have been more effective. The senate was a more successful reform and outlasted his reign. Its role was undermined by the introduction of the fiskals, designed to root out corruption, showing that Peter sometimes lost patience and his attempts were praiseworthy even if his achievements were quite limited.*

*Historians have argued that in four ways Peter made great changes in Russia. His westernising policies opened Russia to European influences in a way which meant the former inward looking attitudes could never be totally resumed. He abolished the patriarchate in the church and it became a department of state. This was to succeed where other Tsars had failed. He created a Russian navy which ensured the collapse of the Swedish empire through the victory at Cape Hango in 1714 and contributed to Sweden accepting the Treaty of Nystadt in 1721. He built a new capital at St Petersburg, one of the most enduring of his achievements. It could be argued that these achievements alone are enough to ensure he can be described as great.*

*Thus, on balance, Peter's achievements are enough to allow him to be justly known as Peter the Great. He left Russia a very different country from the one he inherited and this was down to his activity. Nothing was beneath his notice and he worked untiringly and heroically against ingrained backwardness. The re-naming of the Russian capital as St Petersburg in 1991 is proof enough of his universally recognised greatness.*

### **Unit 2589; detailed commentary on questions**

There were 7527 candidates for this paper; 630 for Napoleon, 804 for Gladstone and Disraeli, 636 for Bismarck, 1212 for Roosevelt, 1814 for Lenin, 1576 for Chamberlain and 828 for the Cold War. A letter of complaint was received relating to questions 7, 8 and 9.

### **Napoleon**

- 1 Most candidates found the passages straightforward and could address the debate which they contained. Some lacked knowledge of the navy and some thought it was the army. The Continental System was not always linked to British resistance. Some candidates thought Passage A was jingoistic and highly exaggerated, missing the significance of its date. Better responses questioned whether Trafalgar was as decisive as A indicated. Candidates who did observe the date of A sometimes speculated about how far the author was influenced by the Naval rivalry with Germany in the 1900s. This was not very profitable.

- 2 Candidates were rarely sure exactly what the term enlightened despot implied, but some could analyse how far Napoleon was enlightened (not very according to some, notably towards women) and how far he was a despot (quite considerably was the usual verdict). This was an acceptable approach when good supporting detail was included. Some tried to assess how far Napoleon embraced the encouragement of democracy, which did not prove very helpful. There was some serious error about the nature and purpose of the Civil Code.
- 3 Some candidates concentrated on Napoleon's military role with full explanations of his skills as a commander and tactician at the expense of the other factors such as his political contribution and the weaknesses of other states. Some were strangely vague about Napoleon's military achievements. Some detail on key battles such as Ulm and Austerlitz is expected.

### **An example of a good answer to question 2**

*To describe Napoleon as an enlightened despot in his rule of France leads to an interesting debate as to how far the man viewed as the suppressor of liberty and the renouncer of equality can really be seen as enlightened. There are many factors to suggest that indeed he could, however following the questioning of the Napoleon myth by post World War Two historians, it is more commonly argued that Napoleon followed the oppression of the Bourbons and the political apathy of the Directory period by an age, not of enlightenment, but of injustice, censorship and the repression of liberty.*

*One group which did benefit from Napoleon's rule was the middle class. They were allowed to continue to own the land they had bought in the Revolutionary period. Some were rewarded further for their support or given the prestigious Legion of Honour. Education improved dramatically, which might suggest Napoleon was enlightened, but the new lycees were limited to the sons of the notables, so it was only the middle classes who profited, but to an extent this was an enlightened policy. He also established the imperial university which controlled the curriculum and inspected schools, which was more despotic but probably justified by results.*

*The abolition of feudalism was upheld by Napoleon which might suggest he was enlightened. The peasantry suffered terribly from his taxation and conscription, yet they still rallied to his side on his return from Elba. He had tried to control the price of bread and flour and limit the export of grain to help the peasants.*

*His attitude to the church could also be seen as embodying the principles of enlightenment and his Concordat with the Pope in 1801 was popular with the peasants. There were equal rights for Protestants and Jews and the lands seized from the church during the revolution were not returned. Bishops were chosen by Napoleon and the clergy were paid by the state. The church was no longer able to challenge the secular power.*

*A further example of his enlightened policies can be found in the Civil Code introduced in 1804 which reinforced the destruction of feudalism, liberty of conscience and in employment and some equality as in the equal division of inheritances between children. But the Code was also unfair, especially in stressing the authority of men over women which can be seen as the act of a despot. Judges were appointed by Napoleon.*

*Madame de Stael, a contemporary critic of Napoleon believed that his betrayal of the revolution meant he could not be viewed as enlightened. As a result of her criticisms she was exiled to her native Switzerland. Napoleon maintained strict control over the press. By 1809 only four newspapers were in print, and each was censored by Napoleon. His use of propaganda and publishing of bulletins not only secured him glory in military affairs but also ensured the public thought they were enjoying liberty and freedom of speech. In reality book publication was strictly controlled and some authors fled into exile.*

*After he crowned himself as Emperor in 1804, Napoleon became even more despotic. In 1810 imprisonment without trial became legal and there were more people in prison than during the revolutionary period. He was able to issue decrees, bypassing the senate. When plebiscites were held, the outcome was rigged. His carefully chosen prefects and secret police reported to him regularly and his people were no longer citizens but subjects.*

*One reason why Napoleon enjoyed a reputation as enlightened was because of the Napoleonic Myth, tailored by Napoleon himself and often drawn from Las Cases' book on Napoleon which shows how he acted for the benefit of France and believed in the principle of France coming first above all. It was only later that Napoleon was exposed as an oppressor as negative opinion about Napoleon was banned from publication up to 1830. Once he was exiled to St Helena the French people forgot the tyranny under which they had suffered and only remembered the benefits of Napoleonic rule.*

*Although Napoleon did make valuable contributions to French education, the Civil Code and to establishing an effective form of government and keeping order, his system was oppressive. The masses did not enjoy liberty as what they read was strictly censored, all workers needed a livret in order to get work and were watched and punished for misbehaviour and there were heavy taxes on tobacco and wine, thus reducing their pleasures. Government was controlled from the centre and resistance firmly dealt with. It is therefore hard to see how Napoleon's rule in France was enlightened. Its main aim was to maintain himself in power and to enjoy the privileges of a despot.*

## **Gladstone and Disraeli**

- 4 The Passages were accessible and soundly analysed by most candidates. They were able to pick out the relevant references in the Passages and compare the views. Even weaker answers displayed knowledge about the coming together of the Liberals into a Party. Contextual knowledge was sometimes a little thin. The prevailing cynicism among candidates about the motives of politicians meant most considered ambition guided Gladstone to the leadership of the Liberal party.
- 5 This was more popular than the question on Disraeli's reforms and some good responses focused on the debate and reached a supported conclusion. Some tended to describe the policies rather than compare them. The distinction between foreign and imperial policy still evades far too many candidates. The question specifically mentioned the British Empire but many appeared to think that Turkey, Europe and even the US were part of the Empire. Gladstone's views about Disraeli's forward policy and his pressure for a moral policy were well used but references to the Bulgarian Horrors, the Franco-Prussian War and the Alabama issue were not relevant, nor was Ireland. Some candidates knew about Gladstone's policies in his second ministry and this was credited, but it was not expected as the topic ends in 1880.
- 6 Not many candidates attempted this question and the weaker responses described the reforms with variable accuracy and maintained they were permissive and so ineffective. Candidates could not adapt the lists they had learned into a coherent answer. Some diverted into the reasons why Disraeli passed the Acts and gave him little credit, missing the point that the effect of the Acts did not depend on whether he had a major role in their inception. Better answers could assess their impact and there was some good and detailed use of the work of Chamberlain in Birmingham to argue both that conditions did improve or that little new housing was provided and so the impact was limited. There were also good answers which examined the impact on different groups in society.

### **An example of a good answer to question 5**

*Most historians agree that both Gladstone and Disraeli's opinions of the purpose of Empire differed greatly. Gladstone saw the empire as a loose affiliation of self-governing nations for the benefit of trade and saw the dependant empire as hindering Britain as a great nation. Contrary to this, Disraeli saw the empire as a matter of national prestige. He believed that in order for Britain to continue to be a great power, the empire must be protected and enhanced. These different ideologies were reflected in the varying policies of the two prime ministers.*

*Historians such as Shannon state that, in practice, Gladstone believed that the empire should not be expanded and that self-government of the settler colonies should be encouraged. True to his words, Gladstone did indeed attempt to prevent the empire from growing. Despite calls from missionaries to annex Fiji in 1873, he resisted the temptation, a clear display, according to some historians of his belief that the dependent empire was a burden on the British economy. Similarly he attempted to hand over Gambia to the French, but government instability in France meant this never happened. Gladstone also tried to encourage the self-government of the settler colonies by withdrawing British troops from Canada and New Zealand, despite an ongoing war with the native Maoris in the latter. This shows Gladstone's determination to encourage independence and, more importantly, to reduce the overall cost of maintaining the empire.*

*Conversely to these policies implemented by Gladstone, historians such as Moneypeny and Buckle state that Disraeli believed that the empire should be celebrated and expanded. During his Manchester and Crystal palace speeches of 1872 he declared that the empire should be widened to the delight of the crowds of the new working class electorate, enfranchised by the Second Reform Act. On coming into office in 1874, Disraeli completed the annexation of Fiji expressing his intent to show that Britain should be proud of its empire and not see it as an embarrassment. As a result of the Congress of Berlin in 1878, he gained Cyprus, a strategic Mediterranean base, from Turkey. He promoted the empire in its most important location by declaring Queen Victoria Empress of India, a symbolic gesture widely welcomed in India, if less popular with some at home. He purchased 44% shares in the Suez Canal, a key route to India, to promote British interests and hold back the threat of Russia to the Indian territories. Towards the end of his time as Prime Minister, his government became involved in two conflicts. In Afghanistan many lives were lost in an attempt to expand British interests and in South Africa a war was fought against the Zulu who threatened British control in the Transvaal area. Gladstone claimed these were clear examples of a forward policy which he called Beaconsfieldism in an unkind reference to Disraeli's peerage, supposedly bestowed on him by Victoria in gratitude for her imperial honours.*

*This evidence appears to show that Gladstone and Disraeli had totally different policies on the Empire. However, this is not entirely the case. Firstly many of Gladstone's policies to reduce commitment in the empire were never repealed by Disraeli. He made no attempt to send out troops to garrison the colonies which could defend themselves and meet the expense. Like Gladstone he recognised that the reduction in government revenue of the period meant that such undertakings needed to be scaled down. Cost mattered more than prestige. To say that Gladstone never expanded the empire is also false as he became involved in the Ashanti War in 1871 and eventually territory in the Gold Coast came under the protection of Great Britain, Historians such as Moneypeny and Buckle also point to the fact that the idea that Disraeli had an expansionist policy when he came to power is incorrect. The gains he made such as Fiji and in the Transvaal were very small in comparison with the accretions of later years. His gestures symbolising national pride, such as the queen becoming Empress of India and the Suez canal shares are little more than that. The latter was partly to outdo the French and so not an imperial issue and Disraeli was careful to avoid any involvement in Egypt beyond the canal.*

*Like Gladstone, Disraeli felt that the settler colonies could be a burden and had referred to them as millstones around our neck. He made speeches suggesting he wanted some representative council to bring the colonies together but did nothing to introduce it. He himself took few steps to*

*expand the empire. The forward policy in Afghanistan was the result of the disobedience of Lord Lytton, condemned in private by Disraeli, while the disaster at Isandlwana was caused by the incompetence of Sir Bartle Frere who alienated Cetawayo and made a war inevitable. Disraeli was indignant at having to defend such men and declared that Frere ought to be impeached. Gladstone exploited his discomfort with his attacks on the war in Afghanistan which had made it a miserable ruin. Thus, despite their differing ideologies, in practice their policies were quite similar.*

*In conclusion both men were restricted in their policies towards the empire by a weakening financial situation which left little room for manoeuvre. Both did annex territory. The main difference arises in what was said. Disraelian rhetoric used imperial themes to win votes, suggesting that it was the nature of the English to create empires and that English power was far from being on the wane. Gladstone took up the moral high ground urging his hearers to remember the rights of the savage, but he had the same end in view.*

## **Bismarck**

- 7 Many candidates were able to identify the debate here quite easily and to argue whether Bismarck had a master plan or not. AJP Taylor was well known as a wild card among historians and evaluated appropriately. Some found Passages C and D harder to handle as they needed to interpret the Passages to see the link between the lenient peace and Bismarck's future plans. Some of the contextual knowledge used was only loosely linked to the Passages, such as the Zollverein, an aspect of the period which candidates like to mention as frequently as possible.
- 8 Candidates had clearly been taught about the wider European context to German Unification and were able to discuss the relative strength of Prussia and her neighbours and the onlooking states, even if they were not certain whether Great Britain was uninterested or disinterested. Better answers were particularly well informed on this issue, although some needed to reach an overall judgement as to which factor contributed the most and some needed more material on Prussian military strength. Others ran through the various causes of unification, failing to see that this was a straightforward question asking for a judgement between two possible causal factors.
- 9 There were fewer answers to this question, possibly because discussion of Bismarck's aims and goals seemed too challenging. Some could not say much about German liberalism and many failed to consider the significance of the Indemnity Bill.

## **An example of a good answer to question 8**

*The unification of Germany has been attributed to the weakness of other European states by a number of historians. Mid 20th century historians, often vilifying Bismarck as Hitler's predecessor, have tended to emphasise Bismarck's weaknesses and dependence on such external factors. Yet many historians have supported the strengths of Prussia as paramount to Bismarck's successful unification. Prussian militarism, its power, technology and the strategic brilliance of its leaders is the most important factor for some, while for others it is the economic strength provided by the Prussian controlled Zollverein. Some even argue that these strengths, regardless of Bismarck, would have brought about German unification anyway.*

*The European states which had most to lose from the unification of Germany were the least well placed to prevent it happening, while the stronger states, such as Great Britain and Russia were not especially interested. The Crimean War was responsible for the lessening of Austrian influence and its loss of Russia as an ally, but the Austrian economy was close to bankruptcy. The Austrian army could not be mobilised rapidly and hence Austria by mobilising unilaterally as they feared a surprise attack was made to appear the aggressor in the Austro-Prussian war. In*

*the crucial battle at Sadowa the Prussian artillery and needle guns proved decisive and Austria had to retreat. She lost Venetia to Italy. Despite the leniency of the Peace of Prague, Austria was a spent force, excluded from the Zollverein and marginalised on the edge of the future Germany. The multi-national Austrian empire could not expect a role in a German state. Bismarck's diplomatic activities, stirring up trouble through his agents with revolutionaries in Hungary and the Balkans emphasised this weakness.*

*Other states were not necessarily weak in themselves, but their policies towards Bismarck's Prussia lacked decisiveness. Once Britain had been out-manoeuvred over Schleswig-Holstein, there was little enthusiasm for further involvement as British governments entered a period of semi-isolation from Europe. In any case they were hostile to France and hoped a united Germany might contain their ancient enemy. Russia had no desire to support Austria since her betrayal in the Crimean war. Italy was equally unlikely to aid Austria, the main bar to the unification of the peninsula.*

*This meant that only France was in a position to resist Bismarck's moves towards German unification and as a result of German diplomacy France was diplomatically isolated. Napoleon III was defeated over the Luxembourg issue and his foreign minister the Duke of Gramont blundered in being provoked to war in 1870. The French mobilisation was a model of strategic incompetence and Napoleon himself was old and ill. The cumulative weaknesses of the European States left the way open for Bismarck to act.*

*But it can also be argued that the positive strengths of Prussia made German unification likely. The Prussian controlled Zollverein managed the economies of almost all German states and, by 1834 touched the lives of over 26 million German speakers. It was the source of the German economic boom of the 1850s and 1860s that gave the German states a collective pride. It was a force for unity...and was therefore a focal point for nationalist sentiment according to Andrina Stiles. The failed attempt of Schwarzenberg to launch an Austrian take over of the German economy suggests national unity was prevalent as well as economic unity. The German states recognised Prussian economic dominance as Austria floundered, economically backward and hugely in debt: a further example of their weakness as compared with Prussia. Yet other historians have argued that the Prussian economy was not necessarily a cause of unity. Membership of the Zollverein did not prevent the south German states from allying with Austria in 1866 according to David Williamson. Yet, clearly, the Prussian economy provided for another pivotal Prussian strength in unification: Prussian militarism.*

*Stephen Lee argues that the Prussian economy only provided Bismarck with the skeleton of a united Germany. It was the role of war to put flesh on the bones. Victory against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1871) made Prussia seem unbeatable. The strategic genius of General von Moltke, the reforms of von Roon and the strength of the Prussian economy gave Prussia an unassailable war machine, drilled, educated, armed with breech-loading, rapid-firing needle guns. They had Krupps guns for artillery and railways for quick mobilisation. As a result Bismarck could make his secret alliance with the southern states which helped to lead to unification.*

*A further Prussian strength was Bismarck himself, even if his role is exaggerated in his unreliable Memoirs and it is unlikely he had any master-plan. But he made the most of his advantages and the isolation of France and exploited French weaknesses over the Hohenzollern candidature. His master stroke was his editing of the Ems Telegram which led France to declare war and in time to the famous scene in the Hall of Mirrors.*

*It can certainly be argued that the weaknesses of other states were pivotal in the unification of Germany. French diplomacy blundered about in much the same way as its well equipped but hopelessly incapable army. Bismarck called the French minister Gramont, the stupidest man in Europe. Austrian diplomatic isolation and heavy indebtedness meant the military challenge to Prussia was minimal. But despite these factors, Prussian economic and military strength and the*

*marshalling of these assets by Bismarck assured the existence of Germany in 1871 and it is hard to see how even more powerful and better prepared opponents could have stopped this process.*

## **Roosevelt**

- 10 The Passages were focused on an aspect of the specification about which candidates were well prepared to write an essay and some did so, reluctant to waste, as they saw it, the material they had prepared. In extreme cases they made very little reference to the Passages. Examiners felt that the content of the Passages was more neglected in this question than in any other Passages question. There was plenty to analyse in the Passages and some strong responses which were well balanced and contained supported evaluation. Some candidates assessed success rather than change.
- 11 This question elicited a large number of weak responses as candidates explained the reasons for prohibition and the reasons it failed, but not the extent to which it divided or united US society. Crime and corruption dominated answers.
- 12 This question was less popular. Candidates did not always observe the dates and wrote about policy in the pre-Roosevelt period, often a general analysis on isolationism not specific to FDR. Relationships with Japan, a key element, were often neglected and there was some misunderstanding of the Neutrality Acts. Very few grappled with the idea that abandonment was against his will. The debate on interventionist versus isolationist was the focus of many answers. But there were candidates who considered if FDR was an isolationist was this because he chose to be so or was it because circumstances forced it on him? Other responses were able to offer a balanced assessment of motives and argue a case, often concluding that both motives mattered and sometimes were inextricably entwined.

### **An example of a good answer to question 10**

*Franklin D Roosevelt was elected President in 1932 and pledged a New Deal to bring America out of the dark years of the depression. Many historians including the authors of passages A and C stress that he did not do enough and his attempts to create a Utopian society failed. Passages A and C are classic examples of the work of new left historians. On the other hand, passages B and D argue that the New Deal was a considerable success in changing the US with improvements to the regulation of the economy. Passage A presents the views of the critics of the left who claimed Roosevelt was cautious and conservative. But if Roosevelt's predecessors are examined, it can be seen that he was far more radical and interventionist. His policies made less change than they might have done because they were subject to the scrutiny of the Supreme Court and some, such as NIRA, were declared to be unconstitutional. Before 1942 his impact is seen as minimal in several key aspects such as public housing, but the first New Deal was concentrated on instant relief to the starving and unemployed. Permanent change took longer and needed co-operation. But the Banking Acts and the regulation of Wall Street prevented any repetition of the speculation and panic of 1932 and passage D thinks there was considerable success here. Passage C agrees that the New Deal did not make much difference because it was not properly thought out and put together without much idea of what was intended. The passage emphasises the limited progress made in reducing unemployment and so indicates there was little substantial change in the US until 1941 when America was at war. But passage D suggests that there was some help for the unemployed and C shows that the voters, at least, were impressed by Roosevelt's reforms, so this backs up the idea that there was change, even if it could have been greater.*

*Passage B is rather more favourable towards Roosevelt and his achievements in reducing the influence of Big Business. The passage agrees that full economic recovery was not achieved and this was a change that only the onset of war could bring about as indicated in passage C. Up to 1939 there were still millions unemployed and wealth was still unevenly distributed as passage A asserts. But the beginnings of state responsibility for welfare was a real turning-point as B suggests and the social security provided, although far from comprehensive as healthcare was not included, marked a real break with previous administrations. Funding it from taxation meant that future governments could not cut the benefits. The Wagner Act gave protection to Trade Unions and allowed them to expand and increase in membership which was another significant change in the US.*

*Passage D is the most supportive of the idea that there was considerable success in bringing about change in the US as it looks at a variety of aspects, suggesting that there was success in aid to farmers, although the policy of destroying crops when people were going hungry has been criticised. Other historians such as Badger argue that farm incomes rose and so did standards of living and that rapid measures rather than long term radical changes which would be hard to force through, mattered more. This shows there was some change. But D argues that the biggest change was in the greater role given to the Federal government and to the President and that this was a lasting change in the US. Roosevelt took control of the banking system and the alphabet agencies gave him the power to provide relief. To fulfil these tasks he greatly expanded the federal government and then sent government officials to the individual states to see the agencies were working. This gave the federal government more control over the states and expanded its role out of all recognition.*

*Thus the passages do generally indicate that the New Deal did bring change to the US. Passage A gives examples of aspects where there was little change but does not discuss aspects where there was change. The other passages all agree there was some change but are less united on how much. Unemployment is agreed to have been an aspect which stubbornly resisted improvement until the war began. But passages B and D, in comparison with the lukewarm attitudes of A and C, are clear that the social security system and the increased power of the federal government and the President were important changes. In addition it could be argued that Roosevelt gave the American people a new confidence and hope in the dark days of the depression and this was a triumphant example of a successful change in the US.*

## **Lenin**

- 13 Candidates seemed to understand the issues here better than in some sessions and reached good judgements. Some found Passage A more difficult and there was some inappropriate *ad hominem* evaluation of Pipes. Others were confused by the ideas in Passage B. Evaluation was often attempted by using the dates of the Passages and then fitting them into one of the schools of history on this basis. Few candidates were aware of recent suggestions that Lenin only used the term War Communism when about to introduce the NEP and that he did this to make it look as if the purpose of the policy was to win the Civil War.
- 14 This was a popular question and candidates were well aware of the debate surrounding the downfall of the Provisional Government. As always, candidates who described the schools of history did less well than those who used their knowledge of the historiography to analyse the causal factors and to make a supported judgement. Some listed the factors with little attempt to judge their relative importance.
- 15 This question was less well understood and general surveys of Lenin's character were common. Some made no reference to the NEP and some were unsure as to what Communist ideology actually was.

### **An example of a good answer to question 14**

*Historians offer numerous reasons for the failure of the Provisional Government to retain power in October 1917. Soviet historians highlight the strengths of the Bolshevik party, such as the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, to suggest that the Bolsheviks would inevitably seize power. However, the Provisional Government faced considerable problems from the beginning of their rule and failed to overcome them. They also proved reluctant to defend themselves in October 1917 and some assert were doomed from the start.*

*In the Soviet view Lenin was an integral figure in the Bolshevik seizure of power. His April Theses outlined measures for takeover, arguing that the revolution had not yet occurred and that power should be grabbed by the Soviets. His clever utilization of slogans such as Peace, Bread and Land and All Power to the Soviets provided the Bolsheviks with significant support. But some revisionists argue that these controversial ideas contributed to Bolshevik disunity and virtual collapse. Lenin was even forced into exile again for part of 1917 and so it was the weakness of the Provisional Government which was more vital than the role of Lenin and his party.*

*The Provisional Government was always open to the charge that it was unelected and only meant to be an interim government. It was forced to share power with the Petrograd Soviet, making it a relatively weak and ineffective body. This is demonstrated by the Soviet Order Number One which gave military control to the Soviet, leaving the Provisional Government with little ability to enforce military discipline and thus to maintain themselves in power. The Soviets came under the influence of the Bolsheviks by October 1917. Hence this was a key factor in the downfall of the Provisional Government, although it could be argued this was a weakness outside their control.*

*One example of Bolshevik military influence comes from Trotsky's Military Revolutionary Committee (MRC) which was a vital source of Bolshevik power in their take over. The MRC stormed the gates of the Winter Palace where the Provisional Government was based with little opposition. The ease of its capture surprised even Lenin. Yet the Soviet historians claim that Lenin's sense of urgency in mounting this attack, as shown in Eisenstein's film Oktober, was vital in the collapse of the Provisional Government. It seems more likely that the lack of resistance was the key factor and that the Bolsheviks had a considerable amount of luck in the actual taking of control.*

*Revisionist historians suggest the radicalisation of peasants and workers was important in promoting a popular revolution. But the weakness of the Provisional Government contributed to this discontent. Some practical and progressive measures had been passed, such as an eight hour working day for industrial workers, but this was not enough to satisfy them, given the huge problems Russia faced. Thus the Provisional Government had a low chance of survival. The Constituent Assembly, to which all outstanding issues were to be referred, was not yet elected. The reform of the landed system was slow to proceed and peasants began to take unilateral action to seize estates. The continuance of the war and the disastrous campaigns of 1917 were hugely unpopular and desertion rates were high. Food shortages had not been addressed and bread prices continued to increase. The rights of minorities had not been considered. Thus it seems hard to see how the government could have enjoyed much support from anyone and so could not hope to last.*

*In the end it was Bolshevik ruthlessness which allowed them to destroy the Provisional Government, but the poor defence put up by the Provisional Government because of their weakness and instability was a factor as well. In addition, the proposals of the Bolsheviks were in line with the hopes and needs of the peasants and workers. The incompetence of Kerensky at the time of the Kornilov coup had led to the arming of the Bolsheviks by the very government they were to overthrow. It is thus clear that the weaknesses of the Provisional Government were so significant that the path was clear for Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks to exploit the situation*

*in their favour. The sharp and rapid deterioration in the position of the Provisional Government in the autumn of 1917 was such that there was no way back for them.*

## **Chamberlain**

- 16 Passage A was misinterpreted by some candidates as the reference to slow progress in rearmament was seen as justifying appeasement, despite the steer to the Passage. Candidates determined to use the schools of history approach argued that Ismay was an associate of Churchill and hence a mouthpiece of the orthodox view, not thinking that the Chairman of the Imperial Defence Committee might be a useful witness on defence issues. In Passage D the points about public opinion were picked out, but the wider critique of appeasement was often missed. There were some general essays about the rights and wrongs of appeasement with little reference to the Passages. There were also answers which identified the arguments for British policy but could not go on to assess how justified these were, possibly because candidates lacked sufficient contextual knowledge.
- 17 There seemed to be little appreciation of the changes over time in British policy from the hard line in 1918. Appeasement was seen as beginning in the 1920s and the changing attitudes shown in the Stresa Front and the Anglo-German Naval agreement were often missed. Candidates did not always cover the whole period in the question or wrote general narratives.
- 18 This question was popular and often well answered with a good knowledge of the debate on when appeasement ended. The Polish guarantee and rearmament were fully covered but the events of late August and September 1939 were less detailed. Some candidates went back to Munich and did not move much further forward. This was another example of candidates unable to bear the thought of not using material they had prepared. Better answers argued that Chamberlain did carry on with appeasement, some thinking he still believed the policy would work and others arguing he was buying time.

## **An example of a good answer to question 16**

*In order to assess whether British foreign policy during the 1936 Rhineland crisis and the German annexation of Austria in 1938 is justifiable, one must first qualify what might constitute a convincing justification. British concerns came from the government based on their military and economic situation, referred to in source A, public opinion in Britain, mentioned in source D, the viability of possible allies, outlined in source C and the likely effects of taking action against Germany over Austria and the Rhineland as in source B. Based on these issues, if the government felt that action would lead to inevitable defeat in any international conflict, then inaction would seem to be justified.*

*One of the most obvious areas of debate surrounding the Rhineland crisis and the Anschluss is whether Britain's military situation justified her inaction. The Defence Requirement Commission had identified Germany as a major threat in 1934 and Chamberlain only began rearmament in earnest with his Four Year Plan in 1935. Emerson, in passage B defends the British approach in the late 1930s partly on the basis that a nation wishing to maintain its position as a major power must have the military capacity to enforce its policies. However, Passage A suggests that a British challenge to Germany was delayed over the Rhineland in order to make time for rearmament and that by the end of 1937 it was impossible to feel satisfied with its progress. The passage also highlights the British fear of German air power. In fact this was a greatly exaggerated fear and it can be argued that as German rearmament was considerable after 1937, that Britain might have stood a better chance of defeating Germany in 1936 than in 1939 and hence British policy was not justified.*

*The viability of possible allies in 1936 and 1938 is also used as a basis for justifying British policy in this period. Passage B defends the British by arguing that in 1936 France possessed neither the means nor the desire to defeat Hitler decisively, a view which may be reinforced by the fact that France had only a caretaker government at the time of the crisis and was subject to great political instability. However passage C argues that Eden forced the French to accept the British stance, indicating that inaction resulted from British concerns rather than from French reluctance to stand up to German aggression. Passage A points out that the government ignored Russia's proposal for a conference over Austria, although this reluctance was partly the result of public opinion in Britain, which was hostile to Russia. This evidence suggests British policy was justified.*

*Passage B states that attitudes in Britain supported the unfairness of Versailles and action against Germany would not have public support. The 1935 Peace Ballot in which 11 million people supported disarmament indicated the dominance of the never again mentality in Britain. Hitler was just going into his back yard in taking the Rhineland and his action was not entirely unreasonable as C points out, in strong contrast with attitudes to Mussolini and Abyssinia seen as a clear case of aggression. Even in 1938, the Anschluss was seen as Hitler taking over a German speaking country and backed by a positive vote in the subsequent plebiscite. Passage D has a different view, that public opinion was moulded by the government to justify appeasement and that there was some support for intervention.*

*It can be argued that government policy depended on economic concerns. Passage B shows the need for a sound economy to justify military action and refers to fears of a financial crisis if Britain intervened. At its height, the depression had left 3 million people unemployed in Britain and recovery was slow. This could be threatened by military action which would also damage the German economy, which Keynes had emphasised as being a key to British prosperity. This economic precariousness seemed to underpin all other motivations for doing nothing except to register disapproval. Britain could not rearm more rapidly and could not give any economic aid to allies. Public opinion would not back increased taxation. Thus this was a legitimate justification for British policy.*

*The outcome of these crises can also be used to see how far British policy was justified. Passage D claims that the Second World War was inevitable and the world situation worse, despite the claims of C that Britain and France had become closer together. It has been asserted that Hitler would have been overthrown from within Germany in 1936 if Britain and France had stood firm, but others are sure he would have been replaced by a similar ruler. The Rhineland crisis may have been the best moment to challenge Hitler, but no-one knew that in 1936. In 1938, with Chamberlain hoping for the best but preparing for the worst, opinion in Britain was more divided, but interpretations have been made more difficult by the Guilty Men thesis. It is easy to blame Chamberlain for the foolishness of Munich and the public for cheering at Heston airport.*

*Thus the passages and other evidence mostly suggest that British policy was justifiable in military, economic and political terms at the time. Germany's breach of the Treaty of Versailles in 1936 did not seem that significant while in 1938 there was no vital need for urgency as British security and interests were not threatened. Newspapers may have made demands for action to counter Germany and Churchill may have been equally strident but the Government reflected the views of the electorate who had voted them to power and so was justified in taking no action other than to register disapproval.*

## Stalin

- 19 Candidates tended to describe the content of the Passages rather than to analyse them and there was less contextual knowledge used. But many candidates knew the debate well and came to differing conclusions, supporting the view that Stalin was justified with evidence to back this up or that he was paranoid and completely wrong about the motives of the allies in delaying the second front. It is sometimes said that candidates do not appreciate irony but they picked up the references in Passage D well.
- 20 This question saw plenty of good answers and brutal and expansionist were well analysed. Some candidates found brutal more difficult than expansionist as they were not certain exactly what qualified as brutal and a few got into semantic discussions. Those writing in general terms about the orthodox and revisionist views rarely reached the higher Bands. Some did not focus on Stalin's policy, asserting that US policy was belligerent and Stalin was merely responding and was not to blame, and others were based solely on the example of Berlin with much detail on the response of the west.
- 21 This question was less well done as the evidential base was often thin. The debate was well known but beyond the Marshall Plan there was little detail. Some answers were narratives of events relating to US involvement in Europe. There were better responses which established other possible motivations for US foreign policy and then assessed whether economic domination was their main aim.

### An example of a good answer to question 19

*The view that Stalin was justified in distrusting his wartime allies can be supported by their delay in the opening of the second front in Europe to relieve Nazi pressure on Soviet forces. But it can also be argued that the delay was necessary to ensure the success of the second front and that Stalin was needlessly paranoid about the loyalty of his allies.*

*Sources B and D both support the idea that Stalin was justified in distrusting his wartime allies. Both show that the Soviet Union suffered the most human and material losses against the Nazi invasion but the allies still did nothing to open a second front. Source C also suggests that the Western allies wanted to see Russia and Germany destroy each other and benefit accordingly. It is true that from June 1941, Stalin and the USSR had suffered the brunt of the Nazi attack and, as source B states, the Anglo-American invasions of North Africa and Southern Italy were not adequate substitutes for an attack in Northern Europe as they did not get to the centre of Hitler's power. The losses to the allies in these campaigns were nothing when compared with the huge losses endured by the Russian army at Stalingrad.*

*Source D makes it clear that the opening of the second front was an urgent necessity and that Stalin was desperate for it to begin from the heavily ironic comments he is quoted as making at the end of the source. But source B indicates the problems faced by the allies and their determination to avoid heavy losses. Their reserves of troops in Europe were not as great as those of Stalin and they needed to maintain morale at home. But refusal after refusal to open a second front did increase Stalin's mistrust. Similarly the arguments in source C, backed up by source D, can be supported as the aims of the US in war, to maintain freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want, were contrary to both fascist and communist ideas. Stalin used the tactic of standing back to watch two enemies fight himself in 1944 at the time of the Warsaw rising when his Red army let the Polish rebels be wiped out by the Nazis so this kind of thinking was in his mind. Furthermore, his distrust was heightened by the development of the atomic bomb, about which he was only told by Truman at the Potsdam conference. The possession of such a weapon by a power with a completely opposed ideology was bound to increase Stalin's distrust of his allies and his fear that they would dictate their will to him. The discussions in 1945 about the future of Poland increased his distrust. It was essential for his*

future security that he should control Poland through which the Germans had invaded in 1914 and 1941.

However, there are other arguments which show that he was not justified. Source A indicates that the complexity of the planning for D-Day meant it could not have been launched any sooner. The scale of the operations outlined in A proves this. The disasters which the allies experienced at Dieppe and Arnhem showed how vital careful preparation was. There would only be one chance to invade France and surprise the Germans and so it had to work. Accounts of the extensive training of troops all over southern England and the practising of landing techniques illustrate this factor. In the event D-Day was a success and the German army was defeated less than a year later, showing that Stalin's distrust was exaggerated. There was a landing and when the allies met with some Germans they fought tenaciously. The allies also sent supplies into Russia, many seamen being killed on the treacherous run to Murmansk and Archangel, showing their commitment and the US sent thousands of tons of equipment under the lend-lease scheme in the three years prior to the opening of the second front. The allies felt that, despite their earlier hostility to Russia and the Nazi-Soviet Pact that they had treated Stalin fairly once he too became an enemy of Hitler and the Uncle Joe image had been spread in Britain and America by wartime propaganda departments. The allied aim was to defeat Hitler by all and any means possible and letting the Germans defeat Russia was not ever seriously considered.

In conclusion, Stalin's distrust was largely justified given his situation. The heavy casualties at Stalingrad, far greater than any allied losses, seemed to be ignored by his allies. These same allies had sent help to the enemies of the Revolution in the Civil War in the 1920s and they seemed to want to establish a democratic government of London Poles in an area which was a key to the safe borders of Russia. They kept secrets from him and constantly made excuses about the weather and their ability to defeat the Germans. Fighting up through Italy had been hard enough they claimed. He was never going to be convinced that the second front was anything more than promises as usual and its eventual success did not lead to any real increase in the degree of cordiality felt by Stalin towards his wartime allies.



## **Report on the Units/Components taken in June 2007**

### **Principal Examiner's Report**

**2590: Themes in History 1066-1796**

**2591: Themes in history 1763-1996**

### **General Comments**

As always at the top end of the range there were some excellent essays, reflecting a genuine sense of engagement with the question and an ability to synthesise a variety of factors over the whole period. Most candidates seem to be well attuned to the concept of change and continuity and appear more capable of taking a thematic approach throughout their essay. Most now attempt an argument with some analysis however modest but, not surprisingly in a synoptic paper, some find it difficult to sustain and save any analysis for the conclusion. Inevitably the weaker essays contain very little comparative analysis or breadth and treat the unit as if they were tackling a period study question.

Both 2590 and 2591 papers worked well and resulted in effective differentiation, though a mean of 74 was slightly down on last year's performance. Most Centres prepared their candidates appropriately but there was a noticeable prevalence of formatted responses in which each candidate started the essay in the same way, used similar illustrations in their argument and worked through the essay in a pre-determined sequence of paragraphing. As a result, too many candidates drifted away from the question set and only returned to it in the conclusion. Of course some candidates try to answer past questions rather than the current one which only serves to confirm their limited grasp of the topic. As last year, some treated their essay as an exercise in historiography, an approach that is neither desirable nor recommended. Many candidates seem to equate the rejection of a question's premise with argument and analysis, and often have insufficient material of their own to support an alternative view. They need to appreciate that their case would be better served by properly weighing evidence and, if the case merited it, sometimes agreeing with the proposition.

Some candidates tended to offload a wealth of factual details with limited discussion or evaluation, a feature that was evident in many chronologically organised essays. Candidates would do well to remember that this thematic paper is best tackled by arranging arguments thematically. Unlike in recent years, a lot of candidates lacked the basic factual knowledge to construct even a narrative account or cover the whole period. While the synoptic paper requires candidates to address most of the period and thus demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and understanding, unless candidates have the depth of detail necessary to analyse and assess a key development, their arguments will always be superficial and unconvincing. A major recurring weakness was a lack of decisiveness regarding opinions. Candidates, so keen to reproduce class notes in an accurate fashion, often did so at the expense of their own opinions on the specific demands of the question.

Two kinds of question caused problems for many candidates: 'turning point' and 'assessment' questions. Too often candidates classify any event of importance as a turning point and so fail to evaluate its relative significance in the development of the theme across the whole period. Rather than try to cover every major development, candidates are strongly advised to use their judgement, discriminate between developments and justify their selection. After all, not every development can be a turning point in relation to the question set. Paradoxically, some candidates try to introduce the concept of a turning point even when the question does not require it, and so weaken the coherence of their argument. A second type of question that caused some difficulty was the requirement to assess a proposition. For many, this was the signal to list events or to write a narrative, and thus immediately reduced their chances of writing a synthesis. Candidates need to evaluate reasons, discuss developments and offer judgements on the relative importance of events in their historical context.

Some candidates failed to answer two questions or to finish their second essay, a feature in particular of candidates answering questions on the American Civil Rights (see comments on questions 28-30 below). Some clearly spent too much time drafting (even drawing) over-elaborate plans that, ironically, often bore little resemblance to the structure of the argument. The overall quality of written English was not impressive and in general the standard of punctuation, spelling and grammar was poor. A number of candidates produced answers that were nearly illegible and Centres should stress the importance of clear handwriting and good English. Examiners are always more favourably disposed towards a candidate when an argument reads logically, clearly and fluently. Similarly a candidate who cannot be bothered to fill in the questions tackled in the cover page of the answer booklet creates a poor impression before the examiner begins to read their essay.

### **Comments on Individual Questions: 2590**

Comments have been confined to questions that were answered by four or more candidates.

### **The Government of England 1066-1216**

1. This was a very popular question and generally well answered. Most essays were analytical and thematic, and focused on the issue of change and continuity, and made a real attempt to compare Angevin with Anglo-Norman government. The best answers dealt with a wide range of examples: chief justiciar, Exchequer, Chancery, law, and increased royal control. Most argued that the Angevins developed many aspects of Anglo-Norman government but were more efficient and developed more formalised methods. Perceptive candidates pointed to the fact that change appeared to have occurred because of the problems of Stephen's reign, which forced Henry II to rebuild government in the wake of semi-anarchy, while a comparison with Henry I showed how much continuity there was. Less good answers produced a chronological and sequential sweep of the period, with an attempt at evaluation to try to link them in the conclusion. Others tended to omit either William I and William II, or the later 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, or both. Similarities were often equated with continuity and there was much assertion without any supporting evidence that Angevin government became more effective.
2. This question proved difficult for candidates who did not have a clear idea of what constituted local government. A disappointing feature of even good answers was a failure to pick up on elements of continuity concerning shires, hundreds and their courts. Much was made about the status of the sheriff but beyond citing the Inquest of Sheriffs, many candidates were unable to say how their powers were reduced under Henry II. Some candidates concentrated almost entirely on the sheriffs. It was difficult to find enough to say unless the answer adopted a broader approach, for example, examining the growth of royal control over the localities with increased centralisation. Some recognised that this was significant but failed to link central government developments to changes in local government. Consequently these responses failed to focus on the question and instead became at worst largely irrelevant accounts of changes in central government. Too many essays were vague, especially in relation to the timing of changes, and suffered from a marked lack of synthesis. Better responses provided good synoptic links between William I and Henry II and between Stephen and John, and where details were supplied they evaluated patterns of change and continuity.
3. This was a very popular question and produced a mixed response. Many weaker candidates had difficulty focusing on the question set and commonly drifted into 'Why was English government strengthened?', 'To what extent was English government strengthened?' or 'How did the continental possessions of the crown strengthen English government?' Some candidates only saw 'continental' in terms of Normandy and many weaker essays described rather than evaluated the relationship between continental

possessions and central government in respect of 'strengthen'. Most recognised that absenteeism was a fundamentally important result of the continental possessions and looked at the measures taken to deal with it but they were much less likely to offer a comparative evaluation. Better candidates analysed the impact of the continental possessions, argued that in some ways they strengthened and in other ways weakened English government, and attempted an evaluation of each. Particular attention was given to the office of justiciar in the reign of Richard. This was also linked to the need to increase revenue for war and hence the development of financial measures. There were also some interesting comments about the reign of John and his presence in England due to the loss of lands. Central government was thus undermined because a system had been developed to run without his presence and his interference caused problems.

### **Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228**

4. A popular question that was quite well answered. Most candidates referred appropriately to Archbishop Theobald and to Hubert Walter, as well as to the archbishops in the specification. While the best answers provided a direct comparison between relations under the Anglo-Normans and those under the Angevins, others, less effectively, adopted a chronological approach with comments. Some candidates addressed how similar or different relations were rather than focusing on 'much worse'. Some answers focused only on examples of poor relations so producing an unbalanced argument and synthesis, and others slipped into 'why' rather than 'to what extent' relations were good or bad. There was a tendency to see this question as a comparison of the Becket dispute with other disputes between the crown and archbishops, where there was an assumption that the Becket affair was typical rather than atypical. Better essays provided synoptic links and several argued that the poor relations between Henry II and Becket skewed our perception of relations between the Angevins and their archbishops.
5. This was less popular than questions 4 and 6. There were some very good responses where candidates argued effectively that, although there was a variety of reasons behind the changing relations between Canterbury and York, failure to resolve the primacy dispute lay behind them all. Some Centres imposed a thematic structure covering not only the primacy issue but investiture and the role of kings and popes that affected the relationship, and this format worked well. The main difficulty facing some candidates was not having enough examples beyond Lanfranc and Becket to illustrate the relationship with York. Weaker answers often detailed ways in which the primacy dispute affected relations without evaluating the importance of this, so failing to address 'how far'.
6. A popular question that produced mixed results. Some candidates did not focus on 'policies' and instead described Innocent's beliefs. Some seemed to find it difficult to focus on 'typical' and instead examined similarity and difference. Others compared Innocent III with only Gregory VII, so producing a very unbalanced essay. Quite a few candidates were confused between 'caesaro-papism' and 'theocratic kingship', or cited these terms without explaining what they meant. Less good answers adopted a chronological approach, reviewing and analysing a number of popes' policies towards England, and coming to Innocent's policies last, thereby only making synoptic points in the conclusion.

### **Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603**

7. This was a very popular question. Many candidates were able to give some reasons why governments suppressed rebellions effectively; fewer candidates focused on particular examples of rebellion and thus on 'so effectively'. However, the question was actually concerned with 'popular disorder' and, while this embraced rebellions, it also entailed looking at how governments strengthened the powers of the state, both centrally and locally, to reduce the incidence of disorder. A common error was for candidates to focus on why popular disorder failed, rather than on government responses to such disorder. This

often produced unduly narrative essays or lists of factors that enabled the Tudors to suppress rebellions. A small number of candidates are still troubled by the concept of 'popular disorder', implying that this idea may be tautological. It is not. Good answers, and there were many, supplied a range of reasons which included: the role of the nobility and gentry in keeping order, the role of the Church, legislation and the power of the state, particularly under Elizabeth, the theoretical issues of the Great Chain of Being, the growing legitimacy of the dynasty. Rather surprisingly, given the prevalence of disorder in 1549 (and the thrust of question 8), several candidates made no mention at all of that year.

8. The least popular of this set of questions and not well answered. The 'frequency' of rebellions during the period was the focus of the question but many candidates explained why 1549 saw frequent rebellions or they accounted for the large number between 1485 and 1549. A few candidates argued that there were more disturbances after 1549. Some focused on the issue of causation but care was needed as some were confused about the situation in the 1590s, arguing that economic problems had disappeared and therefore rebellion had declined. Only a minority compared the years before and after 1549, and so explained how later developments, especially under Mary and Elizabeth, were affected by events under Henry VII, Henry VIII and Edward VI. Most were able to write about the changing attitudes towards rebellion as a means of protest. Weaker essays turned the question into a discussion of the Mid-Tudor Crisis without saying how this could be relevant to the frequency of rebellion. The question was a good discriminator in that weaker candidates responded to the question with a stock answer or twisted it into their preferred choice; better candidates thought carefully about the question and responded to it accordingly.
9. This was the most popular question and generally well answered. The key to it was understanding/defining the term 'political'. It was surprising how many dismissed dynastic, factional or succession issues as separate from or different to political factors. Others, on the other hand, considered all rebellions to have emanated from central government policies and were therefore 'political'. Better answers distinguished political from religious, social and economic causes, where appropriate, and demonstrated the relationship between causes and the overt role of political factors in particular rebellions. Several good answers were able to show that many rebellions were multi-causal and that to break them down into simply political was simplistic. This was usually illustrated by reference to the Pilgrimage of Grace. Indeed a common weakness among many candidates was to devote too much time to the Pilgrimage and too little to the 1489, 1497, 1525 and 1554 rebellions. Weaker answers tended to be a list of rebellions with political factors and then a list without them but failed to address 'assess'. Others began with an attempt at analysis but then reverted to a description of rebellions and their causes, without making any comparative judgements. Many also drifted off the question and answered how serious each type of rebellion was; this meant that their analysis of causation was less developed.

### **England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603**

10. A recurring problem for weaker answers was that they saw the issue of the Netherlands almost exclusively in terms of trade, and then in terms of religion. There was little or no attempt to link this to other geo-political concerns for the Tudors. Many candidates were unable to connect the issue of trade to 'shaping policy' and instead wrote about how important trade was for the English economy. Some even used the question to write almost exclusively about Anglo-Spanish relations. Some did not recognise that Burgundy in the reign of Henry VII was the Netherlands in Elizabeth's reign. The most common mistake was to answer a different question about changing relations with the Netherlands and fail to make links with shaping foreign policy. The Elizabethan period was generally well covered but precise factual knowledge was often at a premium and some candidates assumed that Spain was seeking to conquer the Netherlands from the 1560s rather than trying to retain it. Better answers, on the other hand, not only charted particular changes

over time but also evaluated them in terms of other factors such as the personalities of monarchs, the Reformation, the rise of Spain, the Dutch revolt and the French Wars of Religion.

11. This was a popular question and a good discriminator. What separated good answers from poor was an ability to link the material to the question of 'skilful'. For many candidates, 'successful' meant skilful and a lack of success the reverse. Most agreed with the question and some made a case for Henry VII while all agreed that Henry VIII and Edward VI were the least skilful on account of the cost of wars and garrisoning, which failed to solve the Scottish problem. More discerning candidates justified their reasons and considered the different circumstances in which Elizabeth operated compared to her predecessors. The problems facing Henry VII and Henry VIII, for instance, were not the same as those facing the later Tudors. Some weaker answers, however, were a narrative account of England's relations with Scotland from 1485 to 1603, or focused entirely on Mary Queen of Scots, and any comparison was left to the conclusion. Knowledge of internal Scottish politics in Elizabeth's reign was generally very sketchy and few referred to Guise activities, Esme Stuart and Anglophile regents.
12. This was quite a popular question and generally well done. The most common aim identified and one seen as running throughout the period was national security, although attention was also given to dynastic/marital issues and, as the period advanced, to religious affairs. The best answers were structured thematically and each monarch was compared under the relevant theme being discussed. Weaker responses were frequently chronological narratives or descriptions of events with a concluding assessment. Most gave a lot of attention to Henry VII, Henry VIII and Elizabeth but Edward and Mary were dealt with summarily and, whereas continuity was generally seen to be the main trend, change was dealt with less convincingly and often simplistically.

### **The Development of Limited Monarchy in England 1558-1689**

13. Tackled by a minority of candidates and poorly answered. Some candidates questioned whether the monarchy was ever 'limited' during this period only then attempted to show how religious issues accomplished it. Others focused too much on religious groups, especially puritans, rather than on issues, such as dissatisfaction with the Elizabethan Settlement, or they glossed over issues such as anxiety about Roman Catholic links with the continent and papacy. Any assessment often went no further than asserting that religion was 'crucial' while some candidates thought the question was about religion rather than the limitation of the powers of the monarchy. Few candidates showed how religion limited the power of the monarchy and then compared its importance with other factors such as finance, foreign affairs or the growing self-importance of parliament. In general candidates' main weakness was a lack of solid knowledge of religious issues.
14. A minority of candidates claimed that parliament's role did not change during this period but most argued that it did. However, few defined or discussed what this role might have been and instead wrote about the changing relations between crown and parliament (ostensibly the Commons) while only a small number evaluated and illustrated why this occurred. Too many weaker essays gave insufficient consideration to parliament under Elizabeth and simply asserted that the role was constant. It was also claimed by one Centre that Charles II had exactly the same powers as Charles I and another Centre argued that parliament gave James II problems and eventually overthrew him.
15. This question was not very well answered. Charles II's powers were limited in theory but less so in practice, and better candidates picked this up in relation to earlier and later rulers but even here insufficient attention was given to the Exclusion Crisis and to the varying degree of power held by Charles during his reign. James II and William III were frequently overlooked and most comparative comments concerned Elizabeth and

Charles I. A comparative answer was expected but few candidates adopted a thematic approach. Those who did considered finance, foreign policy, religion and prerogative powers.

### **Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689**

16. Only a handful of candidates attempted this question, which was not well answered. 'Strength' was usually ignored, which meant that few essays contained relevant material or arguments were not focused on the question set.
17. An insufficient number of candidates attempted this question to warrant a report.
18. A few candidates answered this question. Most agreed with the title but proceeded to devote more space to James II's encouragement of toleration. A minority saw Elizabeth and James I as the most tolerant rulers and all agreed that Cromwell was the least tolerant. The better essays explained why rulers differed in their attitudes and established Charles II's reign as the benchmark for their comparison. Weaker responses went through the reigns chronologically with statements concerning the attitudes of each ruler to Roman Catholicism.

### **The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610**

19. There were many very good essays. Better answers looked at the role played by Catholicism in France pointing out how and why its role differed in the early and later years, and the part it played in the development of the nation state. There was some good work on the Catholic League as a cause of disunity and good references to the changes in theory during the period. Weaker answers began with the Day of the Placards and focused on the role of religion and the Huguenots in particular, or gave too little attention to Louis XII and Henry IV. Some candidates wrote two essays: one on Catholicism and the second on 'other factors' in the making of the nation state, without demonstrating their inter-dependence. Others described the contribution Catholicism made or quickly dismissed Catholicism before moving to other factors such as weak kings, finances and factional nobility. Some candidates were clearly prepared with a set of factors that were introduced into answers to all the questions of the unit.
20. This question produced some excellent answers. The best not only illustrated the extent of the power of French monarchs, they set this argument against contemporary theories which, on balance, gave rulers unlimited authority. It was encouraging to see that some candidates were familiar with the ideas of Seyssel, Budé, Bodin, Hotman, et al. Weaker answers contained little about 'supreme in theory' and often reserved any comment for the conclusion, while others argued simplistically that 'supreme' kings had stronger personalities. Many wrote about the 'transition from medieval to renaissance monarchs' without explaining what this meant or how it related to the question. Candidates were much better at writing about 'limited in practice' and most argued that this was the case even under the strong Renaissance monarchs, using examples of rebellion or the problem of regional issues.
21. A problem candidates faced was how to distinguish between 'united' and unified'. Few attempted a definition and many either assumed there was no difference and just wrote about unity or ignored both terms and examined the strengths and weaknesses of the French nation state. Some candidates took the line that France became disunited during the Wars of Religion but as time went on the opposing sides in these wars became more united and entrenched. Others assumed that 'unified' meant centralised and went on to look at how France developed administratively during this period. Several answers claimed that strong kings united and unified France and weaker kings did not, but they could not explain why. The best answers showed how France became unified with the acquisition of

lands such as Brittany and Calais but remained disunited, and pointed to the issues of language, law, religion, administration and regional liberties. The issue of religion was prominent in many answers and attention given to the Huguenot Midi and the concept of a state within a state, leading to the question of whether France was unified in the middle years of the period.

### **The Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century**

22. This question was generally well answered. Most candidates found it easier to link the issue of aims to the Protestant Reformation, rather than achievements, and a common weakness among several scripts was a failure to address this part of the question. The weakest candidates discussed the Protestant Reformation irrelevantly, and there was often drift into a discussion of the Jesuits. Better answers produced a more balanced approach, arguing that there were elements that were simply a response to the Reformation, while there were other issues which were dealt with at Trent that had already been considered before the Reformation. Weaker essays relied on sweeping generalisations; better responses supplied precise examples.
23. This question produced a wide range of responses. Some candidates did not find it easy to structure their material and preferred to write three separate sections - on the start, middle and end of the period. Better essays took a thematic approach and looked at issues at various stages. Most candidates examined the Papacy, abuses, territory, bishops and clergy, and the new orders, and concluded that the Catholic Church was stronger by the end of the century. Some, however, suggested that in certain areas this was not the case and pointed to the geography arguing that Catholicism was less strong in Europe than in other parts of the world. Few, however, traced the spiritual element of change, preferring to focus on power, land, finances and the new orders.
24. This question proved a good discriminator. Better answers showed a good knowledge of a wide range of popes and weighed up their contributions. Many focused on Paul III and made good comparative points across the whole period. Weaker responses either ignored the Renaissance popes, supplied few details of the majority of popes or were unable to explain how Sixtus V's work contributed to the success of the Catholic Reformation. Many merely described the work of later popes and then explained how corrupt early ones were, with details of Alexander's orgies.

### **The Decline of Spain 1598-1700**

25. A small number of candidates tackled this question. Most viewed both France and the United Provinces to have equally contributed to Spain's decline though more discerning candidates suggested how the two states interacted in the middle years. They saw the United Provinces as being more significant in the early years of the period and France in the second half of the period. Knowledge was generally sound and there was an appropriate focus on issues such as the impact of war on finance and how it prevented reform and consolidation.
26. The small number of candidates who did this question often interpreted 'economic' to be simply financial and so focused on debt and taxation. These weaker responses ignored agriculture, trade, commerce and industry, all of which played a prominent part in the development of the Spanish economy. Though a minority of candidates offered useful sections on wider economic issues, many made no evaluative comments about the relative importance of these factors.
27. Candidates generally agreed that a turning point occurred in the 1640s and most explained why. Some candidates suggested the accession of Charles II was a more significant turning point and explained what followed but few were able to compare the 1640s with

other turning points or indeed evaluate the periods immediately before and after. Several candidates, however, viewed any decade when something significant happened to be a turning point.

### **The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715**

28. Candidates answered this question with a fair degree of confidence and competence. Most agreed with the statement and tried to explain why Colbert contributed more than Richelieu and Mazarin yet knowledge of French ministers was often quite thin. Mazarin in particular was given a brief appraisal, the years 1683-1715 were often overlooked, and few candidates discussed Colbert's views on mercantilism. Weaker responses failed to focus on the economy and wrote generally about the development of France. Many focused too much on Colbert's work and only in the conclusion were differences between him and Richelieu and Mazarin considered. The best answers displayed enormous details of Colbert's work in financial, economic and industrial themes, and then cross-referenced his achievements and failures with a wide range of finance ministers across the period.
29. This question elicited a wide range of responses. At the top end, candidates argued that the zenith of French authority was attained in the 1680s, compared this era with the situation in 1660, and then set their preferred date in the context of the whole period. Weaker answers did not explain what constituted a 'strong international power', while others assumed that the acquisition of any territory automatically meant France was stronger internationally. Knowledge of the situation in 1660, however, was sometimes quite thin and many candidates could not compare the strength of France with other periods. A very common weakness was to overlook the early years, especially 1610-30, and to ignore developments after 1697. Centres are reminded that the whole period between 1610 and 1715 must be taught and evaluated.
30. This question produced some excellent thematic and evaluative essays. Most candidates explained the trend towards absolutism in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and the key reasons for changes over time. Some saw this development in terms of personalities and policies; some recognised the role of external factors. Better candidates were aware that the strength of the monarchy ebbed and flowed over the period and acknowledged the limitations facing Louis XIV, though knowledge of developments after 1700 was often thin. Weaker essays devoted too much time to Louis XIV and Versailles, and gave an unbalanced answer. Many described the achievements of Richelieu and Mazarin and failed to assess the reasons why Louis XIV was more absolute than Louis XIII. Some turned the question into 'How far was Louis XIV more absolute than Louis XIII?' or substituted 'strong' for 'absolute' and so missed the point of the question.

### **From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661-1796**

31. This question produced some very good answers. 1715 was usually seen as a key turning point and useful contrasts were made between Louis XIV and his successors. A definition of 'absolutism' proved helpful to better responses whereas weaker ones made many assumptions about France's changing condition. The quarrel between crown and parlements during the 1750s and the claim of the parlements to be guardians of the fundamental laws of France were often ignored. Some weaker answers produced unbalanced essays by failing to pay sufficient attention to the reign of Louis XIV while others omitted to assess or identify alternative turning points. The best answers traced themes within absolutism, such as control of nobility, financial and military strength, church support, and the personality of the rulers.
32. This was a popular question that elicited mixed responses. Most candidates agreed that Russian and Austrian rulers exhibited signs of both enlightenment and repression but many assumed that repressive meant 'effective' and so offered inappropriate evidence to

support a flawed argument. Some candidates struggled with the term 'assess' and found it difficult to produce an effective argument. The best essays grouped rulers for similarity by their enlightened or repressive approaches, compared and evaluated similarities and differences, and summarised by country at the end, cutting across individuals for patterns of change and continuity.

33. Only a minority answered this question. It was generally argued that religious toleration was one of several principles, and where it was evaluated and compared with other principles, such as Reason, rationalism and science, candidates scored well. Too frequently, however, candidates responded with a mainly descriptive answer and any evaluation of 'most important' remained very subjective.

### **Comments on individual questions: 2591**

Comments have been confined to questions that were answered by four or more candidates.

#### **Britain and Ireland 1798-1921**

1. This was a very popular question and generally well answered. Most candidates produced analytical work and considered several turning points in addition to the Easter Rising. The usual alternatives were the Act of Union (which had limited mileage), Catholic Emancipation and the Famine. However, a common weakness was to regard any major development as a turning point without explaining what had turned. Some claimed that events earlier in the period were more important because they were a necessary precedent for later ones. Others devoted too much time to describing the 1916 rising, or ignored its aftermath completely. The weakest answers adopted a chronological approach and made little attempt at synthesis. Others offered rather superficial and poorly supported comments, or tried to twist the question into one that compared revolutionary and constitutional nationalism.
2. A popular question that produced a wide range of responses. The best essays stuck to the focus of the question and offered both Protestant and Catholic views on the Union. Almost all candidates recognised the shifting relationships between loyalty to the Union and religious background amongst the Irish. Most candidates performed more strongly in investigating separatist attitudes than loyalist ones though some exaggerated the importance of the Republican cause and some assumed the question only applied to Protestants. Others tried to turn the question into opposition to the Union or proffered blanket statements such as 'support never changed'. Often the difference between southern Unionism and Protestant Ulster attitudes was not clearly understood nor was the significance of 1886 in awakening Ulster separatism.
3. This was the least well answered question in this set. Many responses were chronological narratives – administration by administration – and offered few synthesising elements. Some candidates thought the 'Liberal governments during 1865 to 1895' consisted of one Liberal government. Others focused almost entirely on this period and failed to address any other administration, and some had insufficient knowledge of Liberal policies for these years. On balance most candidates favoured the view in the question. Only a small number suggested Pitt's administration as a possible alternative, and few felt confident enough to argue a case for Peel, Salisbury or Lloyd George.

#### **War and Society in Britain 1793-1918**

4. This question was attempted by a small number of candidates. Some produced well informed answers although coverage of the navy was better than for the army. The best answers matched the funding issue to military priorities and to the status of the armed

forced but the underlying reasons for under-funding – retrenchment, pacifism, radical/liberal opposition to the expansion of the armed forces – were not always well explained. There were, however, many weak essays due to inadequate knowledge, a lack of focus on funding and too much attention given to the outcome of the reforms.

5. A poorly answered question. Some candidates struggled with the concept of 'organisation' and muddled it with strategy and tactics. Others defined weaponry very loosely to include horses, barbed wire, railways and telegraph. Most candidates produced a chronological narrative of the period and added little factual detail beyond what was contained in the Insert.
6. This was the best answered question in the set. Most candidates were able to measure the importance of balance of power against other factors, though there was a preferred slant towards 'always used' rather than the converse. The distinction between European and colonial wars was not always made and only the better candidates defined 'balance of power' and went on to exemplify their argument.

### **Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**

7. Generally poorly answered. Most candidates failed to say what the problems were as a consequence of urbanisation and so could not deal with the question set. Many struggled to find a range of examples with which to pinpoint and demonstrate a lack of funding or to identify a set of alternative obstacles. Many weaker essays described the evils of 19<sup>th</sup> century towns and how successive governments and enlightened individuals tried to overcome them. Finance was often dealt with superficially but other factors, such as vested interests, poor medical knowledge, *laissez faire* attitudes, were covered more competently. Unfortunately the question did not produce many comparisons or contrasts over time, or reflections on the themes of continuity and change.
8. A common weakness in several answers was a predilection to narrate or list the main educational acts without any serious attempt at synthesis or comparison. Several essays became embroiled in the religious issues of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; some focused more on factory reform and failed to link it to the question. Though knowledge of the 1870 Act was generally sound, there was much factual confusion on other key developments – 1902 was often muddled with 1944 – which made any evaluation of turning points hard to sustain.
9. This was the most successful question of those set on this topic. The most effective essays compared and interlinked Liberal social reforms with other themes across the period such as social reformers, government attitudes, warfare and foreign examples. However knowledge of the reforms often went no further than old age pensions and the Insurance Act of 1911 but the importance of these measures was generally well understood. Many candidates had difficulty identifying alternative factors that helped to create the welfare state and, though the significance of the Beveridge Report was known to most, knowledge of the post-1945 reforms was often poor.

### **The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992**

10. The main weakness in many answers was that candidates failed to provide any information on party organisation. Most stated that it was important but were unable to provide any examples of the electoral organisation of the main parties. Many candidates felt implicitly that leadership and policy were synonymous, while some overlooked 'victory at elections' altogether. Better answers looked at other factors such as party divisions and good leadership but even here many failed to mention key elections. 1906 was the best known but the elections of 1918, 1945, 1970, 1974 and 1979 were often ignored.

11. Many candidates had difficulty responding to the command 'Assess the reasons...', and gave a list of reasons instead. Candidates were stronger at identifying factors that were of an external nature which affected the Labour movement but looked less to within the movement itself for reasons that affected its fortunes. It was assumed by many that only Labour benefited from the increase in the working class vote. There were also serious omissions in knowledge, such as the period from 1957-79, which made any comparative analysis difficult to sustain.
12. This was the most popular of these questions but many candidates suffered from not defining key terms such as 'mass media' and 'democracy'. The weakest essays listed developments in the mass media – newspapers in the 1890s, radio in the 1920s, TV in the 1950s – without linking them to the development of democracy. Evidence and illustrations often lacked range and many paragraphs consisted of one or two detailed examples that were not always typical of the point being made.

### **The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996**

13. Very few candidates attempted this question and responses were generally poor. Too many essays drifted into a chronological description of the growth of newspapers, radio and television, unloaded prepared material or focused on the changes in society and how the media responded to them rather than to the question set.
14. This was quite well answered. The best essays offered a sound argument concerning the role of the media. They focused on the changes from the moral philosophy of the Reithian BBC, which acted as the guardian of the nation, to the commercial requirements of radio and TV. Weaker responses were confused by the concept of 'changing balance' and most essays focused on post-1945 developments with few examples drawn from before 1939.
15. This question produced generally poor responses. Most thought that the question was about how technology had brought down prices of media products and 'reasons' were not well understood. Even better answers failed to assess reasons and instead listed developments without offering any sustained comparison, evaluation or synthesis. Generally candidates who study this topic need to acquire a better working knowledge of British history over the period, and then to apply their knowledge of the growth of mass media into this context.

### **The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1919**

16. This question elicited many excellent essays. Most candidates were able to cite a range of generals across the period and avoided focusing too much on Napoleon and others linked generals to factors such as decisions to use military technology at certain times to achieve success. Weaker responses had difficulty deploying appropriate evidence to verify their claims about good or bad generalship or evaluated different generals without making comments about development, change and continuity. Some focused a little too much on generals and ran out of time for other factors.
17. There was a mixed response to this question. Technological knowledge of the whole period was often very impressive though many paid particular attention to developments in the French wars, the American Civil War and World War One. Some candidates struggled to make explicit links between weapon advancement and how this advancement was applied to battlefield tactics. Some lost focus bringing in other factors that affected battlefield tactics rather than factors that determined the application of new techniques. Weaker essays drifted towards descriptive/ narrative accounts of weapons technology and avoided any discussion of battlefield tactics.

18. There were some good answers particularly in relation to Napoleon and Wellington but few candidates discussed colonial and nationalist conflicts. Candidates who linked public opinion to military decisions scored well but some focused too much on how public opinion influenced non-military decisions. Weaker essays gave insufficient attention to other factors, showed limited factual knowledge to illustrate public opinion or twisted the question round to discuss how military decisions affected public opinion.

### **The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815-1919**

19. A popular question that was generally well answered. Better answers engaged in a detailed discussion of the nature of German nationalism and showed how it changed over time. Three eras were often cited: a liberal early phase, a Prussian dominated and militaristic phase, and a final extreme phase. The factors most quoted were economics, political leadership, the fall of Metternich and the rise of Prussian militarism. The Wilhelmine period was covered well by most candidates, which was an encouraging sign. Some candidates, however, struggled with the question and gave a very generalised narrative account with occasional references to nationalism rather than analysing the factors that influenced change.
20. This question produced some very good essays. Knowledge of the 1848-49 revolutions was very sound and many candidates developed the significance of events surrounding them with confidence. Several challenged the premise and opted instead for the rise of Prussia and Bismarck or the outbreak of World War One as the 'most important turning point'. Most candidates covered the whole period though not all related their knowledge to change in German nationalism and some evaluated the years 1815-48 as a turning point. Most seemed to understand the concept of a turning point but problems often occurred when other turning points were considered because this element of the essay ended up as a catalogue of significant events. Those candidates who offered an evaluation and/ or comparison with 1848-49 scored well.
21. This question produced a mixed response. Most candidates agreed with the claim in the question and were able to show the role played by Prussia but many then went along with the proposition and ignored the role of German nationalism or merged 'creation and development' and only dealt with Prussia in the early part of the period. Generally there was a tendency towards chronological narrative without many comparative links. Only a few managed a balanced assessment of the relationship between Prussia and German nationalism.

### **Russian Dictatorship 1855-1956**

22. This was a popular question that presented a few problems for a number of candidates. Most were able to discuss the effectiveness of a regime or leader but few understood the term 'autocrat'. Indeed some became so preoccupied by its definition that they were unable to assess the effectiveness. The better answers argued that all of the Russian rulers were 'autocratic' to a greater or lesser degree, and focused their argument around 'effective rule'. Stalin was often cited as the most effective communist ruler. Weaker responses failed to differentiate between the three tsars or tried to turn the question into a comparison of real tsars and red tsars. Few took the route of explaining the aims/ motives of various rulers and then measuring 'effective' against whether or not these were achieved. A common failing was to concentrate heavily on repression whereas more positive aspects of autocracy, such as success in war, welfare reforms, industrialisation, agricultural modernisation, were often ignored. Some candidates made the assumption that if there was a high body count or if economic growth occurred during the reign of a particular ruler, then he must have been an effective autocrat.

23. Most candidates handled this question well with Stalin emerging as the most successful ruler at dealing with opposition. There were many excellent answers that displayed a good knowledge of opposition and an apposite range of comparative rulers. Weaker answers often neglected Alexander II and Nicholas II or dealt with them cursorily. Measuring 'success' proved difficult for some candidates although few had problems listing the methods of control. Some omitted examining the means of repression or included the Hungarian uprising as an example of successful repression under Khrushchev. Some Centres produced a chronological tsar-by-tsar, leader-by-leader approach that hindered synthesis, and many omitted the Provisional Government period and Khrushchev. Better responses recognised that methods of control, such as propaganda, reform and concessions, could be as effective as repression and coercion.
24. This was the most popular Russian question and many candidates showed excellent knowledge and understanding. The most common response was a chronological one and to adopt a rather negative view of peasant life. The best answers distinguished between different classes of peasants and different areas of Russia, and discussed the lives of peasants using themes such as social reforms, rights to land, levels of wages, living conditions, degrees of repression, famine, agricultural reforms, and war service. The impact of war was often neglected, as was the effect that religious persecution had on pious peasants and the improvements in health, education and literacy during the soviet period. Weaker essays demonstrated little knowledge of peasant conditions or failed to link these to any leader. To many candidates, life deteriorated as the period progressed and so life was 'uniformly bleak'. The overall impression was that no ruler succeeded in improving the lives of the peasants in any lasting way although some did on occasion attempt to do so.

### **The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877**

25. This was a popular question and was well answered. Most candidates were able to evaluate the various factors contributing to sectional conflict, though many over-emphasised the issue of slavery. Surprisingly only a few candidates considered the impact of westward expansion and the constitutional issues it generated. The majority of responses examined the problems inherent in the 1787 Constitution, though not always in any detail, but the better essays linked these effectively with sectional conflicts by highlighting issues such as states' rights, implied powers, the status of slaves and the indivisibility of the Union. Weaker essays took a chronological approach: some focused on the early years and said little about the period 1861-77 either due to a lack of knowledge or lack of time.
26. Most candidates had little difficulty writing about American presidents but they were less comfortable at assessing the powers of the office. Most did not help their cause by adopting a chronological approach often characterised by three separate essays on Washington, Jackson and Lincoln. Knowledge of Lincoln, however, varied considerably and some candidates had difficulty interpreting the concept of turning point. Thus comparisons with Lincoln were generally weak and heavily dependent on assertions. Some candidates argued against the question – often perversely – which resulted in conclusions that were at variance with the evidence. For instance, the importance of Jackson's presidency was often established by downplaying Lincoln's actions in similar circumstances. Some argued that the Nullification Crisis was a turning point yet played down secession and the Civil War.
27. Few did this question and it tended to be the least well done. Some candidates clearly struggled with the concept of 'social changes', which led to a variety of interpretations. Most tried to hang their essay around the amendments and were able to present a reasonable, if limited, line of argument. Knowledge of the constitutional amendments was often weak and few were able to explain why they were enacted or the significance of the

Bill of Rights' amendments. The weakest essays described each amendment and tried to explain why it was important though often failing to link it to the notion of social changes.

### **Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980**

28. This was an extremely popular question and many candidates spent too long writing their answer and had insufficient time to produce a good second essay. While many had extensive knowledge of African American Civil Rights, few consistently applied this to answer the question set. Turning point questions often produce lists of events, decade by decade, and this was no exception. As a result, some candidates wrote a narrative account, had problems covering the full time range, and only gave superficial attention to the 1960s, while others rejected the 1960s before launching into an advocacy of their alternative period, usually World War Two or the 1950s. A significant number of candidates, on the other hand, wrote exclusively upon the 1960s and so failed to address the question. There were, though, many essays that did full justice to the question set and responded in a synoptic manner.
29. This question produced a range of responses. At the top end there were some excellent essays that assessed both negative and positive sides of Trade Union divisions. The roles of federal government and big business figured prominently as well as racial divisions, tension between skilled and unskilled workers, and problems within European groups. Many saw the AFL/ CIO split as a pivotal moment. The majority of essays, however, were disappointing. Individual unions were rarely cited but instead lumped together, and there was limited reference to the key union figures such as Sylvis, Powderly, Gompers, Debs, Heywood and Hoffa. Many emphasised the New Deal era to the detriment of other periods and factors. Many focused too heavily on other 'obstacles' and frequently presented them as a list with little evaluation or synthesis. Overall there was a disappointing awareness of change and continuity over the period.
30. This was the least popular question in this set and poorly answered. Far too many candidates relied on the Insert for their factual knowledge and offered vague generalisations. Too few focused attention on 'continually improved' and the concept of Native American Civil Rights was often handled simplistically. Many showed good detail of the 1865-90 period but little knowledge of later periods, particularly post-1945. Only a small number of candidates seemed to realise that different tribes had different experiences and many claimed that the Plains Indians lived an idyllic life prior to the white man's arrival. Statements such as 'Indian civil rights did not improve because they did not have any' were commonplace in weaker essays. Some candidates attempted to re-write the question and compared Native Americans with other ethnic groups. The better candidates looked at the nature of the improvements, identified turning points and evaluated change and continuity in a thematic and synoptic manner. Centres should look carefully at how they prepare their candidates for this topic. Each key issue needs to be addressed in breadth and depth. At present there is a strong impression among examiners that too much time is being devoted to the teaching of African Americans and, as a result, many candidates have insufficient knowledge and understanding of the other areas of study.

## SYLLABUS COMPONENTS 2592 AND 2593

### PRINCIPAL EXAMINER'S REPORT 2007

#### 2592 INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

[Passages in italics are extracts from examiners' reports or from the work of candidates in this year's examination]

##### Section A: Introduction

Before identifying errors and shortcomings and offering advice for improvement, let us remember what the majority of coursework can be:

*As ever, I was impressed by the exceptionally high quality of a number of the investigations, many of which were awarded full marks (and could have earned more if they had been available). Such scripts were fully focused on their titles; their arguments flowed with apparently effortless ease; their sources were evaluated where appropriate and were integrated within an argument that led up to a convincing conclusion.*

Corroboration of an unusual kind was provided by another examiner:

*Having returned to marking this component after a break of four years... I am left with the impression that the level of work has risen considerably... The interpretative element and the critical use of sources are now well understood and when applied to a suitable topic by a literate and bright candidate the result is rarely less than Band 1*

##### Section B: Preparation and title selection:

Again, this year, examiners remarked on the tendency of a 'significant few' candidates to ignore advice offered by coursework consultants – sometimes with painful consequences. For example, one candidate proposed to write on witch hunting in England and produced a source list dealing with witch hunting in Europe. Advice to opt for one or other focus having been ignored, the candidate wrote to the English title using European sources. Another candidate altered her approved question: *To what extent did Elizabeth I live up to her successful reputation?* writing instead on the virtually unanswerable: *To what extent was the reign of Elizabeth I the Lord's doing?* Candidates are, of course, free to ignore the advice of coursework assessors, but should pause to consider the very large number of proposals that each assessor sees and the dangers/pitfalls that he/she is aware of.

It cannot be said too often that the title is both the starting point and finishing point of the investigation. Understandably (in view of resourcing issues), many titles focus on standard A-level topics, but it is vital that individual titles reflect candidates' own interest in the topic and that candidates are not unduly directed by teachers – either in their choice of titles or in the material they use in their investigation. It seems unlikely, for example, that several candidates from the same centre should *simultaneously* discover an interest in whether or not Haig deserves to be called the 'Butcher of the Somme', or in the 'greatness' of Peter the Great. Worse still is the situation in which all candidates attempting a similar question have clearly been supplied with the same collection of quotable extracts, which the candidates link together with text of their own. It cannot be stressed often enough that this component requires an **independent investigation** that reflects each candidate's **personal interest**. This does not preclude, of course, investigations of Haig, or of Peter the Great; it simply involves recognition that Haig's career was not limited to the first day of the Somme, or that Peter was concerned with other things than how history would judge him.

Despite clear improvement in investigation titles, at least three common failings tend to persist: (1) the unfocused question; (2) the twin-focused question [excluding the possibility of synthesis]; (3) the self-answering question; and (4) the unanswerable question. This excludes those containing a statement but no question! Examples of each category are as follows:

- (1) *To what extent was Martin Luther King the largest influence on the Civil Rights Movement from World War II 1945 (sic) till the establishment of the Civil Rights Bill (1964) and following its passing up until 1968?*
- (2a) *Stalin; Hero or monster?*
- (2b) *The Holocaust: Myth or reality?*
- (3a) *To what extent can it be argued that the Communist North won the Vietnam War?*
- (3b) *To what extent was religion a major factor in the partition of India?*
- (3c) *To what extent was Hermann Goering a military genius?*
- (4a) *Was the 1969 moon landing a hoax?*
- (4b) *Who was Jack the Ripper? (inevitably)*
- (4c) *Was Anna Anderson really the grand-duchess Anastasia?*

In contrast, one examiner listed the **21 separate, varied and valid titles** that he had received from one centre. The following is a sample:

*“The First Media War” To what extent was the media the main reason for America’s withdrawal from Vietnam in 1973?*

*“If ever any one man won the battle, he did” To what extent is this a fair assessment of Keith Park’s contribution to the Battle of Britain?*

*To what extent was foreign intervention the main cause of the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War?*

*To what extent was the American War of Independence simply a rebellion against oppressive British rule?*

*To what extent did the British deliberately favour India in the question of Kashmir?*

*To what extent were government policies 1910-70 responsible for the demise and destruction of English country houses during this period?*

Sadly, as in previous years, there seems to be a sort of ‘regression to the mean’ of Nazi Germany, Russia and American Civil Rights. Some examiners pleaded simply for more variety; others asked, yet again, why there are so few local studies. As one remarked:

*“Research into new areas of history are entirely absent... and students who later... visit their local record office or the National Archives with the intention of tackling primary historical research will find that their A2 coursework was an entirely different activity. The growth areas of History – buildings, landscapes, families, military and especially local studies – are virtually untouched by the Individual Study.”*

One can but wonder why this is the case, as the component is an ideal vehicle for this sort of investigation.

On the other hand, early and medieval topics seemed to fare better and outstanding work was reported on the First Crusade, the Battle of Hastings, the kingship of Edward the Confessor, Alfred as military leader, the Albigensian Crusade and Eleanor of Aquitaine.

The following advice was offered by one senior examiner on how to choose a good title:

- *Make sure that the title exactly corresponds to the argument you have in mind.*
- *Make sure that the title really does lead to the possibility of critical evaluation.*
- *Make sure, in titles calling for causal explanation, that a range of factors can be identified and their relative importance to the explanation evaluated.*

- *Make sure that the evidence is available to answer the question – conspiracy theories or studies reliant on e.g. secret files usually lead to dead ends.*
- *Make sure that the study allows for depth of investigation. ‘Can Adolf Hitler be defended?’ is far too broad and likely to be superficial.*
- *Beware questions that involve moral judgement outside the remit of normal historical enquiry – e.g. ‘Can Hiroshima be justified?’*
- *Make sure that you understand the debate before launching into e.g. ‘How far was Hitler a weak dictator?’*

There is evidence from examiners that some centres provide candidates with collections of resources for their Investigations. The good intention is recognised – particularly on topics where sources are otherwise difficult to come by – but this practice, carrying with it the suspicion of excessive teacher intrusion, runs counter to the spirit of an **independent investigation** and should cease.

### Section C: Quality of argument

The title – as already stated - is all important, since it defines the kind of argument that is to follow – usually either a causal explanation (*To what extent were the leaders of the First Crusade motivated by religious zeal?*) or an evaluative enquiry (*How acceptable is the judgement that Cromwell only deserves to be remembered for his military achievements?*). The structure suggested by the former is an argument in which various factors, including the one proposed, are analysed, then evaluated in terms of their contribution to the explanation; the structure suggested by the latter is an argument of two sides with an adjudication, or possibly a synthesis (conflict resolution) in conclusion. This is all there is to it. If the title does not permit one or other kind of argument, it is probably not valid; and if candidates do not achieve one or other kind of argument, it is unlikely that they can be rewarded beyond Band IV.

Whatever kind of argument may be required, candidates are wise to make interim judgements at the end of each paragraph to confirm how the exposition in the paragraph (or section) has contributed to the overall argument. This also tells the reader that the candidate is in control of the argument (see below) – in a much more subtle and useful way than: “*First, I am going to look at the argument in favour of...*”

Successful candidates show that they are **in control** of the argument. Less successful candidates either tend to ‘describe’, or to allow their argument to be driven by their sources (particularly secondary sources), rather than making evaluative use of them as they go along. Typically, for example, a candidate writing on, say, Hitler as a ‘weak dictator’ will use the opportunity to debate a range of historiographical opinion, rather than *themselves* examine the evidence for Hitler being a weak dictator – or, indeed establish what the debate is *about*. Although Kershaw’s views will (indeed, must!) be used, it is not *his* argument that needs to be described; rather, it needs to be *used*, and evaluated, in the context of the candidate’s own argument, or in relation to other interpretations and/or primary evidence available to the candidate. Mere ‘historiographical narratives’ are, indeed, narratives and are rewarded as such. Here is a good example of a candidate being in control of an argument dealing with the significance of Neale’s ‘Puritan Choir’. Note how cross reference is integrated and used as a means of furthering a particular line of debate:

*Doran puts Neale’s argument into perspective, stating that ‘only fifteen of four hundred in the Commons were radicals, and only eight of these were Marian exiles’<sup>fn</sup>. When one puts into perspective the extreme minority of members in Neale’s ‘Puritan Choir’, it leads one to consider how they could pose a serious opposition towards Elizabethan government. Although numbers were small, Elton argues that ‘because sittings were often thinly attended, the influence of a group of men who knew what they wanted made itself more effectively felt than their numbers may have warranted’<sup>fn</sup>. However, Graves disagrees with Elton, arguing that the ‘handful of members lacked general parliamentary support and were easily smothered by official action’<sup>fn</sup>.*

*The evidence does support Graves' argument. It can be seen in the case of the imprisonment of the Wentworths that extreme Puritans were unsupported by Parliament, and without this support their influence was not effectively felt.*

In questions calling for a causal explanation, candidates still seem to have problems with determining the relative importance of causal factors. Most candidates understand that they need to identify and explain the role of a range of factors, including the one usually proposed in the title - contributing to the event or outcome in question. This is often done well but spoiled by a conclusion in the form of an *assertion* that one factor is key - which does not validly answer the question ('What was the *main* reason...?'). In order to do this, the candidate needs to *demonstrate* the relative importance of the factors involved - i.e. *in relation to each other*. This can be done in various ways - e.g. by *showing* that one factor was dominant and all of the others dependent on it; or by *demonstrating* how a different outcome would have been likely, had one of the factors (i.e. the dominant one) been absent.

More attention needs to be given than is normally the case to the conclusion. All too often these tend to be either recitation of what has been said before, or perfunctory 'signings off', neither of which add much, if anything, to the argument. Conclusions should have a more weighty purpose. For example, they should convey some sense of *hierarchy* in respect of the argument - e.g. a decision (with justification) about the relative importance of causal factors (as in the 'Crusade' example, above), or about the relative strength of evidence for or against a proposition (as in the 'Cromwell' example).

The 'labelling' of historians remains something of a problem - though less so than in previous years. One examiner recorded five groups - 'Marxists', 'Liberals', 'Revisionists', 'Optimists' and 'Pessimists' in the same study on the Russian Revolution. At the risk of sounding tedious, it matters little, if anything at all, to the argument that historians fall into any of these categories; what matters is: the name of the historian; the value of what he/she has written; the extent to which it is consistent with the views of other (named) historians - and how any, or all, of this advances the argument. Another reason why candidates should avoid labelling is that it tends to indicate that research has been limited to tertiary sources, which, for no doubt valid reasons, seem, alone, to indulge in this sort of nomenclature. Finally, incorrect use of a label seems to be doubly unhelpful; as one examiner pointed out, Michael Lynch is not a 'revisionist historian' but someone who writes A-level text books. This was taken further by another examiner:

*The list of historians such as Murphy, Rowe, Laver, Peaple or Stewart was extensive and very flattering, considering that they either edit text books or write them based on the work of other historians. However, Trotsky agreed with Laver and Lloyd George agreed with Peaple and the number of Presidents that agreed with Murphy was spectacular.*

A related problem is the tendency to dismiss older views - such as that of Neale on the 'Puritan Choir' on the basis of criticism by more recent historians which lacks any reference to the evidence they dispute. Similarly, it is really little use saying that Leuchtenberg sees the New Deal as a vital reforming period while Badger is more sceptical without explaining the evidence that these historians use. In cases such as this, candidates tend to confuse cross-reference with mere juxtaposition and the tertiary source is again, one feels, largely to blame.

Two weaknesses of what might be called *germane detail* were identified by one examiner: the first concerned studies that debated the importance of an individual or event but failed initially to establish details of what the event was or what the person did (particularly necessary in the case of more obscure topics); and the second lamented the plethora of studies on Hitler's rise to power that ignored the politics of 1932-33.

Some candidates like to begin their studies with the conclusion. For example: "My view is that by 1553 most Englishmen remained unconvinced by Protestant arguments, conforming out of pragmatism rather than principle" (in answer to the question: 'How far was England a Catholic

country by 1553?'). There is nothing wrong with this practice – indeed, it suggests a positive engagement with the key issue – but it can only work in the context of an *investigation* if alternative views are considered in depth and an adjudication made and justified on the basis of the evidence presented. In other words, despite the opening, there has to be an argument.

Almost all examiners agree that the standard of written English is much worse than in previous years.

#### Section D: Use of sources

Despite exhortations in this report and in INSET sessions over the years, this remains a 'problem' area for some candidates. It need not be so, if candidates are taught to recognise that sources are to be 'used critically' in the course of advancing their own arguments.

Strange as it may sound, some candidates make *too much* use of source material. One examiner calculated that c.2,300 out of 2,560 words in one study on Phillip II were quoted. The result, of course, is that there is so little of the candidate's own ideas in the work that it is difficult to know how to reward it. Candidates would do well to remember that evidence is used to serve the argument, rather than the other way round.

Making 'critical use' of a source, in basic terms, means turning it into *evidence* about something. A quoted source is 'inert' – in the sense of performing no recognisable function – until a question (relevant to the argument) is asked of it. This might be about what the source contains or leaves out; about the author or the circumstances of its production; or about the extent to which what is contained in the source is consistent with evidence from other sources. In this way, the source and what it contains have become *evidence* that can be used, singly or in combination, to develop or challenge a line of thought, or to test an assertion. It follows that the practice of inserting quoted extracts as though they were self justifying – what one examiner refers to as 'toast-racking' – will not do, because the sources remain in their 'inert' state. They are not being used as *evidence* of anything. **The golden rule is that sources do not speak for themselves.**

The following is a good example of sources used properly in combination to build up a line of argument. The candidate is investigating the extent to which Southern opposition was to blame for the slow implementation of the Brown Decision (high school desegregation) between 1954 and 1980:

*Evidence shows that the Southern white backlash to the ruling was vast. There was an overwhelming amount of Southern whites outraged, with public support falling from 15% to 8% over the five years that followed, showing how white attitudes hardened towards desegregation. This was reflected in the forming and spreading of White Citizen Councils (WCC) which developed in the South in response to the Brown decision. They were against desegregation and were as committed to white supremacy as the KKK but less crude in their methods. Their members believed in segregation: Thomas P. Brady, Mississippi State Supreme Court Justice and WCC member wrote, "Whenever and wherever the white man has drunk the cup of black hemlock, whenever and wherever his blood has been infused with the blood of the negro, the white man, his intellect and culture have died"<sup>fn</sup>. This view was supported in pamphlets like 'Segregation and the South', which described African Americans as having "an inherent deficiency in mental ability"<sup>fn</sup> and "a natural indolence"<sup>fn</sup>. Another, 'The Ugly Truth about the NAACP' spread the accusation that the organisation was controlled by Communists intent on destroying America, a common rumour that was seized on by WCC propaganda to deter white support.... The WCC openly met and was seen as reputable as their tactics did not include direct confrontation with violence or terrorism and had the support of leading citizens in the community, including business, civic and even religious leaders.*

Each year seems to throw up a particular bad habit. This year was the year of the ‘embedded source’. This occurs when the candidate integrates a **historian’s reported view** in the body of the text, usually accompanied by a superscripted footnote reference. The corresponding reference duly appears at the foot of the page, but all we have is the candidate’s word for the view that is supposedly expressed, and that the view is contained *somewhere* on the page mentioned in the footnote. This is not to call into question the integrity of candidates; rather it is to reinforce the message that, *before a candidate can be rewarded for e.g. critical evaluation of a historian’s view as evidence about this or that, the view itself has to be presented, not merely reported.* In the worst examples of this sort of practice, whole paragraphs can be filled with the reported views of historians, usually lined up on each side of an issue. Presumably, it is meant to pass for cross reference, but it is not cross reference – merely a list of reported views, supplied, it seems, by everyone except the candidate.

The plethora of ‘embedded sources’ is caused in turn by the plethora of tertiary sources – ease-of-access sixth form topic books with ready-made historical debates: “*Robert Service points out..... Acton supports this view .....However, Wood contends.... Fitzpatrick agrees with Wood by arguing...*” These books have their place and, indeed, are arguably vital in providing a baseline for A-level study, but they are not sufficient for the Individual Investigation. Contrast the approach quoted above with that of a candidate who achieves a valid cross-reference that contributes to his own argument:

*Although Lynch does argue the importance of foreign intervention as the cause of revolution, he does not deny the secondary importance of China’s own social preconceptions. He notes that “between 1900 and 1949 Chinese economic and cultural conservatism proved so strongly entrenched that the prospects of an orderly transition from feudalism to modernity were always more apparent than real”<sup>fn</sup>. In this he is supported by Mackerras, who believes it was Confucian tradition that was “contrary to those forms of modernisation necessary for the twentieth century”<sup>fn</sup>.*

The lesson here is that candidates ought to seek out a few more ‘big books’ about their chosen topic. These will not need to be read from cover to cover but should be ‘plumbed’ for the *actual arguments* used by their authors, from which quoted extracts can be presented as sources, that can in turn be critically appraised and integrated as evidence into the candidate’s argument.

When evidence is presented in this way, it further exposes the inappropriateness of the weaker sort of evaluation – the one in which the unreliability of a source seems to come as a surprise to the writer:

*It was written by a historian called Robert Lees (sic) for his book ‘The Nazis: a Warning from history’ to explain how the Nazis came into power. This source is unreliable as it may be bias (sic). It is also secondary as the book was written in 1997, so this may make it unreliable. However this may be reliable as Hitler was able to become leader of the Nazi party in 1921 because of his talents as an orator....*

Contrast this with a candidate who achieves a *valid* version of the oft-maligned ‘ad hominem’ evaluation – one that considers the circumstances of the historian as having a bearing on what he writes - and relates this, in turn, to the argument. This is normally much harder than it appears – hence the usual advice for candidates to evaluate what historians write rather than the historian himself. However, it can be done well, as in the following example, where the value of each historian’s view is compared in terms of their approach to historical evidence and their use of different methods. The example is from a study debating the significance of the role of Communist intervention in the Spanish Civil War.

Preston emphasises the positive aspects of Soviet aid, stating that 'the Communist party, for all its crimes and its errors, played a major role in keeping Republican resistance alive as long as it did'<sup>fn</sup>. However Beevor views Stalin more critically, saying that Russian aid was "little more than the necessary minimum"<sup>fn</sup>. The root of this disagreement comes from the two historians' different backgrounds and prejudices. Preston lived under Franco's dictatorship for several years and openly admits in the preface of his book, 'The Spanish Civil War' that he had little sympathy for the Right, believing that, despite its mistakes, "the Spanish republic was an attempt to provide a better way of life for members of a repressive society"<sup>fn</sup>. Beevor, on the other hand, is less willing to overlook the faults of the Left, and, in his acknowledgements for his recently revised edition of 'The Battle for Spain', he states that he has made extensive use of "material from German archives and especially from Soviet files that had not been previously accessible"<sup>fn</sup>. Despite these disputes, it is clear that, as Russian aid grew, so did Moscow's influence on the Republic's decisions.

By the way, authors who wrote subsequently can agree with earlier authors but not *vice versa*, hence Roger Wendover cannot agree with John Warren.

### Section E: Rubric, presentation and expression

Examiners expect to see the following when presented with investigations to mark:

- An overall **authentication statement** (CCS 160) signed by all teachers involved in the component; and **cover sheet on each script** also signed by the teacher involved.
- **The script** itself, stapled top left. This can be enclosed in a 'poly pocket' but not in a folder with separate sleeves for each page.
- A length limit of **3,000 words** – **examiners simply stop reading when the word limit is reached**; similarly, there is no point in stretching 2,500 to 3,000 if the argument has been made in 2,500. An interesting, though regrettable, feature of this year's examination was the number of under-length studies that were reported.
- A narrative that is single-sided, double spaced (or 1.5) and paginated.
- A **bibliography** reflecting books actually used; 6-10 is the normal number of items – though one examiner expressed dismay at the number of bibliographies containing less than 4 items, which is inadequate, given that the Investigation should be the work of months, not weeks. Items should be listed alphabetically by surname.
- **Footnotes**, preferably at the foot of each page, indicating author/title/**page number** and, ideally, year of publication or number of edition. Proper use of *ibid.* and *op. cit.* can help to cut down on typing time, whilst extracts from one historian quoted in the work of another should be footnoted as: '*quoted in...*' Website references can only be taken seriously if they include author and provenance and, consequently, *Wikipedia* cannot be taken seriously at all, since entries are anonymous. Despite much reported improvement, the habit of allowing the footnote to be part of the argument seems to persist. Since this habit is officially viewed as a means of circumventing the word limit for the argument itself, lengthy footnotes of this kind are not read by examiners and so whatever impact might have been intended is simply lost.
- Sensible **paragraphing** is used to deal with different facets of the response.
- **Accurate written expression**. *Their* and *there* should never be confused in an A-level script; nor should *cite* and *sight* given the nature of this unit. The plural of *Nazi* should never be presented as *Nazi's*, and, while on the subject, candidates should know that neither *Gobbles*, *Gobbells* nor *Gebbells* were in charge of propaganda for the Third Reich. The case was eloquently made by one senior examiner:

*In some cases errors might amuse the examiner but gross carelessness can adversely affect the assessment of the work. So in a piece on opposition to Hitler one candidate rendered Von Stauffenberg in three different ways, each one incorrect. In an essay specifically on Hitler, 'Fuhrur' appeared throughout the work and in another on the Holocaust the candidate throughout discussed 'Hitler's anti-Semantic views'. We had the*

*1552 Prayer Book containing 'the Black Brick' and English seamen 'privatising the Spanish Main. Finally, it was claimed that in Tsarist Russia 'peasants had always been at the bottom of society and women fell beneath them'*

Another examiner lamented the intrusion of slack modern usage:

*There was also some sloppy use of language: "Things began to go pear-shaped for the Third Duma"; "When the war began, the fun really started"; "The Protestants and Catholics were constantly causing agro (sic) over religion".*

A simple suggestion – mentioned last year – is to insist that candidates read over/read out (possibly aloud) their finished work to check for errors of spelling, punctuation or grammar, for historical inaccuracy and for general coherence of argument.

- **Absence of plagiarism.** Some (usually weaker) candidates simply copy out long sections of 'argument' from a convenient text and claim it as their own. Unfortunately for the candidates, differences in written style are very easily detected and the work marked down accordingly.
- **Tidy administration.** Some centres failed to include an attendance register and this inconvenience was compounded by scripts not being placed in candidate number order. Without the vigilance of examiners a candidate in this case could have received the wrong mark.

## Principal Examiner's Report June 2007

### Unit 2593 Open Book Examination

#### Introduction

- ***There were relatively few really good scripts this year but a fair number of competent ones.***

#### Title adaptation

- This was urged last year, and the practice of question adaptation was very much improved this year as a result. However, operational errors remain; in particular, it is necessary for the adapted title to make exactly the same demands as the original question on the paper – the only difference being the inclusion of the focused example. For example, 'To what extent was Napoleon a military genius?' is not the same as 'Evaluate claims made by historians on behalf of any commander you have studied that he was a 'military genius''. It was made explicit in the teacher guidance accompanying the paper that the focus of the question was on the *claim*, not on the leader – thus giving the candidate the opportunity to develop reasoning consistent with AO2.
- One question, Question 5, invited candidates to focus their answers on one individual. In others – particularly Questions 3 and 6 – reference to more than one example enhanced the answer considerably.

#### Quality of argument

- Better answers had a firm structure and favoured a thematic approach, with some attempt at critical use of sources.
- Weaker answers tended to be heavy with description, illustrative use of quotation, weak, misunderstood cross-references and stock evaluation, often of a GCSE (or even sub-GCSE) quality. In a good number of cases, closer, more careful reading of the questions would have helped, as well as reference to guidance notes issued by OCR earlier in the year.

#### Critical evaluation

- Weaker responses find it difficult to cross-reference as well as integrate and evaluate individual sources.
- Better answers were sparing in their use of uncritical quotation and did try to use cross-reference to relate to, and progress, the argument (or counter-argument). These answers conveyed a real sense of debate, going beyond mere descriptions of differences in historians' views to assess, explain and evaluate them.
- As in Unit 2592, many candidates demonstrated a lack of historical insight, treating textbooks as major sources and juxtaposing such with the work of professional, front-line historians.

- There could be still more improvement in the 'physical' deployment of source material. Sources gathered beforehand for inclusion in the answer need to be edited down to, say, two lines each at the most. The disadvantages of using longer sources is that it is not always clear to the reader which part of a long quoted extract is relevant to the argument (or part of an argument) that immediately precedes it in the narrative. This applies whether sources are directly inserted into the answer or included as referenced appendix items. **By far the best approach is to reduce the quotation to a manageable length of one or two lines and insert it into the main text with the usual critical commentary to accompany it.**

#### Report on individual questions.

##### **Q1: *How useful is the literature of a given historical period for assisting our understanding of the past?***

- This question yielded a relatively high number of answers. The best of these recognised that fictional 'evidence' could both add to, and detract from, our understanding of a period, and that it may or may not be consistent with other kinds of evidence from historical sources. Several candidates, for example, made good use of Poor Law sources, comparing their value as evidence with extracts from *Oliver Twist*. The best studies went on to draw conclusions about the position of the author and the value of unreliable evidence. Weaker studies tended to focus on 'how accurate', rather than on 'how useful', failed to compare literature to other evidence, or indulged in some form of literary criticism without any reference to historical enquiry.
- By far the most popular topic was Dickens but several attempted to write about the historical value of a range of American literature 1920-40. A particularly good essay was produced, using *Stendhal*, with particular reference to '*Le Rouge et le Noir*'.

##### **Q2: *Assess the impact of factors that have caused inflation in a given historical period.***

- There was a small number of good answers that did try to consider impact levels e.g. on classes/sections of society, on social order (or disorder), or on 'mindsets' leading to changes, crises and the like. Weaker answers tended to focus on the consequences of inflation, or were overly descriptive, failing to address the notions of either 'impact' or 'relative impact' of factors.
- Favoured topics were Weimar Germany and 16<sup>th</sup> Century England, in which there was good discussion of demographic change, debasement of the coinage, war expenditure and harvest failure.

##### **Q3: *How far would you agree with Thomas Carlyle that history is no more than 'the biography of great men'?***

- The best answers to this question evaluated the contribution of 'great men' relative to that of lesser individuals, the masses, situational social or economic factors, and the importance of chance in determining the outcome of significant historical events or developments. Weaker answers opted for biographical narrative or reached for a literal definition of 'biography'.
- Favoured subjects were Elizabeth I, Hitler and Stalin.

- More confident candidates attempted a counter-argument around either 'great women', or other facets/ purposes of the study of history.

**Q4: *To what extent have the artefacts and/or archives of a local museum helped you to understand the history of a locality?***

- Sadly, only a few takers. What more enticing question could there be on local history? Even these tended to describe exhibits rather than considering their value in assisting historical understanding of the locality.

**Q5: *Evaluate claims made by historians on behalf of any commander you have studied that he was a 'military genius'.***

- Some very good answers, characterised by attempts to assess genius at several levels and with a sense of factors interacting with the military leader and critical cross-reference of competing claims. Weaker answers focused on the leader, rather than the 'claim', analysing battles in the search for genius. As a result, however, they found it difficult to develop an argument based on competing interpretations. Weaker responses, predictably perhaps, settled for little more than a biography of the subject.
- Success was highly dependent on choice of subject. Favoured subjects were Napoleon, Wellington, Lee, Trotsky, Wallace, Cromwell and Genghis Khan (fruitful debate); Rommel and Montgomery (less fruitful debate). No candidate chose to study Nelson, who might have seemed an obvious choice.

**Q6: *How far would you agree that a successful political regime always depends on a strong leader?***

- This was a popular question. Some candidates focused on both parts of the equation, determining that strong leaders could preside over unsuccessful regimes and vice versa – and looking for reasons why this could happen, or for why the character/fortunes of either the leader or the regime could change over time. Some candidates argued convincingly that a balance between regime success and strong leadership mattered, as did imbalance, but for different reasons. Weaker responses tended to focus on the leader at the expense of the regime.
- The question attracted lots of answers on Hitler as a 'weak dictator' but these tended to be betrayed either by focus on events between 1918 and 1933, by lack of assessment of the strength of the Nazi regime after 1933, or misunderstanding of the original debate. There were, however, some sound, balanced answers on Henry VIII which showed some understanding of the strengths of the Tudor regime.

**Q7: *Compare the immediate and longer-term impact of any religious change you have studied.***

- Those attempting this question tended to focus on Henry VIII, Luther or the Counter-Reformation. Most did try to compare/distinguish between short and longer-term consequences. Several of those opting for the English Reformation displayed good knowledge of the economic and political consequences of the sell off of monastic and church lands, though *explanation* of the consequences (or of similarities/differences between short and longer-term consequences) was often not as assured as their identification.

**Q8: Assess the relative importance of factors that have tended to advance or impede technological progress in any period you have studied.**

- Very few attempted this. Those who did tended to offer descriptions of the chosen change – or fall back on GCSE studies in development. There were, besides, a few courageous but over-ambitious analyses of the factors causing the Industrial Revolution.

**Q9: Assess the impact of factors acting for or against social cohesion in any period you have studied.**

- There were some reasonable answers on the Civil Rights Movement (CRM) but candidates tended not to distinguish immediate and longer term consequences, and assume, consequently, that the CRM had only a positive effect.
- The phrase ‘social cohesion’ seemed to cause candidates problems, despite the definition that was given on the paper itself – “*the degree of harmony that exists either within or between different groups in a given society*”. In addition to the CRM, Weimar Germany, or 16<sup>th</sup> century France provided reasonable responses; revolutionary France also proved a surprisingly good choice.
- Some candidates, given the bicentenary year, simply wanted to write about slaving and the slave trade. Hardly any were accurately focused on the demands of the question.

**Q10: Assess the claim to greatness of any Asian ruler or leader that you have studied.**

- Genghis Khan and Mao were favoured - with some particularly good answers on both – engaging with the argument as well as with the individual, and setting ‘leadership’ within a wider context of events and forces, pressures and structures.

**Advanced Subsidiary & Advanced GCE History 3835/7835**

**June 2007 Assessment Series**

**Unit Threshold Marks**

	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>u</b>
<b>2580</b>	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2581</b>	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2582</b>	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2583</b>	Raw	45	37	32	28	24	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2584</b>	Raw	45	37	32	28	24	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2585</b>	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2586</b>	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2587</b>	Raw	90	70	63	56	50	44	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2588</b>	Raw	90	70	63	56	50	44	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2589</b>	Raw	90	70	63	56	50	44	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2590</b>	Raw	120	89	79	70	61	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2591</b>	Raw	120	89	79	70	61	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2592</b>	Raw	90	72	64	56	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2593</b>	Raw	90	72	64	56	49	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

**Specification Aggregation Results**

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

Report on the Units taken in June 2007

	<b>Maximum Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>3835</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
<b>7835</b>	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

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

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total Number of Candidates</b>
<b>3835</b>	19.1	43.5	68.7	86.3	95.3	100	14454
<b>7835</b>	23.4	52.3	78.8	94.0	99.2	100	12623

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam\\_system/understand\\_ums.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**