

Mark Schemes for 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 mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© 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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (7835)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3835)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
	Marking Instructions	1
2580/81/82	Generics Mark Schemes	5
2580	Document Studies 871 – 1099	11
2581	Document Studies 1450 – 1693	17
2582	Document Studies 1774 – 1945	25
2583/84/85/86	Generic Mark Schemes	37
2583	English History 1042 – 1660	41
2584	English History 1780 – 1964	65
2585	European History 1046 – 1718	85
2586	European and World History 1789 – 1989	111
2587/88/89	Generic Mark Schemes	129
2587	Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	135
2588	Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	141
2589	Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	151
2590/91	Generic Mark Schemes	165
2590	Themes in History 1066 – 1796	169
2591	Themes in History 1763 – 1996	189
2592/2593	Independent Investigation	209
	Grade Thresholds	218

Marking Instructions

June 2007

Marking Instructions

AS/A2 HISTORY

SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Examiners should refer to OCR's *Instructions for Examiners* for more detailed guidance.

1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

All candidates must meet the Assessment Objectives set for History by the QCA. Although these Objectives are expressed and weighted separately, the assessment seeks to secure coherence and unity in the candidates' understanding and interpretation of History as a discipline. The Objectives are thus not disaggregated when marking, and AO1 pervades AO2.

2 THE ASSESSMENT OF SCRIPTS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BANDS

Every answer should be marked bearing in mind the AOs and the following explanatory criteria:

- (a) the **relevance**, accuracy and quantity of factual knowledge;
- (b) evidence of the exercise of **informed historical judgement** and **awareness of historical context**;
- (c) **effectiveness of presentation**: the ability to communicate arguments and knowledge in a clear, orderly fashion with maximum relevance to the question set. All Units require responses in continuous prose, and therefore include the assessment of quality of written communication (including clarity of expression, structure of arguments, presentation of ideas, grammar, punctuation and spelling). Candidates' quality of written communication is not assessed separately but pervades AO1.

The proper application of the AOs and the explanatory criteria will mean, for example, that a long answer crammed with detailed knowledge will not be rewarded highly if the knowledge is not effectively applied and the answer shows a lack of historical judgement. Conversely a convincingly argued, highly relevant and perceptive answer may be well rewarded although based on less overtly expressed knowledge.

Examiners should seek the advice of Team Leaders about unusual approaches to a question.

3 GENERIC MARK BANDS

The generic Bands are the most important guide for examiners and apply to all answers. Examiners assess which Band best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify for a Band. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'.

Units 2580-2582: For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.

Units 2583-2586: Provisionally award the middle mark and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Units 2587-2589: For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.

Units 2590-2591: Provisionally award the top mark and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Units 2592-2593: Provisionally award the middle mark of the Band and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Mark each answer individually. Do not be swayed by impressions gained from marking other answers in the script or other candidates from the same Centre or scripts from another Centre.

Marking Instructions

Units 2580-2586

Examiners will remember that they are assessing AS Level (not A Level), usually the work of 17 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably four other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

Units 2587-2593

Examiners will remember that they are assessing A2 Level, usually the work of 18 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably two other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

Units 2592 & 2593 are coursework. Candidates have considerably more time in which to prepare, with constant access to resources. For Unit 2592, they also have considerably more time in which to write.

4 QUESTION-SPECIFIC MARK SCHEMES

Question-specific mark schemes are secondary, supporting the Generics. They do not specify the 'correct' answer required for individual questions. Rather, they indicate possible points that candidates might make. They offer a broad guide to what may be encountered and are therefore the guide for moderating the actual generic mark up or down within the appropriate Band or (if the history is particularly strong or weak) into the next generic Band up or down. When appropriate, suggestions are made about Bands for different approaches; in some cases, limits are indicated. Examiners must use their judgement but, **if in doubt about a particular answer, they must consult their TL. The most important principle for examiners is the primacy of the Generics.**

Answers need not be long to merit high marks. Reward answers that are direct but concise. Reward selection of relevant material and appropriate comment rather than paraphrases. Quotations should only be rewarded if used to substantiate relevant points made in the candidate's own words.

5 ASSESSING STRUCTURED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS GIVEN IN NOTE-FORM

Answers are marked individually. Questions in Units 2580-82 and 2587-89 have sub-parts; each must be marked individually, without reference to the others.

Answers which are very largely in continuous prose but which are completed by significant notes may be awarded marks in one Band lower than that normally awarded. Purely note-form answers which show sound relevance, structure, understanding and sufficient knowledge can be awarded marks up to the top of Band III. In every case, examiners must make a note both at the end of the answer and on the front page of the script.

6 POSITIVE MARKING

Examiners must be positive in marking what is written, without being influenced too much by omissions. Marks must represent what a candidate has accomplished, not what her/she has failed to do. Even the most successful answers may have omissions which could have been rectified had more time been allowed. **Examiners must not 'penalise'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg for accuracy and relevance).

Question-specific mark schemes alone indicate any omissions that will affect marks awarded or any ceilings to be applied. Mark positively by rewarding what has been written. When things go wrong, it is usually because an undue severity creeps in when omissions and errors are looked for (marking negatively).

Marking Instructions

7 USE OF THE FULL RAW MARK RANGE

Examiners use the full mark range to reward work appropriately, to enable candidates to be ranked in order of merit and avoid bunching, and to ensure that raw marks convert appropriately to UMS after grading. This is an invitation neither to be generous at the top nor to under-mark at the bottom.

8 MARKING SCRIPTS

All mark must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'Ref' written in the margin indicates there is some significant irrelevance;
- 'N' or 'D' in the margin indicates an excessively narrative or descriptive section;
- Occasional brief notes in the margin should indicate sound points or knowledge;
- Ticks are of little value, and can seriously mislead. They should be avoided.

Each page should indicate that it has been read. Good practice will avoid a sequence of pages with nothing but ticks (or crosses).

A brief comment summarising the main qualities of an answer should be written at the end, together with the Band and the mark. The best way to do that is to quote briefly from the appropriate Band.

The Mark Band and the appropriate numerical mark should be recorded at the end of each answer (eg Band IV – 45). The total marks for answers should be ringed in the right-hand margin at the end of each question. All marks for sub-questions should be recorded un-ringed in the right-hand margin. They should be repeated at the end and the total shown as a ringed mark in the right-hand margin at the end of the question (eg 5 + 15 + 45 = 65, with 65 in a circle).

Do not alter a mark other than by crossing it out, inserting the correct mark and initialling it.

Comments on scripts

The comment at the end of an answer should reflect its qualities as defined by the Mark Bands so quote from it. Comments help you to arrive at a fair mark and indicate to senior examiners how your mind has been working. Marks and comments must be substantiated unequivocally from scripts.

Examiners should use a professional, business-like and straightforward style. Always use:

- reference to the assessment objectives and/or Mark Bands;
- reference to creditable points and major gaps which affect assessment;
- reference to 'the answer' or the third person, not 'You...'

Always avoid:

- derogatory terms eg 'rubbish', 'shoddy', even though examiners may consider such terms to be justified;
- humour, interjections or jokes;

Ignore poor handwriting. If it is illegible, send the script to your TL. Candidates must not be marked down.

It may be appropriate to make general comments about matters such as:

- use of time and/or length of answers;
- presentation and use of language;
- rubric infringements;

Marking Instructions

Do **not** make:

- comments on how you perceive teaching may have been carried out;
- reference to answers by other candidates, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg 'should have revised more fully';

9 RUBRIC INFRINGEMENTS AND INCLUSIONS FROM CENTRES

If a candidate answers more questions than the specified number, all answers must be marked. The highest marks for the number of questions allowed must be used to constitute the script's total mark. The marks of the surplus answers should then be reduced to 0 and an explanation written on the script's front page.

If a candidate fails to answer sufficient questions, write an explanatory note on the front of the script. If several candidates from one Centre infringe rubrics, the PE and Subject Officer should be informed.

Centres are responsible for requesting special consideration for individual candidates. Such cases are dealt with directly between the Centre and OCR. Requests for special treatment sent with scripts must be ignored in your marking and forwarded directly to OCR.

Notes such as 'Out of time' written on scripts (by invigilators or candidates) must be ignored.

10 OVERALL

Mark consistently, periodically refreshing yourself via the standardisation scripts and the Generics.

Pace your marking, follow a regular timetable and avoiding the need to mark many scripts in limited time or when fatigued. If difficulties arise, inform your TL at once so alternative arrangements can be made.

Return mark sheets and scripts promptly. Failure to do so will jeopardise the issuing of results.

Contact OCR with admin problems and your TL on marking issues. Examiners must never contact a Centre.

**Our secondary educational system is built around external assessment.
Students, parents, teachers, FE and employers all depend on volunteers to mark the exams.**

Thank you very much for being an examiner.

Generic Mark Scheme 2580/81/82

June 2007

GENERIC MARK BANDS Units 2580-2582

AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

- In AS/A2 HISTORY June 2007 Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- In Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see Marking Instructions #5].
- Remember that you are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit.
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin answers **without an introduction**.
- The quality of English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to use a lower Band.
- Glosses in [] exist to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the mark scheme.” (*Code of Practice* 2005, #4.17).

Question (a)

BAND/20: Comparison

NB Contextual knowledge is NOT required for (a), but credit should be given for any which is used relevantly and effectively.

- I (18-20) The response provides a genuine comparison and/or contrast about most of the qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. Areas of agreement and/or disagreement are discussed. The argument shows judgement. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

['genuine comparison and/or contrast' means both content (area of agreement and/or disagreement) and provenance. The list of qualities is not exhaustive & they do not all need to be discussed. A judgment 'as evidence' or on the relative extent of support is expected]

- II (15-17) The response provides an effective comparison and/or contrast. The judgements are supported by appropriate references to internal evidence. The answer is relevant but the answer lacks completeness and the full range of the available comparative criteria. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

['internal evidence' means appropriate references to both content and provenance (the introductions and/or attributions)]

- III (12-14) The response provides a comparison and/or contrast but makes limited links with the Sources. The answer is relevant, but the organisation of the answer is uneven. The quality of the answer is satisfactory rather than sound. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

['limited links with the Sources' means either too much focus on content or on provenance so the comparison is uneven. Where 'the organization' is uneven, the comparison will be confined to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph]

- IV** (9-11) The response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comments are largely sequential and with few points of internal analysis or discussion of similarities and/or differences. The answer is largely relevant. The organisation of the answer is limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

[Sequencing prevents comparison. Band IV is to be used if there is some element of sequencing but there are a few points of internal analysis (comparative provenance) and/or a few comments on the similarity/difference in content]

- V** (6-8) The response provides a very basic answer to the question and can identify some points of agreement and/or disagreement. The comparison and/or contrast is mostly implicit. There may perhaps be significant irrelevance. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain frequent errors.

['very basic answer' means sequencing is especially prevalent. The answer will, however, identify one or more very basic points of comparative content or provenance, even if only implicitly]

- VI** (3-5) The response is very limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There may be very basic paraphrase which lacks a genuine attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- VII** (0-2) The response is extremely limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There is no attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The answer is irrelevant. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Question (b)
BAND/40: Context

- **Answers using Sources but no own knowledge may not be put in Bands I or II.**
- **Answers using own knowledge but no Sources may not be put in Bands I to III.**

I (36-40) The answer contains a good balance between analysis of all four Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge which is used appropriately and effectively in relation to the question. (This independent knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.) There is a clear judgement on the question. There may be some indication about the limitations of the Sources or what may be required to add to their completeness and explanatory power. The strongest answers **may** offer views on the general consistency and completeness of the Sources as a set, as well as individually, but this is **not** a pre-requisite for Band I.

[Band I answers are likely to use their own knowledge to extend and enrich the quality of source evaluation]

II (30-35) The answer contains a fair balance between analysis of at least three of the Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge, although the comment may not be complete or fully developed, and the judgement on the question may not be entirely convincing. There may be some imbalance between discussion of the Sources and use of external analysis. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

['own' knowledge should be focused on the key issue of the question]

III (24-29) The response attempts to address the Sources and deploy independent ('own') knowledge, although the balance between them may be uneven. The argument is fairly clear, but the comments may not be fully sustained and the overall judgement may be incomplete. The organisation of the answer is uneven. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

['attempts to address the Sources' means Sources are largely used for reference and illustration of an argument rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument (the characteristics of Bands I and II)]

IV (17-23) The response shows a clear imbalance between source analysis and use of independent ('own') knowledge. These aspects are not linked effectively into an argument. The Sources are discussed sequentially; a basic argument is provided, but overall judgement on the question is very limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

*['clear imbalance' does **not** mean completely unbalanced between use of Sources and own knowledge. It means **more** imbalance than in Band III. Sources discussed sequentially are unlikely to establish a sense of different views, but 'grouping' might coincide with Source order (A and B v. C and D) - examiners are to watch if this is the case]*

V (11-16) The response provides little comment on the context of the key issue. There is some evidence of knowledge of the key issue, but the relevance is implicit with a limited attempt to analyse the Sources. The argument lacks a coherent structure. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some frequent errors.

*[There is likely to be a clear imbalance here between Sources and own knowledge. Although there will be little comment on the context of the key issue there will be **some**, just as there will be some awareness and evidence of the key issue. Sources will largely be used for reference and illustration of an argument (ie rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument). Judgement will be skeletal if present at all]*

- VI** (6-10) The response shows serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent ('own') knowledge. The attempt to address the question will be very limited, and the argument may be fragmentary, and there may be serious irrelevance and frequent errors of fact and understanding. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII** (0-5) The response shows extremely serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent ('own') knowledge. There is no attempt to address the question. There is no argument. The answer is irrelevant. At least most of the fact and understanding are wrong. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Mark Scheme 2580
June 2007

2580 DOCUMENT STUDIES 871-1099**The Reign of Alfred the Great 871-899****1(a) Study Sources B and D**

Compare these Sources as evidence for Alfred's methods in dealing with the Viking threat [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

Candidates need to compare the two Sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for.....'. The introductions and attributions can be used to aid comparison.

The dates of events mentioned in the two Sources are important. Source **B** comes from the first phase of Viking attacks while Source **D** comes from the second phase, when Alfred had reorganised his forces and undertaken important reforms. The time gap is important to assessment. **B** features land operations and the desperate struggle to repel and overcome Viking attacks, while **D** features the new navy and its activities against Viking ships. In source **B**, at a critical time in the first wars with the Vikings, the emphasis is upon army operations and Alfred's ability to rally local forces and the military outcome.

The tone of language is important ('relentlessly and tirelessly'). Alfred was able to exhort those he rallied to fight; it is noticeable that some 'sailed overseas'. In source **D**, in the second war phase, after the significant military reforms, the emphasis is more on naval operations in the South and South-West, importantly with mixed outcomes. The issue of the effectiveness of naval operations is noteworthy (Viking ships, though beached, are able to attack English ships that are stranded). Source **D** builds upon Source **B**; the dates are important; there is a sense of change, advance, improvement, but **D** effectively cautions that Alfred's methods were not wholly successful.

1(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred's successful leadership against the Vikings owed as much to careful planning as to military strength. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

The proposition may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use all four Sources, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge.

The Sources offer several points and comments for evaluation. Source **C** mentions 'remodelling of the national defences'; 'builder of fortresses'; 'fortifications of Wessex'; 'militia'; 'new defensive system'. Source **D** comments that Alfred 'ordered 'long-ships' to be built', reflecting awareness of the need to match the Vikings at sea. Topic knowledge could supply references to eg *The Burghal Hidage* and the new burghal system, to the reconstituted *fyrð* (maybe 27,000 or so strong in all), the rotational system used, the linkages of men and the 30 or more towns in a network, and the issues of building a new naval fleet. Military strength is referred to in Sources **B and C**, and some of **D**. In **A**, Alfred suffered setbacks and defeats; topic knowledge could mention the run of such in 871 and again in early 878. Many of these defeats were on a big scale. In Source **B**, the prelude to a famous and important battle and victory, Alfred rallied forces and gave strong personal leadership. In Sources **C and D**, elements of military (and naval) preparedness are linked to outcomes, albeit unevenly at sea in Source **D**.

Candidates will need to seek a balance between the two issues set out in the question, though they may well argue in favour of one more than the other. Then again, there are clear links between the two. Preparedness of defensive positions and strengths, better organisation all emanated from the harsh lessons of 871-8 (as depicted directly in **A** and indirectly in **B**). The date of the Sources or the date of events referred to in Source **C** should merit comment. Source **A**, at the start of the reign, reflects the uneven military fortunes of Alfred then (and indeed the same was true in the years ahead). In Source **B**, at a critical juncture, Alfred rallied his forces and led them to success at Edington, a turning point. His leadership was strong, even inspirational. There then followed a phase of relative peace until renewed major fighting started in 892-6. That was a period of intense military reforms and recovery of military strength. Source **D** shows naval actions; the navy was the product of the period of military reforms in the 880s. Source **C** reflects upon Alfred's strong position when the fighting resumed; he had undertaken important and significant reforms. In 892-6 Alfred's forces more than held their own against the new waves of Viking attacks, often supported by those who had already settled inside England, though the levels of real and significant success are debatable.

The Normans in England 1066-87

2(a) Study Sources A and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for the nature of the relationship between the archbishops of Canterbury and York [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

Candidates need to compare the two Sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The introductions and attributions can be used to aid comparison.

Lanfranc's assertion of his primacy and the struggle with the Archbishop of York, Thomas of Bayeux, was a prolonged affair, no matter the initial success outlined in Source **A**. Source **D** can be compared directly to **A** as to contents and the issue of the nature of that primacy as well as the methods used to secure it.

Overall, the two Sources largely support each other over the relationship, the difference centring upon the relative authority of each archbishop. Both confirm Lanfranc's victory, with royal backing clearly expressed in Source **A** (see later). The methods as set out in Sources **A** and **D** suggest a mixture of the legitimate and the possibly less legitimate. In **A** Lanfranc's claim to primacy is upheld and Thomas in effect made to give written acceptance. Thomas agreed to obey Lanfranc's will. Then there followed 'declarations of obedience' from all the bishops. In **A** note may be made of the comment 'decided by the King's order and the general decision of all those present', reinforcing William I's support for Lanfranc and his stance. The reference to 'all matters relating to the practice of the Christian religion' can be seen to extend across liturgical and theological areas, possibly embracing the primacy issue as well. In Source **D**, however, we find reference to the possible, though highly contentious, issue of whether Lanfranc employed under-hand tactics to gain his supremacy over Thomas; the reference to forged documents is important, although the author adds the *caveat* about demonstrability. This can be compared to Source **A**, where Thomas had to 'read out what he had written to Lanfranc'. Though not a requirement here, contextual knowledge might be used to provide support: the relationship between Archbishops Lanfranc and Thomas was never that easy and often strained, no matter the reference (a possible cross-reference) in Source **C**. The relationship had gone wrong over issues such as York's consecrations and appeals to Rome, not routing such via Lanfranc.

2(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Lanfranc was more concerned to extend Norman control over England than to reform the English Church. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

The proposition may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use all four Sources, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge.

Here, it is important for there to be a good focus upon the argument generated by the question title: the issues of Norman control as against (genuine, committed) reforms. Norman control is explicit in Source **D** and pretty explicit in Source **C** and implicit at very least in Source **B**. Reform intent and actions are mentioned in Sources **B, C and D**. The Sources offer several comments and points for evaluation there as they do for other views of his role and activities. Lanfranc's central role in the Anglo-Norman Church and his drive for both primacy and reform are set out. Source **A** is very much about the primacy and the assertion of control over Thomas of Bayeux. Source **A** can be linked to Source **D** in the references to primacy. In turn, Sources **B and C** can be linked to Source **D** in their common theme of reforming energy and impetus. Source **B** outlines some early reforms, not least the shifting of sees and the drive to eradicate clerical abuses; all happened with the permission of the king. Topic knowledge could supply a little detail of Lanfranc's methods to assert his primacy as of the methods and thrust of his reforms (see below). Source **C** further develops the idea of reforms via councils and the changes in personnel at the top of the English church. Source **D** reflects upon Lanfranc's impact, his relationship with and support from William I and his desire to create a stronger, better Church.

Contextual knowledge can supply support and development here. There is plenty of topic knowledge evidence of Lanfranc's interest in and pursuit of a range of reforms, driven by a growing need to Normanise the Church, mentioned in **D**, as well as harness it more effectively to European practices, again mentioned in **D**. Knowledge might be supplied from (eg) Lanfranc's key role in Norman takeover of and consolidation of hold over England; his activism in ecclesiastical and political affairs (a regent and leader of forces against rebels as in 1075); his working partnership with William I; the range of his activities, legal, proprietorial (there is an allusion to this in the reference to 'rights' in **D**), monastic, directive, reformist; the advancement of new abbots and bishops (as seen in **C**); the deposition of Anglo-Saxon bishops and abbots (explicit in Source **C**, where several are named, implicit in Source **B**); organisational and structural changes centred on Cathedrals and chapters; the use of Norman models, new dioceses (Source **C**); the developing roles of archdeacon and priest (and the likely increases in numbers); the place of canon law and church courts; the use of councils.

Normanisation included ambivalence towards English saints and customs, spoliation and upheaval, especially in monasteries, the use of Latin, liturgical practices, encouragement of endowments and of new foundations. Bishops and abbots had important political, governmental and military roles too. Lanfranc had a clear political role, not least in William's absences, and this could be imported from own knowledge, to link with the idea of Norman control. Reference might be made to ecclesiastical leadership, to military retinues and fighting forces as well as to the role in local and other courts and government of the kingdom.

The First Crusade and its Origins 1073-99**3(a) Study Sources A and B**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the reasons why there was strong support for the People's Crusade. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

Candidates need to compare the two Sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for...’. The introductions and attributions can be used to aid comparison.

The provenances of Sources **A and B** are important, with **B** coming from an author likely (indeed known) to be critical of the Crusade undertaken. Source **A** is laudatory, while **B** mixes some praise and sense of inspired leadership with the *caveat* about over-confidence. There is clearly Byzantine reserve about the People’s Crusade, couched in respectful post-event terms. Source **A** outlines the impact of Peter the Hermit’s appeal and the acclaim and support he received. Comment can be made upon the tone (‘acclaimed for his holiness’, ‘no-one ever having been held in such honour’, ‘regarded as divine’). Source **B** extends the sense of inspiration set out in Source **A** (‘a divine voice in the hearts of all’, ‘inspired people from France and other parts’, ‘enthusiasm and ardour’) and outlines how he gained much popular support; the range of support is mentioned, including women and children; but the Source adds a note of caution as to Peter’s impetuosity (‘confident in numbers, he would not wait’). Again, tone of language might be an area of comment. The emphasis is upon personal appeal, perhaps a touch of charisma, allied to the nature of the message preached.

3(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the People’s Crusade failed primarily because popular enthusiasm was no substitute for effective military organisation [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

The proposition may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use all four Sources, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge.

The Sources offer several points for comment and evaluation. Candidates need to balance out ‘popular enthusiasm’ and ‘strong leadership’. They are likely to conclude with support for the argument but no set conclusion is expected and the quality of argument, based upon the Sources and some knowledge, will be all important. There needs to be a good focus upon both ‘popular enthusiasm’ and ‘effective military organisation’. Topic knowledge can support each of the Sources and the grouping of those Sources: the make-up of the crusade; its journey; its defeat and aftermath. Sources **A and B** focus upon aspects of the leadership of Peter and the enthusiasm generated, the response to his preaching. Sources **C and D** focus upon consequences of that preaching in the aftermath of the collapse of the Crusade and upon the prior ill-discipline, a feature of the Crusade itself and a factor in its collapse. Sources **A and B** are linked by their emphasis upon popular appeal and enthusiastic responses; many flocked to the crusading idea. Source **B** does point out at its end the failure of Peter to heed advice.

The consequences of that failure are seen in Source **C**, where the People’s Crusade had suffered defeat, become divided, with one group in Muslim hands, the other besieged and in need of rescue. Peter was away from the People’s Crusade when it was slaughtered by the Turks. Whether his presence would have made a difference is debatable. Then again he had not waited for the arrival of the proper military leaders (‘the nobles’ in Source **B**). Source **D** reflects upon the essentially undisciplined content of the People’s Crusade, reflected in their attacks on the Jewish areas. This lack of discipline, allied to weak leadership, came through in the actual crusade and its disastrous collapse. The nobles and their retinues, their knights, were capable of

supplying the necessary organisation and *esprit de corps*. All the People's Crusade had was uneven leadership and much enthusiastic but ill-disciplined and uncoordinated fervour.

Source **D** might be used to create the context for evaluation of the other Sources. Contextual knowledge can supply details of the People's Crusade and reasons for its eventual failure. Candidates might illustrate its flawed leadership, poor organisation, over-reliance on rabble-rousing speeches, poor weaponry and tactics; Peter was a charismatic preacher but he was no military leader. In addition, there is an issue of the role of the Byzantine Emperor: no matter his advice (Source **B**) and despatch of a relief force (Source **C**), it is arguable that he could have done much more. Candidates might also contrast the failures of the People's Crusade with the successes of the Crusade from 1097 with nobles and knights to the fore.

**Mark Scheme 2581
June 2007**

2581 DOCUMENT STUDIES 1450-1693**The Wars of the Roses 1450-85****1(a) Study Sources B and D**

Compare these Sources as evidence for relations between Richard of York and the Duke of Somerset in the early 1450s. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources provide clear evidence of York's hatred of Somerset and his willingness to use force in pursuit of the quarrel. The main difference is that Source **B** explains York's motives, while Source **D** describes the action he took against Somerset in 1455. In this way they complement each other. Source **D** shows York taking the sort of action from which he had drawn back in 1452. The provenance of Source **B** makes it a reliable Source for York's view of the quarrel, but obviously does not show whether this was a correct view. Source **D**, from an anonymous foreigner, offers no comment on this. Unlike Source **B**, its language is neutral. It shows that York regarded Somerset as a traitor but also notes that the King was with Somerset and thus presumably favoured him as against York.

1(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that defeat in the wars in France was the main cause of the outbreak of civil strife in 1455. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Sources **A and B** provide evidence to support the proposition. Source **A** shows that as early as 1450 Somerset's role in the loss of Normandy led to charges of treason and an armed attack on him. In Source **B** York makes the loss of Normandy (and consequently also Gascony and Guienne) one of the main justifications for his appeal to armed force. Although this came to nothing more than a demonstration of force at Dartford, it was clearly a precursor to York's rising in 1455. Thus these two Sources show a clear link between the loss of the Hundred Years' War, the feud between York and Somerset and the outbreak of civil strife at St. Alban's. From own knowledge, and passing references in **A and C**, candidates could add the well-known argument that the end of the war left magnates and their armed followers with no-one to fight except each other.

Source **C**, however, suggests another reason – the King's mental breakdown. This led to a bid by Margaret of Anjou to take control of the kingdom. From own knowledge, candidates can point out that this was unacceptable to Richard of York. It also led to a climate of fear and aggravated the feud between York and Somerset. Sources **B, C and D** all give evidence about this feud. Source **B** suggests that it was the result not only of the loss of the Hundred Years' War but also of York's resentment of Somerset's influence over the King. York in this letter speaks of Somerset's 'malice' and in Source **D** he is reported to describe him as a traitor and to be determined to have his blood. Own knowledge can be used to develop the idea of a deep feud

between the two. Somerset's role in the loss of the Hundred Years' War played a part in this but it is for candidates to argue whether it was the major or merely a contributory cause of the feud.

The German Reformation 1517-30

2(a) Study Sources A and D

Compare Sources A and D as evidence for the response of the Roman Catholic Church to criticism. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...' The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Sources **A and D** give different, but complementary, accounts of Papal responses to criticism. Source **A** accuses the Church of inflexibility whilst Source **D** accepts criticism, although **A** is concerned with heresy and theology whilst **D** is preoccupied with institutional and organisational reform. Candidates are given enough guidance to Erasmus in the introduction to Source **A** but they can also note that the Source is from a letter to an important religious and secular ruler. Candidates are not expected to show knowledge and understanding of the period before 1517 but some answers might question the accuracy of Erasmus's claim that previous heretics had been listened to with respect by referring to Hus(s). However, the statement that charges of heresy were now made very easily is correct. The charge had been made against Luther at an early stage to prevent the spread of his views.

A reading of the introduction to Source **D** provides enough information about Adrian VI to draw interesting conclusions and candidates are not expected to know more than this about a Pope whose rule was so short. The Source itself accepts the faults in the Church and promises reform. Adrian VI was therefore willing to accept criticism. The Source's reliability as a statement of Adrian's intentions can be assessed in the light of the information in the introduction, the purpose and the content of the source.

2(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that, from 1519 to 1523, it was not possible to reach a compromise between Luther and the Papacy. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The dates in the question reflect the dates of the Sources. Candidates are not expected to have a detailed knowledge of 1523 beyond the fact that it marks the date of Source **D** but they should avoid going on to discuss the later 1520s and the Diet of Augsburg. Some reference to pre-1519 can be accepted as relevant to put the period into context, for example in discussing Source **A**, but is not required for any mark.

Sources **A and B** might be seen to support the claim in the Question that a compromise was not possible. Sources **C and D** might be used to contradict the claim. One can expect the most

successful answers to group the sources. In this case, the sequence **A - D** might be the best approach but examiners should be open to alternative explanations.

Source **A** seems to reflect Erasmus's despair at the extreme unwillingness of the Papacy to accept alternative opinions. The purpose of the Source is to bring the problem to the attention of a major religious and secular figure. The slightest unorthodoxy and criticism of dubious ideas by 'second-rate scholars' are viewed as heresy. Candidates' limited knowledge of the period before 1517 (the beginning of the Study Topic) might lead them to accept uncritically Erasmus's claim that heretics had previously been treated leniently, although this is a questionable opinion: the fate of Jan Huss, with whom Luther was linked by his enemies, would contradict this.

At face value, Source **B** supports the claim. It is a virulent attack on the Papacy by Luther. Candidates can be expected to contrast this extract with Source **C**, in which Luther seeks to deny that he had criticised the Pope personally and blamed others for causing trouble because they had imputed to the Pope powers which Luther disputes. (Candidates should note that Sources **B** and **C** are based on the same pamphlet by Luther.) But even in Source **C** Luther maintains some claims that were unacceptable to the Papacy - the interpretation of the Bible, the subordination of the Papacy to Church councils; these were fundamental to the Pope's authority. The extreme contents of Source **B** lead one to question how far Luther was being either frank or realistic in Source **C**. Own knowledge might test the view that Luther was offering to compromise. Credit should be given when candidates attempt to distinguish between Sources **B** and **C** and judge which is more reliable in the light of the question.

Source **D** promises compromise by the Papacy but the introduction tells candidates how briefly Adrian VI was to rule. We can also wonder how realistic he was. In using own knowledge, candidates might refer to such as the Leipzig debate, Luther's pamphlets of 1520 Luther's excommunication by Leo X (1520), the Imperial Ban and the Edict of Worms (1521) and the immediate aftermath. They should examine how far these developments relate to the question.

Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58

3(a) Study Sources C and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for the causes of rebellion in 1549.

[20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both are reflections on the causes of the rebellion, a year after the event, by protestant clergymen. However, their explanation for what happened is slightly different. Source **C** blames it on greed by **both** gentry and commons, each defying legitimate authority: the gentry unwilling to observe the attempt to address popular economic grievances through remedial action such as the enclosure commissions, the commons by taking the law into their own hands. Source **D** also condemns both gentry and commons, also sees each animated by greed, and contributing to 'rebellion'.

3(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that commentators at the time mostly blamed enclosure for the economic and social problems of the mid-sixteenth century.

[40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Enclosure is condemned as a major economic grievance in sources **A, B and D**; but closer reading makes it clear that the action of enclosers are driven by greed or covetousness (Sources **A, C and D**), a disease not restricted to the gentry (Sources **C and D**) and which is expressed in other ways too, such as lack of compassion (Source **A**) and raising prices (Sources **A and B**). Greed may also lie behind depopulation (Source **A**), and is condemned in Source **C** without explicit mention of enclosure. Source **B** in particular is worth careful scrutiny, since it contains a number of contrasting views from different economic viewpoints: it refers to the problem of shortages or dearth, which the Knight suggests cannot be blamed on enclosure, which in fact encourages the expansion of livestock. It also identifies the problem of price inflation, which hits all economic groups, a development also mentioned in Source **A**. Price inflation is blamed on the gentry in Source **A**, a point parried in Source **B**. So these various grievances need sorting out and their importance to contemporaries debated. Source **B** in particular indicates the tendency by some to blame enclosures for everything ('These enclosures ruin us all...'; 'if enclosures are the cause...').

The English Civil War 1637-49

4(a) Study Sources A and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for Cromwell's military leadership.

[20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both statements are recollections or memoirs, though for individuals well-placed to know what happened: Lucy Hutchinson was married to a parliamentarian colonel, and Richard Baxter served as in the New Model army as a chaplain. Source **A** is an unqualified account of Cromwell's decisive leadership at Marston Moor; Source **C** supports this by referring to Cromwell's 'great reputation... among his soldiers'. It also relates the enormous boost his appearance gave to the New Model, though this was because it was assumed that he had brought a sizeable number of reinforcements rather than simply because he had joined them; and the brief account of the battle that followed, in contrast to Source **A**, makes no mention of Cromwell's actual contribution.

4(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the re-organisation of the parliamentary forces in 1645 was the main reason for Parliament's victory in the First Civil War.

[40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as

evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

‘The re-organisation’ should be understood to refer to both the Self-Denying Ordinance and the New Model Ordinance, as outlined in the introduction to Source **B**. Source **B** supports the proposition, noting how the Self-Denying Ordinance removed commanders such as Essex who lacked the killer instinct, but retained Cromwell, whose military skill is attested elsewhere (Sources **A**, and to some extent, **C**). Arguably, without this, the separate but linked creation of the New Model Army (The New Model Ordinance) would not have been so decisive. The emergence of a single national army, the New Model, in place of a series of regional armies, able to pursue the enemy in different theatres of war (Naseby in Leicestershire followed by Langport in Somerset) needs spelling out.

Does re-organisation alone explain the New Model’s string of victories in 1645-6? It evidently possessed the determination to win the war (Source **C**), perhaps because of its self-belief as a group of elect saints (Source **D**) or merely a result of more regular pay (Source **D**), which opens the whole issue of the respective strengths of the financial and logistical support for the two armies and its contribution to the outcome of the war. There is also the matter of ‘the errors of the royalists’ (Source **D**). ‘Errors’ can refer to tactical, strategic or political mistakes. Candidates may draw on other factors, too, such as the Covenanters’ support for Parliament (‘the Scots’ in Source **A**) or the bitterly-divided war councils of the royalists, and debate the respective importance of these various elements.

Louis XIV’s France 1661-1693

5(a) Study Sources A and B

How far does Source B challenge Source A as evidence for the condition and treatment of the Huguenots before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes? [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for...’ The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Candidates might note the interesting contrast between the views of a Catholic writer (Source **A**) and a Protestant commentator (Source **B**). It is interesting that Locke (Source **B**), who is generally regarded as a fair commentator, should believe that the Huguenots were generally well treated before the Revocation. He claims that relations with Catholics were generally good and their numbers remained constant. There is no hint of persecution by the authorities. However, his description contradicts what is known of the increasing pressure on the Huguenots that began early in Louis XIV’s majority. In addition, he is describing the situation in a particular region. Conditions might have been different elsewhere. Source **A**, written by a Catholic, tells a very different story and his report makes a particular point about the King’s attitude. As an official report, he may well have been trying to be accurate, especially when we consider his own religious stance.

5(b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, examine the claim that the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was necessary because the Huguenots presented a serious problem to the French monarchy. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources might be seen as falling into two groups. Source **D** broadly supports the claim whilst Sources **A and B** contradict it. Louis XIV in Source **C** refers to the serious problems that had been caused by the Huguenots. Much was made of this during his reign but candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of religion in France from 1598 to 1661. However, the King adds that the Edict of Nantes is redundant in 1685, hardly support for this argument that the country was in danger. Source **D** is the view of a leading Catholic cleric who regards heresy as a major problem. Religious uniformity is linked to Louis XIV's authority. On the other hand, Source **A** shows the Huguenots as demoralised and weak, hardly a problem to the King. Source **B** also argues against the claim but from a different viewpoint. A stable and quiescent Huguenot population would not pose a problem. One can expect the most successful answers to group the sources. In this case, the sequence **A - D** might be the best approach but examiners should be open to alternative explanations.

In using their own knowledge, most candidates can be expected to argue against the claim. There might be descriptions of the Huguenots as a hard-working group. Most answers will probably concentrate on the unjustified nature of the revocation but high credit should be given to answers that explain policies from the point of view of Louis XIV and the Catholic nation. In the seventeenth century, religious disunity was seen as a major problem by most French people (and by most Europeans). The Revocation, and the tougher policies that preceded it, were supported by most of the population. The question is about the reasons for the Revocation. The consequences will not be relevant unless they are included briefly in a conclusion to round off the argument.

**Mark Scheme 2582
June 2007**

2582 DOCUMENT STUDIES 1774-1945**The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-92****1(a) Study Sources C and D.****Compare these Sources as evidence for opinions about the King.****[20]**Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

In terms of content, the distinction is between **C** which is generally hopeful about the King's popularity and **D** which sets up the possibility of the country ceasing even to be a monarchy. **C** says that the King has tried to please the people by stating that he chosen the constitution freely. **D** cannot see any wise acts, only blunders. The gesture of illuminating the gardens and attending the opera to gain favour is praised in **C** by implication; but the King gets no praise in **D**. **D** refers back to the continuing effects of the Flight to Varennes, which **C** does not. **D** also gives an extreme example of suspicion of the King; In **C** he seems to be going about in a free way. The fetes of September are not apparent 4 months later.

In terms of nature, the sources are both from outsiders, one American, one British. Both are foreign observers of the French scene. Oddly, the British aristocrat is more critical of royalty than his republican counterpart. {Candidates are not expected to know this, but Jefferson did sack Short} The key is in the date of the dispatches. By January 1792 with war in the air and the threat from Austria perceived, the hopeful spirit of September had gone. The flight to Varennes which the constituent assembly had chosen to forget in the autumn of 1791 had not been forgotten by the radicals. The radical groups in the new Assembly did not trust the King and the agitation in Paris had re-emerged. **D** is written in a different context, though for the same purpose as **C** – to inform a foreign government.

1(b) Study all the Sources**Using all these sources and your own knowledge, assess the view the Constitutional Monarchy established in 1791 had little chance of success.****[40]**Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The discussion here is about whether general circumstances and developments made republicanism and the overthrow of the monarchy inevitable, or whether it was not. Some may wish to argue it was really the fault of the King, who had already tried to flee from France and justified himself in a foolish way. However, it is possible to see that without the decision to go to war and without the failure to manage the constitutional monarchy, it might have been longer-lasting.

Louis' greatest defender is Short in **C**. However, this hopeful view of illuminated gardens and visits to the opera may be a product of short-lived enthusiasm. It does not seem to reflect the popular radicalism that is more apparent in **A**. Despite its rhetoric it does make the point that the constitutional arrangements did depend on trust between king and people; the more moderate **B**

sums up the point that Louis would find hard to accept – that his power would be reduced to a sort of functionary. Additional knowledge might point to likely foreign reactions to this, for example by the Austrian emperor, which reduced the chances of the constitution succeeding.

D takes a more dismal view of the situation, blaming Louis. This may refer back to the flight to Varennes or may be a criticism of the King's failure to take any really decisive actions since 1789. **A** is typical of the growing radicalism of the clubs which was indeed to result in the fall of Louis XVI and the violence of the Tuileries massacre the following year.

Additional knowledge may be brought to bear in terms of the demand for war, which led to radicalism, and the possibly weak and unstable nature of the constitution and the Assembly, though this is contested. Some may know the economic stresses which underlay growing Parisian radicalism and some may know about the fears of émigrés and foreign invasion and set these factors against the faults of the King. There is a wide range of additional knowledge possible here, and it is important to credit what candidates use rather than to expect particular knowledge.

The Condition of England 1832-53

2(a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these sources as evidence for the progress made by the 1833 Factory Act in changing attitudes to child labour. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both sources come from Leonard Horner, the leading factory inspector. The statistics provided in the 1836 report (Source **A**) are set against his written report to Parliament in the following year. Both monitor progress on child labour four years after the first Factory Act of 1833. Candidates will need to assess provenance and type of content very carefully. They are not entirely consistent. There is more optimism in the Report (Source **B**) that the Act has changed attitudes for the better, the resistance of both worker and owner subsiding (perhaps reflecting Horner's institutional position). The statistics in **A** do not fully bear this out, as he later admits in **B**. His judicial actions in **A** point to certain evils persisting – working more than 9 hours (for 9 –13 year olds), failure by owners and parents to send children to school and particularly not keeping appropriate paperwork (registers).

However, reported offences and convictions for employing under 9s, night work, 12 hours plus for 13 –18 year olds and short meal times are low, confirming the optimism of **B**. Better candidates could take this further through provenance as the statistics do not show the number of factories in Lancashire. Do we assume they were all looked at or were all those not recorded in the graph carrying out the 1833 Act? Convictions almost match the reported offences so perhaps there is progress in changing attitudes or was Horner just scratching the surface? The most common offence, failure to keep a register, was crucial to effecting change, as was not providing an education which is contrary to the claims in **B**.

The argument in **B** for progress is very dependent on comparing different industries and areas, asserting that textile factories are better, but his claims are vague – no specific examples are given of generous provision. Yorkshire is considered to be 'good' yet the statistics show problems for Lancashire. Both are useful in commenting on progress but both have their limitations. Source **A** may be an unrepresentative sample with the added difficulty that some age certificates would be false, whilst **B** is basing its argument on vague comparison with a vested

interest in doing so. The picture presented of changing attitudes could, in practice, be quite the opposite, the situation being much the same as before the Act.

2(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that factory reform was the most important factor in promoting the education of the children of the poor in the period from 1833 to 1853. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Horner's statistics (Source **A**), his Report (Source **B**) and Graham's proposals for the 1843 Factory Bill (Source **C**) all suggest that Factory Reform was the most important engine driving educational provision for the poor in the period and may well have provided a higher proportion of schooling. Own knowledge of the 1833 Act could point to the requirement of 2 hours schooling a day for those aged 9-13 (ie 12 hours a week), provided 'free'. The 1833 statistics in Source **A** do demonstrate that there were prosecutions for failures to do this confirming Source **D**'s 'firmly enforced' (68 in the first 6 months of 1836 in Lancashire alone).

However, there are problems with this evidence eg the percentage of educational failures in Lancashire is not provided. Horner's Report (Source **B**) comments on the role of the Act claiming that before 1833 factory children had no opportunity for education (was this true?). He is keen to cite generous provision by many owners. In Source **C**, in 1843, the Government were anxious to use another Factory Act to extend provision – 3 hours for 8 to 13 year olds. As part of a proposed piece of legislation it is clearly reliable. It targets working children as urban morality and radical activity (Chartism) was important. The historian in Source **D** mentions the role of Factory Acts and sees them as being 'firmly enforced' but does not provide much information on the proportion educated. Own knowledge could extend this with reference to the extent and the quality of the education provided.

However, the historian in Source **D** and the other 3 sources could also bear a different interpretation – that Factory Reform was just one of many educational avenues. Source **D** suggests that Dames' Schools were very popular amongst the working class, especially as Factory or Coal Owners' Schools (the 1842 Mines Act made no provision), the religious Voluntary Schools and any state or owner provided education had a 'control' agenda, hinted at by Graham in Source **C** as the reason for educational provision in 1843. The evidence of Source **D**, reliable but with limitations, suggests both the Dames' Schools (cheap) and Ragged Schools (free) or even Mechanics Institutes might have been preferred by the working poor. If a third of pupils were prepared to pay for cheap private schools then, together with Ragged Schools which took off in the 1840s, large numbers must have been absorbed here. The statistics in Source **A** could be read to suggest that Factory owners did not provide much, whilst Horner in Source **B** suggests that it was often down to owners being privately generous when it came to Factory Schools (as Owen and the coal owners with different motives had been). Graham's proposals, given Anglican Church control, failed and the educational clauses were dropped in 1844 due to Nonconformist hostility.

Sources **A**, **B** and **C** all show an interest, to be expected from Horner and Graham, in promoting education through Factory Reform but, whether they were the most important developments in this period, is questionable. Own knowledge could cite the Voluntary Schools as another useful avenue to pursue as the key force, especially given Government backing in 1833 and 1843.

Own knowledge and Source **D** provide a wider picture of what was available to balance the input of Factory Schools.

Italian Unification 1848-70

3(a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for the role Italians expected France to play in Italy.[20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The sources differ on several points, although both sources agree that Austria was to be expelled in order to free Italy. Orsini, in Source **A**, asks Napoleon to simply not intervene against Italy whereas the terms of Source **B** make it clear that France was to intervene directly, albeit only if the war was defensive. Similarly, Orsini implies that Italy is prepared to fight alone in contrast to the terms of Source **B** which clearly state that the French army will fight with Piedmont. The aims expressed in each differ, too. Source **A** suggests the objective is independence for Italy as a whole but Source **B** is less ambitious and anticipates the creation of a Kingdom of North Italy only. Both sources assume that the French will be acting on behalf of the Italians.

Comments on the provenance of the sources might stress the personal nature of Source **A** compared to Source **B** which presents the official position of the Piedmontese government. Better answers might suggest that Source **A** reflects the idealism of some Italian nationalists including the Mazzinians and supporters of Young Italy whereas Source **B** represents the more practical positions of politicians like Cavour, the architect of the treaty cited. Further, the context in which these sources were written is relevant. Orsini was trying to arouse Napoleon's interest and his language was designed to persuade and appeal to Napoleon's selfish interest. He is, perhaps, conscious of expecting too much from Napoleon, given the position of French troops in Rome, to which he refers. By contrast, Source **B** was the outcome of an agreement already made between Cavour and Napoleon at Plombieres in 1858; as such it is precise and functional.

3(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Napoleon III was an obstacle to the unification of Italy. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Certain sources might be interpreted in more than one way. However they are viewed, there is scope to group them. Yet, on balance, Sources **A and C** are more likely to be seen as supportive of the statement as Napoleon III appears as an obstacle in both whereas Sources **B and D** show Napoleon III in a more positive light.

Orsini complains that France was responsible for the loss of liberty and independence in 1848-9. Candidates should be able to elaborate on the events of those years and explain how and why

the French intervened in Rome. However, it is possible to argue that, despite the past, Orsini anticipates how France can act as a facilitator of the national cause if only by working to keep other countries out of Italian affairs. Some might relate Orsini's appeal to Napoleon to the latter's membership of the Carbonari earlier in his life or his espousal of national causes in general. Source **C** shows Napoleon acting against the interests of Italy. Firstly, Venetia is shown firmly tied to Austria giving candidates scope to refer to the war of 1859 and the terms of Villafranca. Secondly, by placing the papal hat over the head of Italy Napoleon is shown to support the Pope, and the conservatism he represents, in preference to the cap of liberty on the pike. Candidates can comment on Pius IX and his political views and record since 1846 and the reluctance of Napoleon III to do anything to compromise the Papacy.

On the other hand, Source **B** shows that Napoleon III was prepared to assist the Italian cause by committing French troops to a war against Austria albeit on certain conditions. Articles 1, 2 and 6 could be used to demonstrate this and candidates should be able to explain how the war began to satisfy the terms of Article 1 and to provide some details of the size of the French army that allied with Piedmont. However, some may choose to highlight the limitations of Napoleon's commitment. Article 2 envisaged the unification of only half the peninsular and could be linked to Article 4 as an explanation. Equally, some may stress Cavour's reluctance to unite more than the north and so excuse Napoleon of the limited ambition implicit in Article 2. Candidates will also know that Napoleon broke the terms of Article 6 and they might be able to explain how. Similarly, Articles 3 and 5 would suggest that Italy was expected to bear a cost; the former would mean a diminished state whilst the latter might be considered reasonable given the size of the French army. Overall, the judgement might be that, given the political circumstances of the time, Source **B** shows Napoleon's position to be reasonable and positive.

Source **D** is more obviously favourable to Napoleon III. Seaman makes it clear that the progress of 1859-1860 was due to Napoleon. Candidates might explain how weak Piedmontese forces were and how the battles of Magenta and Solferino would not have been won without French arms. Similarly, the reference to the Duchies and Romagna can be explained by candidates who might mention the revolutions there in response to the war in the north and the plebiscites which were eventually held. The comments of Garibaldi might be assessed as proof of the importance of French assistance, given his hostility to French possession of Rome as well as Nice after the plebiscites of 1860 although, given such circumstances, others might regard his comments as cynically diplomatic. A judgement either way is possible depending on how the candidates choose to interpret the sources.

The Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61

4(a) Study Sources B and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for the effects of slavery.

[20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The two Sources offer diametrically opposed views. Wilson (Source **B**) regards slavery as degrading, turning 'human beings made in the image of God' into private property. Davis (Source **D**) claims that the slaves themselves benefited as well as the economy of the South. They have been turned into 'docile, intelligent and civilized agricultural labourers'. He ignores the point made by Wilson that they are denied freedom. The provenance of the Sources explains the contrast. Wilson is a Northerner, a Republican and an abolitionist. Speaking only a year before the outbreak of civil war, his aim is to press the case against slavery in the strongest possible

terms. Davis is a Southerner. Addressing the Confederate congress a fortnight after the attack on Fort Sumter he is speaking to the converted and aiming to boost morale in the now inevitable civil war, but his purpose is also to justify secession to the wider world. Wilson attacks slavery on moral and political grounds; Davis defends it on economic grounds.

4(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the South was determined to extend slavery to the whole of the United States. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Only Source **A** explicitly argues that the South aimed to extend slavery. Seward sets out what he claims is a 'plan of operation' to extend it first to the territories (building on the Dred Scott judgment) and then to the free States. Source **B** is not quite so explicit but it does claim that the slave States control the Federal Government. In the light of disputes over the extension of slavery into the territories in the 1850s (own knowledge), this implies a view that the slave States wish to extend slavery. This, indeed, is what Northerners meant by 'Slave Power'. The two Southern Sources make no such claim.

Source **C** makes a counter-claim: that the Northern States aimed to abolish slavery throughout the United States. Source **D** claims that slavery is indispensable to the economy of the South. From own knowledge candidates could interpret this as showing that the Confederacy was formed to preserve slavery, which, as Source **C** suggests, the South regarded as threatened by the election of Lincoln as President. Thus what the Sources show is that the proposition in the question is a Northern view of Southern aims. However, candidates may suggest that the two Southern Sources are economical with the truth about Southern ambitions. Certainly the political battles over slavery in the territories and the Fugitive Slave Act in the 1850s were seen by Northerners as evidence that the South wished to extend the reach of slavery. Candidates may conclude that the North was correct in its fear that the South aimed to extend slavery – but so was the South in fearing the North's intention to impose free labour. Such a conclusion could be linked to the opening remarks in Source **A**.

The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93

5(a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for the support Parnell had in Ireland after 1890. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

In terms of their content, Source **A** shows loving, admiring, obviously spontaneous support, while Source **B** shows stage managed torchlight processions. **A** has people from all walks of life supporting Parnell, while **B** has rascals, revolutionaries and landlords. Source **A** talks about the Irish people as a whole, while **B** sees the solid sort being for his opponents. **A** talks about his own people loving him; while **B** has him as a member of a minority – protestant and aristocrat.

Source **B** sees him as an adulterer, implying that the divorce has cost him support, but **A** sees him as being so well loved that people do not enquire into his private life.

In terms of provenance, Source **A** is not by a politician involved in Home Rule internecine struggles, but by a writer and is quoted by someone who loved Parnell. Source **B** is by a former associate, now a bitter enemy, who led the attack on Parnell in the famous committee room meeting and sees Parnell as not only someone who will bring disrepute on the movement, but as an outsider and a demagogue. By January 1891 Parnell had returned to the radical rhetoric of the late 70s and early 80s, so what was at stake was the future of the Home Rule Party's alliance with the English politicians likely to pass Home Rule. The motives of the Sources are different. **A** is personal, and unpolitical, concerned with one expression of good will. **B** is concerned with the long term political future.

5(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these sources and your own knowledge, consider the view that the O'Shea divorce case was the main reason for the split in the Irish Home Rule Movement. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The issue is whether the O'Shea case in itself destroyed Parnell and split the movement, or whether there were already strains. The failure of the Home Rule Bill in 1886 and the success of land legislation in the 1880s made a purely political solution seem less likely. Parnell's autocratic style was a problem for some. He had become less active, possibly as a result of distraction by Mrs.O'Shea and he resumed a radical stance after 1890 which was unwelcome to more conservative Home Rulers.

On the other hand, Gladstone's response to the moral concerns of his non-conformist voters and supporters was certainly a key factor. Parnell had tied himself and his party to Liberalism and without that, there was little chance of success, so Parnell lost support politically. Residual loyalty and admiration among some in his party ensured a split. Source **C** alone, though, makes the split the only key issue (although **B** does make reference to the success of the Land legislation) It refers to the sudden impact of Gladstone's letter withdrawing support and sees the instant effect – in the twinkling of an eye and 'all because' of the divorce. Source **B** agrees that Parnell's position as an adulterer is one of the dividing points, but also throws in his position as a protestant and aristocrat – longer term factors are indicated here and also Parnell's supposed support of the Tories. Parnell's strange contradictory appeal – to revolutionaries and Tories – is thrown up here and this could be argued to go back beyond the excitements of the divorce to being a feature of Parnell's whole career – sometimes radical and sometimes conservative.

Source **A** seems not to see the divorce as even causing a divide among his supporters, but the Kilkenny meetings were not typical and the source is contradicted by Source **C** and by knowledge of the ebbing of support from the Church and from many elements of press and public – Parnell even had lime thrown at him. The events in the parliamentary committee room in 1890 show this to be a romantic view.

Source **D** takes a more balanced view. It refers to Parnell's authoritarian tendencies and to the mixture of elements in Home Rule with which he had had to juggle since he became leader – the rural violence, Catholicism, urban constitutionalism. These different elements are now at odds – the source refers to Catholic opposition and rural sentiment which saw Parnell as being too much part of the urban establishment. However, it was the furore about the divorce which

propelled him to the irresponsible attitudes which he struck in 1890-91 – he had previously been very careful not to associate himself too much with the Plan of Campaign, for instance. So as well as long term factors, there were the immediate effects of the scandal and betrayal.

England in a New Century 1900-1918

6(a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for the approach to social reform of the Liberal and Labour parties. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources agree that social reform is important. But, beyond that basic agreement, the emphasis in each Source is very different. In Source **A**, Lloyd George (in the Liberal Cabinet as President of the Board of Trade) emphasises the importance of Liberal welfare reforms as a means of keeping working class support at the expense of Labour. In Source **B**, Beatrice Webb supports this evidence by her reference to Lloyd George’s attempt to “dish” the socialists through the provisions of the 1911 National Insurance Act. However, it is her hope that Lloyd George will fail in this respect.

It could be argued that, in terms of content, Source **B** is the more useful as it clearly shows the different approaches of the two parties towards social reform; whereas Source **A** is much less specific. Both Sources are optimistic that their side will prevail in this “trial of strength”. Differences between the Sources can be explored through provenance. Source **A** is expressing the Liberal mood not long after their massive electoral triumph of 1906. It is a political speech (necessitated by the steady rise of Labour); and anticipates a period of successful Liberal social reform, which should reduce the appeal of socialist policies to the electorate. Source **B** (nearly five years later) represents a growing Labour dissatisfaction (although not all Labour supporters were as socialist as Beatrice Webb) with Liberal welfare policies. It suggests that Lloyd George has not succeeded in doing everything the working class wanted.

6(b) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the rise of the Labour party was the greatest political challenge to the Liberal party in the period from 1906 to 1914. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Candidates should be aware that, following the General Election of 1906, the Liberals were in a very strong position; and that the Labour party (often allied to the Liberals) was still a small (if growing) force. Source **A** (from early in the period) suggests that Lloyd George saw Labour as a possible threat to the Liberals. As a politician, Lloyd George was keen to avoid complacency in the Liberal ranks; and so may have exaggerated the Labour threat. But he is also confident that the Labour challenge can be defeated through the New Liberal policies of social reform. In Source **B**, Webb backs up Lloyd George’s fears of Labour; but she dismisses his confidence in

the effects of Liberal reform. She suggests that by 1911 Labour has become a real threat to the Liberals. However, her obvious hostility to Lloyd George may help to explain her mainly optimistic view of the political situation. Both Source **C** and Source **D** could be used to illustrate both the challenge of the Labour party, and that of the Conservative party. Source **C** (the cartoon) suggests that, during the period, the splitting of the vote between the two parties of social reform was bound to help the Conservatives: although the outcome of this challenge was still unclear by 1914. Source **D** points to working class disappointment with Liberal social reform as one reason for the poor showing of the party in the two elections of 1910. But, it also suggests that, although Liberal unpopularity continued to grow between 1910 and 1914, it was the Conservatives who gained most from this rather than Labour.

By 1914, the Liberals had lost ground; but Labour was still clearly the third party. Candidates might cite the two election results of 1910 to illustrate this general trend. Heavily defeated in 1906, the Conservatives now (1910-14) had the same number of seats as the Liberals; and the latter now required Labour support. Certainly, there were other reasons for Liberal decline besides the steady growth of the Labour party and Labour's growing disillusionment with Liberal social reform. Candidates might legitimately refer to other problems for the Liberals such as women's suffrage, industrial unrest, the House of Lords, and Ireland: although it should be noted that only the first of these is in the specification. None of these factors is required for a Band One answer.

Nazi Germany 1933 – 1945

7(a) Study Sources C and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to the Nazi Regime.

[20]

Focus: Comparison of two sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attribution should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both sources are an appeal to the German people, condemning the Nazi regime and justifying their reasons for doing so in a rhetorical fashion. As such both are similar in their attitudes despite very different backgrounds (youthful students, very highly placed German Army Officers). Both demonstrate a hatred for the regime on the grounds of repression and tyranny. Both see it as a morally debased government (oblique references to the Jews and atrocities?) and both, as wartime sources, stress the waste of a war that was going badly from 1943 (Stalingrad 1943 and 1944) albeit from different perspectives. Terror is condemned by both sources and both seek to overthrow the Nazi regime, the students in **C** by encouraging non co-operation, the officer in **D** by an armed coup.

The differences in their attitudes stem from their provenance. In **C** the students stress free expression and personal freedom through popular democratic action. However, the Officers in **D** are not necessarily democratic. They talk of "assuming power" and using the existing police. Then, concerned with honour, they move to internal conciliation and foreign negotiations. Their justification would appear to be God, mention of whom is absent from **C**. Their anger is less that of excluded students than insiders who have thrown in their lot with Hitler, who has then ignored their advice and betrayed them. There is an interesting comment on economic and cultural treasure in Germany, a concern with power, property and heritage. They would be much more aware, by the summer of 1944, of impending defeat (the D Day landings of the month before and the shrinking Eastern Front). The White Rose would only know of the German failure to take Stalingrad. Both represent minorities and were probably not typical in their attitudes. As such both have equal weight as evidence for attitudes.

7(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Nazi Regime faced dangerous opposition during the period 1935-44. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Most candidates are likely to agree that opposition was persistent as all four sources focus on this throughout the period (1935-44), becoming more open, dangerous, awkward in wartime (Sources **B, C and D**). In **A** there is clearly grumbling and private opposition which has become public in **B** with action taken in **C and D**. Candidates may well take more varied views on the issue of danger to the regime, using own knowledge to contextualise the threats. The White Rose were arrested, tried and executed for their efforts as were those, over 5,000, involved in the Bomb plot and in opposition in general. Yet Galen's public opposition in **B** to euthanasia succeeded. The policy was dropped, although many of those involved regrouped to involve themselves in what became the Final Solution. Much would depend on the nature of the organisation involved. It is clear that the source evidence can bear different interpretations. Those arguing for or against danger can use all four sources.

The Gestapo Report, Source **A**, is reliable given the context (Norheim was a typical North German Protestant, rurally based small town that was classically Nazi). They are aware of opposition across the spectrum. They face considerable public non-cooperation and underground opposition from Communists and Socialists working on Nazi faultlines revealed in the previous year, 1934 (the report itself may reflect 'older' Nazi sympathies in the local Gestapo). However, candidates could question how serious the evidence of the Gestapo Report was. Own knowledge would suggest that the older generation (parents) had always been more immune to the Nazis. There is no comment on the attitudes of Youth. Such a report could be used as evidence for awareness and preparedness for such grumbling. Formal opposition remained underground and secret. Source **B** could also be viewed as limited, a one-off. One Catholic Bishop protests, strengthened by the Catholic nature of Westphalia and the war. Own knowledge could set this against the Concordat and other examples of co-operation. The Nazi instinct was to use terror (to hang him) as they did to the plotters in **C and D**. Nonetheless the wartime context, the private and frank discussion of Tiessler and the referral to Hitler show that organised opposition from the Catholic Church was dangerous (candidates could cite clashes over the respective youth organisations to support this).

Sources **C and D** also appear dangerous and own knowledge could point to other Youth groups and other examples of Army plotting, assassination attempts and coups. Source **D** was to be the last of many, especially dangerous as the war was going so badly (a point referred to by both). These are opposition sources (**A and B** are Nazi). Yet better candidates could use both to demonstrate the relative lack of danger. The White Rose in **C** recognises the structure of the terror, the ruthless suppression and the indoctrination at every level (Youth, SA, SS who 'regiment and brainwash us'). This is supported in Beck's Appeal - the 'unchecked reign of terror' with no justice. Own knowledge could point to Army support for the Nazis from 1934 until it was clear that defeat was Germany's inevitable fate. Both suggest how strong the Nazi terror was. The effectiveness of their actions, when taken, could be questioned by candidates. The White Rose pamphlet did not have a wide circulation. Their ability to fight was minimal. Few were likely to 'quit' the Nazi organisation given State intimidation. Were Germans aware of the need to 'demand' moral obligation of their government? Source **C** is perhaps over-strong on rhetoric. As for '**D**' how will the public know of Hitler's failure to take army advice? The Appeal was never

published. Own knowledge could be used to point to the lack of organisation in the Bomb Plot (Stauffenberg's arrest on arrival in Berlin). Clearly a large organisation is needed to dent the Nazis (Army, Church, Underground Political Parties). The evidence might suggest opposition but it was only intermittently dangerous given that the Army preferred support and obedience to armed coups.

**Generic Mark Scheme 2583/84/85/86
June 2007**

Units 2583-2586: GENERIC MARK BANDS**AS PERIOD STUDIES****NB**

Examiners are reminded that

- for answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.
- they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Generic Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #3].
- they are marking out of 45. OCR's computer will double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.
- the quality of the English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- if a candidate discusses the wrong topic (eg evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II when the question was on William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award up to the top of Band VI.

Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation

Perspective means an understanding of the variety of history involved in the question (eg political, religious, social.)

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (eg analysis, assessment, comparison).

Time is limited so candidates may begin their answer directly, without an introduction.

- I: 36-45 The response evaluates the key issues and deals with the perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

At the higher level (40-45), responses will effectively justify why one factor is the most important or the main factor and will also explain why other factors are less important. There will be a sense of judgement in relation to the factors shown by discrimination between them in terms of type and nature of the factor. How factors are linked to each other will also be addressed.

At a lower level (36-39), responses will justify why one factor is most important but the explanation of why others are less so will be less effective. There will be some attempt to classify and draw links between factors.

II: 32-35 The response is mostly successful in evaluating the key issues in the question convincingly and relevantly. It develops most of the relevant aspects of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The answer will deal with several factors and come to a judgement as to which was most important (ie how far...? or to what extent...? will be addressed). However, the reasoning will often be patchy and may be confined to a lengthy conclusion. Similarly the establishment of links between factors and their classification may not be extensive and, at the bottom end, hardly present at all.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

III: 27-31 The response is reasonably successful in evaluating key issues and in dealing with perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is reasonably successful in showing a good level of understanding. The answer may be descriptive or narrative in approach but the argument depends on some analysis. This analysis, whilst showing some understanding, might be undeveloped and lack sound and substantial support. The quality of recall, selection and accuracy of historical knowledge, applied relevantly, is mostly sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The organisation is uneven but there is a sustained argument.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The response will recognise the need to deal with a number of factors *and where the question demands* it may well provide some very limited argument why one factor was more important than others. A list of factors will be dealt with and explained effectively but the explanation of most important but the linkages *and any necessary explanation of most important* will be slight and undeveloped. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

IV: 23-26 The response has some success in discussing some key issues and in dealing with some of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer might be descriptive or narrative in approach but there is some implicit analysis. The analysis might show relevance and some understanding but the points might be undeveloped and explained generally. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points, omitting some key issues, or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The organisation might be uneven but the answer pursues an argument. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

V: 18-22 The response discusses some key issues in the question but only at a very basic level. The answer might include a series of valid and relevant but largely unsupported points. There might be significant omissions. The answer shows some adequacy in its level of understanding and is descriptive or narrative in approach. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is limited but is mostly communicated in a competent manner. The organisation is uneven. There is some irrelevance but most of the answer focuses on the question. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some frequent errors.

- VI: 10-17 The response does not discuss the key issues in the question and shows little understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is inadequate in its level of understanding with poor description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge is thin or significantly inaccurate. There is significant irrelevance. The answer is communicated in a competent manner and the organisation of the answer is very poor. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII: 0-9 The response fails to discuss the key issues in the question and shows no understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is completely inadequate in its level of understanding. Historical knowledge is either absent or completely inaccurate or irrelevant. There is no organisation to the answer. The writing shows very major weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Mark Scheme 2583
June 2007**

2583 ENGLISH HISTORY 1042-1660**England 1042 - 1100****The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066****1(a) How effective a king was Edward the Confessor? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the success of a king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the first Key Issue and associated Content in the relevant Study Topic, 'How effective a king was Edward the Confessor? The personality of Edward the Confessor, the powers of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy, government, taxation, law and military organisation'. He did not have the strength of character to seek to do great things. However, he sought to reign in an orderly manner and to maintain stability. The reign saw a number of crises, for example the threat from the Godwin family in 1051-52 which saw the King in a weak situation. The succession issue can be discussed and candidates assess how far the outcome reflected on Edward's achievements. It might be argued that the crisis was not of Edward's making. However, for the most part, the King carried on affairs effectively. Taxes were collected; laws were generally enforced. Some might refer to Edward's interest in the re-building of Westminster Abbey. He had to deal with powerful nobles, especially the Godwins. Candidates can assess the significance of the quarrel between Edward and Godwin and its outcome.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

1(b) Assess the reasons why the Godwin family was powerful during the reign of Edward the Confessor. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the power of an important family.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can put the Godwins into the wider context of the political situation. Kings had limited power in late Anglo-Saxon England. They were expected to consult the Witan and needed the co-operation of their earls. Edward himself had few contacts in England before his accession; his power base was therefore relatively limited in England. Earl Godwin of Wessex might well have played an important role in securing the succession for Edward. He had extensive lands and became the leading critic of Norman influence at court and in the Church. Edith, his daughter, was married to the King. Although he was forced into exile, he was able to return to England and a position of importance. After Godwin's death, Harold became a leading figure in the succession question.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072**2(a) Assess the reasons why there was a dispute over the succession to the English crown at the end of Edward the Confessor's reign. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important political dispute

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Edward did not leave a direct heir. There is debate about his preference but even that was not sufficient to guarantee the succession. In addition, credit should be given when candidates point out that Anglo-Saxon kingship did not automatically pass to the nearest blood relative. There was still an element of election. Harold exercised a powerful position as the pre-eminent Anglo-Saxon earl, second to the King, but his position was not paramount during the reign of Edward. He was strong enough to make a bid for the crown on the death of Edward but candidates might consider the circumstances, whether or not he had already promised allegiance to William of Normandy, recognising his claim to the throne. However, Harold did not have sufficient time to establish full control over England. As King, he was scarcely more than a powerful war lord. There were other claimants. William of Normandy proved to be the most successful but, at the time, Harold Godwinson was a serious threat. Examiners should be careful not to undervalue answers that are organised chronologically as mere 'narrative'. The situation changed and the changes can well be addressed in a chronological framework.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

2(b) Assess William I's success in defending his English frontiers to 1072. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the success of a ruler in controlling frontiers.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners should be careful not to undervalue answers that are organised chronologically, where the narrative is used to support a well-argued case.

The question is based on the fourth Key Issue and Content, 'How did William I ... defend his English frontiers? ... his military success, the Harrying of the North, castle building, the defence of the frontiers.' The northern frontier was particularly dangerous for William because of its remoteness and because it was an open door for intervention by Danes. (The Study Topic begins in 1064. Candidates might link William I's problems in the north with Harold's.) There was a revolt in 1069-70 when the Danes joined Edwin, Morcar and Waltheof. William used more violent means of suppression than he employed in central and southern England. The situation was still uneasy in 1072. Castles were built throughout England to maintain Norman power but they were particularly important in the north and on the borders with Wales.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Norman England 1066 - 1100**3(a) How far did William I control the English Church. Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the relationship between a king and the Church.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

William I and his Normans had a real interest in the Church. This was partly because of political reasons; the Church was a powerful institution that could be either an ally or a hindrance to his rule. But there were also more religious reasons. He favoured the reforms that would bring England closer to continental practices. However, he was unwilling to give the papacy too much influence. His choice of Lanfranc as Archbishop of Canterbury and his relations with the churchman show the King's interest and determination to exert a strong influence but not a wish fully to control the Church. Lanfranc was not a 'puppet' archbishop but William supported most of his policies, such as the wish to give Canterbury the primacy over York. Except for Wulfstan of Worcester, all of the higher clergy were appointed after the Conquest. The King's rights of patronage and appointment were not extraordinary.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

3(b) How far did William II (Rufus) change William I's methods of government? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Comparison of the methods of government by two kings.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far..?' invites candidates to consider both change and continuity and answers that argue a strong case for continuity can reach the highest marks. William I continued his father's strong role in government. But, having beaten off Robert's challenge, he went further than William I in antagonising the nobles. The upshot was a rebellion. Some candidates might consider the controversial circumstances of his death but, if they do, it should be related to the key issue in the question. However, there is evidence that he was mostly admired by those around him. His death is not necessarily an important element of the question because the focus should be on change - or continuity. It is possible that his reputation for oppression came from the animosity of clerical chroniclers who were alienated by his treatment of the Church. Candidates need not go into this aspect of the reign because it was not central to 'William I's methods of government' but it can be used to illustrate William's regard for his personal authority. For the most part, William II maintained his predecessor's methods of administration, for example through the use of writs and sheriffs.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Society, Economy and Culture 1042 - 1100**4(a) To what extent was there a manorial economy and society in England by the end of the eleventh century? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of an economic and social phenomenon.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

An alternative argument that some answers might pursue is to dismiss the idea of a manorial economy and society at the end of the eleventh century. However, candidates are expected to show an understanding of what is meant by a 'manorial economy and society', even if they reject the claim that it was prevalent in England during the relevant period. Preferably, this should be done explicitly. Most of the populace lived in villages that were largely self-contained but the manor has been seen by some as implying more than a collection of people; it also had legal and economic connotations. However, there was a considerable diversity and no common form of manor over the country as a whole. Some holdings were isolated, some villages too small to be described as 'manors'. Other communities were sufficiently large to be towns, which were different from 'manors' in their economy. Whilst communities were expected to provide for themselves, there were regional differences to how the economies might be organised and what they produced. Peasant social structures varied considerably. There was not an orderly division of land and different types of peasant landholding. It might be argued that 'manors' were a Norman innovation and that the Anglo-Saxon economic pattern continued in many, perhaps most, places at the end of the eleventh century. Some might refer to Domesday Book to support this argument.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

4(b) How important was internal and external trade to the English economy in the second half of the eleventh century? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of trade in the economy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most communities were self-sufficient depending on local agriculture - trade was not a major element in an agrarian economy - but it was becoming more important. 'Internal' and 'external' are intended to help candidates to sort out their arguments but they do not imply that they must be given equal weight. Trade was important to some towns, especially London. The Norman Conquest probably stimulated international trade because of stronger links with the Continent. This benefited those towns and ports that were nearer Europe. London can be cited as a prime example. Other towns of some size had merchants and markets developed, encouraged by local lords. The regulation of markets can be explained as an aspect of trade. For most places, trade was internal and local as craftsmen and trades produced and sold products. A growing wool trade can be explained. There were also specialised industries or mines, such as iron works, tin and lead mines and salt was traditionally produced in the Cheshire region and traded over large distances. It can be argued that the more elaborate monarchy and nobility in this period acted as a stimulus to trade by providing markets.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

England 1450 - 1509

The Threat to Order and Authority 1450 – 1470

5(a) Assess the reasons why it was difficult for both the Lancastrians and the Yorkists to achieve decisive military victory during the period from 1455 to 1461. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a military development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In assessing the reasons, the most successful answers, certainly at the top of **Band I**, should explain some priority among the reasons that they suggest. Some candidates might spend time explaining the background to the conflict in the period 1455-61. An introductory paragraph can certainly be made relevant but candidates should link more extensive sections to the key issue in the question. For example, they might use some earlier material to explain the personal weakness of Henry VI, which continued to hamper the Lancastrians during the salient period. However, the question clearly puts the focus on 1455-61. Each side was able to frustrate the other but was too weak until 1461 to inflict a decisive victory. In spite of this, the executions that followed battles and plundering worsened relations between the sides. The Battle of Towton was the largest and most important military engagement in the period. The combined armies might have numbered between 60,000 and 100,000 soldiers. Earlier battles had seen perhaps 5,000 - 10,000 being involved. The scale of the Lancastrian defeat, including the death of a number of their leading figures, left Henry VI and Queen Margaret of Anjou with flight to Scotland as their only alternative. Candidates might consider the issue of leadership, for example Henry VI, Margaret of Anjou and Buckingham against Richard of York (to 1460), Edward and Warwick.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

5(b) Assess the claim that his handling of the royal finances was Edward IV's most important achievement as king to 1470. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a king's achievements.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The balance of answers will reflect the weight of the argument but candidates who reject the claim should still show enough understanding and knowledge of Edward's handling of royal finances to frame a solid paragraph if they are to reach **Band I** or **Band II**. Candidates should note the specified end date; discussions of a later period will not be an acceptable alternative argument. The question is based on the fourth Key Issue and associated Content in the Specification, 'How far had Edward IV restored royal authority by 1470? Edward IV's first reign: relations with the nobility, royal finances and administration, problems with Clarence and Warwick'. An alternative answer might claim that Edward IV lacked any important achievements during his first reign. He was young and personable but spent much of his time on pleasurable activities. He had considerable trouble in handling powerful nobles such as Warwick. Marriage to

Elizabeth Woodville proved unpopular. The Lancastrians, effectively led by Margaret of Anjou, were a constant threat, leading to Edward's defeat and Henry VI's restoration / readoption in 1470. However, there were achievements that can be noted. He was interested in government and took care to restore the crown's weak financial position. He benefited from the considerable resources of the Yorkists and secured money from Parliament. If candidates discuss administration, they can refer to the King's use of able servants, including knights, lawyers and clerics to supplement the nobility. This caused concern among some nobles. Edward took an interest in the administration of justice.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The End of the Yorkists 1471 – 1485

6(a) How far do you agree that Richard III was a complete failure as king? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a controversial king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A strong case can be made to confirm the claim in the question. Richard of Gloucester gained the throne through controversial, allegedly murderous methods. He only ruled for two years before being killed in battle. The throne was then seized by the Lancastrian enemy of Richard's Yorkists. Richard III's reign was marked by rebellion (Buckingham) even before Henry Tudor's invasion. However, answers in **Band I** can be expected to consider alternatives although this is not absolutely necessary for this band: an extremely well-argued critical essay can merit a very high mark. Nor does the mention of alternatives imply that answers should be evenly balanced in the amount of space given to failure and success. Richard tried to improve trade, improve justice, reform some of the less popular means of raising money (eg benevolences) and reach an agreement with parliament.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

6(b) Assess the reasons why some nobles opposed Richard III when he was king. [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for opposition to a king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

However, the focus should be on Richard III and his relationship with the nobles. Candidates might consider a variety of reasons, including the controversial accession of Richard III, the fate of the Princes in the Tower, personal ambition (eg Buckingham), suspicions that the King was preferring nobles from the north over those of the south, the weakness of Richard that resulted from the death of his wife and son, and the counter-attraction of Henry Tudor. In assessing reasons, candidates should explain why and how far they were important.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Reign of Henry VII 1485 – 1509

7(a) How far did Henry VII change the methods of governing England? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of change in methods of government by a king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers in **Band I** should consider both change and continuity, coming to a considered judgement about which was more important. The range of factors that can be considered is wide and examiners should be realistic about what might be expected, even in the best answers. However, it is difficult to see how foreign policy can be made relevant in a question about methods of government. The Study Topic begins in 1485 and candidates are not required to have detailed knowledge and understanding about developments before that date. Henry VII used the traditional King's council as an important agency of government but he selected members himself, rather than admitting nobles by right. An innovation was the Council Learned in the Law. Other courts were adapted rather than newly established but their practical effects were sometimes transformed. Reference might be made to Star Chamber and the Court of Requests. Regional courts for the North and Wales and the Marches were strengthened. Henry continued to use traditional sources of revenue, including feudal dues, benevolences and parliamentary taxes but preferred to use the Chamber rather than the Exchequer to oversee the receipt of finances. It has been claimed that Henry wished to elevate the position of the monarchy by a more formal court and more elaborate ceremonies.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

7(b) Assess the claim that the Pretenders were the most important threat to Henry VII's kingship. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the threats to a king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Lambert Simnel was claimed to be first Richard, Duke of York and son of Edward IV, then the Earl of Warwick. Some English Yorkists, led by Lincoln and Lovell, supported him as did Margaret of Burgundy. With foreign mercenaries, he landed in Ireland, leading to an invasion of England but was defeated at Stoke. Simnel was imprisoned. Perkin Warbeck also claimed to be the Duke of York. He was supported by Margaret of Burgundy and recognised by other foreign rulers such as James IV of Scotland, Charles VIII of France and the Emperor Maximilian. His threat was more prolonged than Simnel's. After his capture, he was executed. Candidates should assess the threat from the Pretenders, even if they argue that other threats were more dangerous. The balance of answers will reflect the weight of the argument but candidates who reject the claim should still show enough understanding and knowledge of the Pretenders to frame a solid paragraph if they are to reach **Band I** or **Band II**. Among other factors that might

be considered are the difficult financial situation that Henry VII inherited, the latent problem of the nobility and the need to gain international recognition.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509

8(a) How far did the social and economic role of the nobility change during the period from 1450 to 1509? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Explanation of change in the social and economic roles of the nobility in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

However, an alternative approach must still be within the key issue of society and the economy. Some candidates might argue that the older nobility was falling on hard times in this period. They suffered from the Wars of the Roses and some had incurred costs during the long wars with France. Lands were lost because of forfeitures and fines. Henry VII's determination to cut down on retainers saved them some money, although it was not popular with the old aristocracy, but their living expenses were generally still high and had to be maintained. They were still expected to sustain large households and many servants. Others, for example traders and merchants, were gaining by comparison. There were new nobles who were promoted by the Yorkists. They had made their fortunes especially in the wool trade and now increased their social status. Some nobles responded positively by engaging in trade or by marriage with rich families of merchant backgrounds. In social terms, the nobility retained its importance. Merchants and others who made money were keen to gain the social advantages of nobility. Their social status was particularly important in regions that were more distant from London.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

8(b) To what extent did the condition of the lower orders change during the period from 1450 to 1509? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of change affecting a social class.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might consider the impact of plague. Although not as virulent as the earlier Black Death and although it affected all social classes, it had a particularly severe effect on the lower classes presumably because of their living conditions and the other reasons for poor health. They might be caught up in the disorders of the earlier part of the period. Some peasants suffered because of the eagerness of some landlords to profit from their lands with enclosures being introduced on some areas, causing depopulation. Those who did not have clear proof of their rights to land (such as copyhold) were liable to lose it. However, there were regional differences. Enclosure was neither a new nor a national phenomenon but affected the peasantry in some places, especially in the Midlands, Buckingham and Berkshire. Some candidates might challenge the basis of the question by claiming that this was a golden age for the lower classes, especially with the demand for labour that resulted from the depopulation of the Black Death.

Serfdom declined and the decline of 'feudalism' had some beneficial effects. Answers worth up to **Band III** might be highly descriptive but one would expect some assessment of change (and / or continuity as its corollary) for answers in **Band II** and especially **Band I**.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

England 1509 - 1558

Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509 - 1529

9(a) How successful was English foreign policy from 1515 to 1529? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the success of foreign policy in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might differ in their assessments of success during this period. Good candidates might make a case for contrasting early successes with later failures. Answers should be kept within the chronological scope of the question. The early years of Henry VIII's reign, to 1515, can be discussed in an introduction but should not be considered during the main part of the argument. Wolsey and the King seemed to be European peace-makers in the Treaty of London (1518). The Field of the Cloth of Gold seemed to be a triumph for English diplomacy and Henry VIII met Charles V in 1520. However, candidates might be dubious about the real effects of these events. Henry's invasion of France in alliance with Charles V in 1523 was a failure. Following the Battle of Pavia, Charles V did not need England. Henry and Wolsey tried to renew friendship with France, again to little effect. The Treaty of Cambrai (1529) between Charles V and Francis I showed that England had little influence in Europe. The Divorce saga also showed the failure of English foreign policy. Neither Charles, France nor the Pope would assist Henry and Wolsey in securing a divorce from Catherine of Aragon.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

9(b) 'Wolsey's successes in domestic administration were much more important than his failures.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1515 to 1529? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the success of an important minister.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Discussions of foreign policy will not be an acceptable alternative approach. Candidates might take issue with the claim in the quotation and argue in favour of failure. He was an active jurist, strengthening Chancery as a court and promoting the Courts of Requests and Star Chamber. He controlled finance on behalf of Henry VIII and managed for most of the time to raise funds to support the King's policies. He was active in trying to limit the harmful effects of some social policies such as enclosure but with limited success in spite of prosecutions. He presided over the Church in England with his various bishoprics and as Archbishop of York, Cardinal and Papal Legate. He carried through some reforms.

On the other hand, his judicial interference alienated some powerful people. He aroused anger by the Amicable Grant (1524), a forced loan, although it can be argued that he was only trying to carry out the King's wishes. His attempts to alleviate social distress and crack down on profiteers were mostly fruitless. He became associated with the worst abuses of the Church (which in turn suffered from its association with him). By the late 1520s, he had attracted powerful enemies apart from those who were to be involved in the King's Divorce. The Divorce will probably loom large in explanations of his fall and assessments of his failure. In 1529, Wolsey was dismissed as Chancellor directly as a result of his failure to secure a Divorce. Moderate candidates might spend too much time describing the events of the growing Divorce crisis. Whilst examiners should not automatically demote 'narrative' (knowledge will be needed to support the argument), the focus should be on assessment and explanation.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529 - 1558

10(a) Assess the claim that reform of the Privy Council was the most important achievement of Thomas Cromwell in government and administration. (Do not include religion in your answer.) [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the success of an important minister.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The balance of answers will reflect the weight of the argument but candidates who reject the claim should still show enough understanding and knowledge of Cromwell and the Privy Council to frame a solid paragraph if they are to reach **Band I** or **Band II**. Historiography is not an AS assessment objective and answers can deserve any mark without reference to the views of particular historians although accurate references should be given credit. The argument in favour of revolution is that Cromwell deliberately sought to enhance a bureaucratic structure of administration, using especially the Privy Council, to replace the role of the royal household. Within the Privy Council, the office of Secretary of State became crucial. Against the claim, it can be said that there was development of preceding practices and that the royal household was still important. Personal influence and factions were still influential. Other factors that might be considered include Cromwell's use of Parliament and reliance on statute. He enforced more central control over local administration, for example through the use of councils in the north, and over Wales and the Marches. Ireland was brought closer to central government. The question excludes religion but it would not be irrelevant (but not necessary) to consider the idea of 'empire' and royal power.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

10(b) Assess the reasons why wars with Scotland and France from 1543 to 1558 affected domestic affairs in England. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the relationship between external factors and domestic affairs in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The final years of Henry VIII's reign were marked by wars with Scotland and France. The King still had hopes of conquering Scotland whilst he remained hostile to France. However, his policies were unsuccessful. The main effect was financial. Henry was already short of money, in spite of the profits from the seizure of monastic land. The expense of war added to the effects of the general price rise. Henry had to resort to taxation, forced loans and benevolences: all unpopular measures. Crown lands were sold. The coinage was debased. Somerset also embarked on a war with Scotland, winning the Battle of Pinkie, but he was not able to follow it up and it added to his unpopularity, helping to cause his fall. Renewal of war with France also weakened Somerset. During Mary I's reign, the unsuccessful war with France, the outcome of the alliance with Spain, proved a major factor in making the Queen unpopular. The loss of Calais was a heavy blow to Mary's reputation. Candidates do not need to provide much description of the wars; the emphasis should be on their effects within England.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Church and State 1529 – 1558

11(a) How far was England still a Catholic country by the end of Henry VIII's reign in 1547? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the religious condition of England in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The Study Topic ends in 1558 and candidates can use their knowledge and understanding of 1547-58 to answer the question but should avoid overlong surveys because the key issue is the situation by 1547. The highest marks can be awarded to answers that make no reference to post-1547 developments to prove the extent of Catholicism in England at Henry VIII's death. He had carried out important changes that enforced royal supremacy over the Church. The Papacy had been deprived of its authority. Monasteries were abolished. Henry prepared a Protestant succession under Edward VI. Prominent and less prominent people who resisted change were prosecuted, often extremely cruelly.

On the other hand, the Church of England mostly adopted the Catholic organisation, under the King. There were few radical theological / doctrinal changes. Candidates might consider the significance of important publications such as the Ten Articles (1536) and Six Articles (1539). Most of the clergy continued and, apart from the use of the vernacular, there were few changes in church services. Answers might distinguish between the Protestantism of officialdom and the Catholicism of much of the populace. This is a topic that is often taught historiographically. Historiography is not a required assessment criterion, that is, answers can gain the maximum mark without reference to the views of individual historians. However, accurate references should be rewarded.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

11(b) Assess the claim that, by 1553, the religious reforms of Edward VI's reign had done little to make England a more Protestant country. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about religious change.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might end their answers in 1553 or they might use their knowledge and understanding of the reign of Mary I to make valid points. Each approach can merit the highest marks but the second is open to the danger that candidates might provide unnecessary details about Mary's policies. The emphasis should be on Edward VI's reign. It might be argued that the circumstances of Mary's accession and the failure of Lady Jane Grey as a Protestant claimant prove the validity of the claim in the question.

However, it can be argued that the perceived legality of Mary's claim was more important than religious issues. Candidates might consider the major reforms from 1547 to 1553, such as the abolition of chantries, the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, Cranmer's 42 Articles and the appointment of committed Protestants such as Ridley and Hooper. However, Edward's reign was short and it is doubtful whether there was time for these measures to have a wide effect. There were signs of resistance and adherence to more conservative traditions, such as the Western Rising (1549), although social and economic factors were also involved. If candidates consider Mary's reign, they might note that the Queen's religious policies were accepted at first; more open opposition occurred when she showed the lengths to which she wished to go to revert to Catholicism. There were also political or economic objections to aspects of religious policy such as the attempt to restore monasteries or build an alliance with Spain.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Social and Economic Issues 1509 - 1558

12(a) Assess the reasons why governments' attempts to tackle economic problems had limited success during the period from 1509 to 1558. [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for unsuccessful economic policies.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might focus on inflation as the primary economic problem and this can merit any mark. They might argue that the causes of inflation were essentially beyond the capacity of governments to limit the phenomenon. For example, the increase in the size of the population created a demand for food and commodities, putting pressures on prices. More plentiful labour meant that wages remained comparatively low. Governments tried to limit price rises but were conspicuously unsuccessful. Currency debasement, the resort of governments in need, added to the problem. There were periodic attempts to curb enclosers and rack-renters, for example by Wolsey and Somerset; none was effective partly because they struck at important interest groups. England was still heavily reliant on the wool trade and this was to cause problems by the

end of the period. Less successful answers might concentrate on accounts of the hardship caused by economic problems but the more successful will focus more on the nature of the problems and the difficulty in tackling them.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

12(b) Assess the reasons why enclosures continued from 1509 to 1558 in spite of the criticism that they aroused. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the persistence of an economic development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Enclosures, in the interest of more profitable sheep-farming, increased during this period. (Candidates might point out that the practice was limited to certain areas, small in proportion with the total of land (perhaps 2%) and mostly in the Midlands where up to 30% of land might have been affected, but this does not invalidate the premise of the question. Enclosure was not new but was more problematic given the prevailing economic conditions in this period). Criticism resulted because enclosures disrupted affected communities, causing unemployment and vagrancy. There were arguments over the legality of tenants' rights against the rights of enclosers. Governments tackled the problem intermittently but found themselves acting against the interests of the richer and more influential sections of the population. Faced with other problems, enclosures were rarely a high priority. Wolsey addressed the problem as did Thomas Cromwell. Thomas More claimed that sheep ate men. The 1540s saw general economic problems and some, churchmen and others such as Latimer and Hales, saw enclosures as a fundamental cause of trouble. Somerset was sympathetic to them. The Hales Commission was one outcome but it seemed to provoke unrest. Somerset's enemies saw the riots as evidence of his mistaken social and economic policies and he was too weak to carry out effective anti-enclosure measures.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

England 1547 – 1603

Church and State 1547 - 1603

13(a) Assess the reasons why Elizabeth I opposed Puritan demands for changes in the religious settlement throughout her reign. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a ruler's opposition to a religious group.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can consider the terms of the Elizabethan settlement and Puritan pressures on the Queen at her accession. But answers in **Band I** and **Band II** should go further. Elizabeth I was conservative; she saw her settlement as final. She was also moderate and saw dangers to religious and political order in the demands of the Puritans for further change, whether comparatively limited or more particularly radical. For example, the Vestiarian Controversy of the

1560s threatened conformity. Criticism of bishops was interpreted as an attack on the Queen. Parliamentary debates and demands impinged on royal prerogative. The Calvinist theology and reforms favoured by the Presbyterian movement and then the growth of separatism were seen by Elizabeth as threats to the basis of the religious settlement. Moderate answers might spend much time describing the aims and development of Puritanism. This will not be irrelevant as long as there is some awareness of Elizabeth's position. However, the approach is unlikely to deserve **Band I**. Answers in this Band can be expected to focus on the Queen's attitude.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

13(b) How dangerous to Elizabeth I was the support within England for Mary, Queen of Scots? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the danger to a ruler from support of a rival.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some candidates might begin with Mary's flight to England in 1568; this would be slightly incomplete but not serious enough to merit exclusion from **Band I** if the rest of the answer were very sound. Mary became involved in a series of plots but Elizabeth I was unwilling to agree to her execution. Candidates can refer to support for Mary from France and Spain but the focus should be on 'support within England'. Norfolk and Arundel were rivals of William Cecil and were drawn into a conspiracy. The earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland were involved. The Northern Rising was potentially dangerous particularly because of the powers of the nobles in the regions. They also appealed to Catholic dissatisfaction with the new religion. Candidates might differ about the actual danger of the Rising. The publication of the papal bull *Regnans in Excelsis* by Pius V (1570) legitimised Mary's claim to the throne but there is little evidence that it was widely supported by ordinary Catholics. Plots followed (eg Ridolfi, Throckmorton). The number of Englishmen who were involved was small; this would argue against serious danger to the Queen. On the other hand, the potential danger was considerable because of the threat of assassination. Mary's execution (1587) did not arouse serious protests in England.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Foreign Affairs 1547 - 1587

14(a) Assess the reasons why relations with Scotland were important to England during the period from 1559 to 1587. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about an aspect of foreign relations.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the third Key Issue and Content in the Study Topic, 'What were the main factors which influenced Anglo-Scottish relations between 1559 and 1587? The Franco-Scots threat (1559-60), Mary, Queen of Scots in Scotland (1561-68) and in England (1568-87).' The crisis of 1559-60 proved an early test for Elizabeth I. Mary, Queen of Scots, had a claim to the English throne. She was married to Francis II, King of France (1559-60) and her links with

France, especially the very Catholic Guise family, survived his death. Control of Scotland was a strategic concern to England. The early crisis also involved religion when Mary was confronted with the Calvinist followers of John Knox. There were pressures among committed English Protestants to support the Scottish Congregation. An important issue for Elizabeth was whether to support a potentially dangerous Queen or defend Protestant rebels. The English government was interested in whom Mary married. Whilst Darnley was English, he was also Catholic and had a claim to the English throne, increasing the danger of the succession continuing through Mary. Darnley's murder and her subsequent infatuation with Bothwell weakened Mary. Relations with Scotland generally improved when Mary was in England but were never completely secure because of instability in Scotland. Morton, friendly to England, resigned in 1578 and the young James VI in theory assumed power. The reality was that French influence grew. Scotland became part of successive plots against Elizabeth I on behalf of Mary.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

14(b) Assess Elizabeth I's problems in dealing with France during the period from 1562 to 1584. [45]

Focus: Assessment of problems in foreign relations in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the third Key Issues and Content in the Study Topic, 'What part did relations with France play in Elizabeth I's foreign policy between 1562 and 1584? 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 Alencon'. The Content points to approaches to the question but even **Band I** answers might not consider all of them. Relations with France raised strategic problems; geographically England and France were not distant. There were religious problems because France was a Catholic state although it was not seen to be as aggressively Catholic as Spain. There were pressures on Elizabeth I to support openly the Huguenots during the civil disturbances in France. England might be drawn into the rivalry between France and Spain, including the ramifications of the Dutch Revolt. As a major European country, France could provide an attractive but also a dangerous ally if a marriage could be arranged with one of the sons of Catherine de Medici. Candidates are not limited by what is mentioned in the Key Issue's Content. For example, they might link France to Mary, Queen of Scots. However, the Content alone can take answers to any mark. Answers in **Band I** might normally be expected to offer some sort of priority when assessing the problems in Anglo-French relations.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558 - 1603

15(a) Assess the role of Elizabeth I's ministers in her government to 1603. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the role of ministers in government.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The Specification mentions Burghley and Walsingham and therefore answers that deal only with these two can merit any mark, but, because the definition of Elizabethan ministers is wide, it will not be irrelevant to consider favourites who enjoyed political influence such as Leicester and even Essex. Some might deal with Robert Cecil.

Burghley / William Cecil was appointed Principal Secretary in 1558 and was Lord Treasurer from 1572. He also occupied other offices such as Master of the Court of Wards. Therefore, he was at the centre of government. He helped to manage Parliament and advised Elizabeth I on most matters, secular and religious. There is some debate about the Queen's use of her ministers, and whether or not she consciously promoted faction as a means of controlling them. But Burghley never enjoyed unfettered power. There are also different views of his religious sympathies and some have seen him using parliamentary unrest to press his ideas against Elizabeth. (This is not to hint that an historiographical approach is needed.) Although he was initially doubtful about the capacity of a female ruler, he came to have a high regard for the Queen, who returned his respect. He continued in office until his death in 1598, providing continuity throughout the long reign although in his latter years his son was more active.

Walsingham, Principal Secretary from 1577 and to become Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, was an interesting choice for Elizabeth because, although his talents were apparent, his Protestantism was too pronounced for the Queen. He played a particularly important role in foreign affairs, where he favoured active support for French and Dutch Protestants, and in the related sphere of detection of Catholic plots in England. He proved to be the nemesis of Mary, Queen of Scots. In their different ways, Burghley and Walsingham can be used to demonstrate the different pressures on, and various methods of, Elizabeth as governor. The most successful answers will assess their importance in relation to the Queen.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

15(b) How far do you agree that parliamentary privilege was the most important cause of disputes between Elizabeth I and Parliament during her reign? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for political disputes.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The balance of answers will reflect the weight of the argument but candidates who reject the claim should still show enough understanding and knowledge of parliamentary privilege to frame a solid paragraph if they are to reach **Band I** or **Band II**. Demands for privilege centred on free speech but there were also calls for freedom from arrest under certain conditions for MPs and freedom of access to the Queen. Claims for parliamentary privilege were based on precedent but candidates are not expected to have knowledge and understanding of these precedents or of previous disputes, eg Strode's case (1512). Disputes arose because the privileges that were claimed contradicted the monarch's prerogative rights, especially to govern certain matters of state without parliamentary interference.

Problems arose over the issues of the Queen's marriage and religion. Strickland introduced a bill to reform the Prayer Book (1571). Peter Wentworth became famous, or notorious, for his advocacy of free speech. High credit should be given when candidates point out that he was supported by a minority; he was committed by the House of Commons to the Tower. Later Elizabeth I and the council committed him. Paul, his brother, was also prominent. Reference might be made to Cope's 'bill and book'.

There are alternative explanations that candidates might suggest. Some would claim that freedom of speech was encouraged by some leading members of the council as a means of putting pressure on Elizabeth. Some might claim that financial issues, especially about monopolies late in the reign, were of prior importance. Another alternative might be to see all of the problems as relatively unimportant in view of the general co-operation between crown and Parliament. This will be valid as far as it goes but there were disputes and these need to be explained.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Social and Economic Issues 1547 - 1603

16(a) Assess the reasons why, in the second half of the sixteenth century, it was difficult for the English economy to recover from the collapse of the Antwerp cloth market. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for economic problems.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the third Key Issue and Content, ‘How far was the second half of the sixteenth century a period of trade expansion? The collapse of the Antwerp cloth market, changing patterns of trade with northern Europe, the opening of new overseas markets.’ The links between English wool traders, especially in East Anglia, and the Antwerp market had been strong. There were also links with the wool trade in other parts of England so that Antwerp was extremely important to the national economy. After the collapse of the Antwerp market, efforts were made to find alternative markets, for example in France, Germany and the Baltic. A problem was that English broadcloth was less attractive to these other markets, for example in the Mediterranean, than the lighter and more colourful cloths produced elsewhere. English merchants were also competing with others who were well established. The English tried to adapt their production later in the sixteenth century but with limited success. Elizabethans founded new trading companies in an effort to increase trade with Russia and the Levant (eg Eastland Company, Muscovy Company, and Levant Company); there were vain hopes that wool and cloth could be exported to the Americas (eg Virginia). The East India Company was set up in 1600. Some of the ventures survived but they were generally incapable of replacing Antwerp. The availability of finance, distance, unreal expectations and stiff competition were problems for such enterprises.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

16(b) Assess the most important problems that inflation caused during the period from 1547 to 1603.

Focus: Assessment of the problems caused by inflation.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Governments were directly affected by the problem of inflation because they were expected to live off their traditional incomes, including crown land, justice fines and residual feudal dues. However, it was difficult to increase the incomes from these sources. Taxation was unpopular and could lead to opposition in Parliament and unrest in the country. The costs of government increased, for example the expense of war. One of several results was the sale of crown land, a short-term gain but long-term loss. At the beginning of the period, the crown debased the currency. This can be regarded as a problem caused by inflation. The impact of inflation on other classes had indirect effects on governments when there was popular dissent.

Reference might be made to the problems faced by Somerset, eg Ket's Rebellion. The aristocracy suffered because of their reliance on landed rents. Whilst they could put pressure on tenants, especially those whose claims to land was uncertain, it was not easy to keep up with inflationary pressures. They had to maintain their life-styles. Some nobles and large landholders became involved in trade and other investments, which helped to alleviate the problem of inflation, but the more conservative nobles found the going difficult. Elizabeth I's reign was troubled by poverty and associated vagrancy, both of which were worsened by inflation. Poverty, vagrancy and the fears of rebellion or riots reflected the particular effects of inflation on the poor.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

England 1603 -1660

Politics and Religion 1603-1629

17(a) Assess the reasons why James I and Charles I, to 1629, opposed the Puritans. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the opposition of two kings to a religious group.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

James I was interested in religion and saw himself as an authority. He was taken aback by the promptness with which the Puritans presented their demands in the Millenary Petition and then at the Hampton Court Conference. He came to see Puritans as a threat to the related structures of bishops and political government. Puritans urged the King to take a more anti-Catholic line. The expulsion of Puritan clergy aroused hostility. Foreign policy proved controversial although it was not only Puritans who were critical of James's attempt to seek reconciliation with Catholic powers such as Spain and the Imperial Habsburgs. Charles I's marriage to Henrietta Maria caused immediate problems at the beginning of the new reign. Archbishop Abbot's influence was supplanted by Laud as Bishop of London. Laud's Arminianism was already controversial by 1629. Reference might be made to the fact that religion was one of the priorities of Parliament in the Three Resolutions (1629). Charles I, like his father, saw the need for conformity, a tenet that was challenged by the Puritans. In assessing the reasons, the most successful answers, certainly at the top of **Band I**, should explain some priority among the reasons that they suggest.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

17(b) 'Charles I's foreign policy, to 1629, was a complete failure.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a king's foreign policy in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

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 will be 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.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Personal Rule and Civil War 1629 - 1649

18(a) Assess the reasons why Charles I went to war in 1642. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the outbreak of civil war.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The relevant section in the Specification refers to 'The short and long-term causes of the Civil War, the Short and Long Parliaments, the limiting of royal power, the breakdown of relations between king and parliament, the resort to arms'. One hopes that candidates will not spend too long on long-term issues because nobody envisaged the outbreak of civil war in 1640. The focus should be on the period from 1640 to 1642. By 1642, Charles I had agreed to significant limits on the exercise of his power, for example, the end of non-parliamentary taxation and the suppression of prerogative courts such as Star Chamber and High Commission. The execution of Strafford had not solved problems. There was evidence that the radicals in Parliament were pushing more extreme measures, such as the Grand Remonstrance. There were fears that the Queen might be indicted. There was mob violence in London, probably supported by the radicals to put pressure on the King. The failed attempt to arrest the Five Members exacerbated the problem. By 1642, he did not believe that it was possible to reach a reasonable settlement with Parliament. He had already surrendered the power of dissolution and could not repeat the personal government of 1629-40. Candidates might differ in their interpretation of events. Some might see Charles I as more culpable, others might judge that he was driven into a corner by radical extremism.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

- 8(b) How far do you agree that distrust of Charles I was the most important reason for the failure to reach a settlement during the years from 1646 to 1649? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a claim about an important political development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In explaining the distrust of Charles I, candidates might refer to developments before 1646 but they should be careful about balance because the focus of the arguments should be on the period from 1646 to 1649. In spite of suffering military defeat in the First Civil War, the King believed that he still enjoyed his power by Divine Right and could not concede on essentials. He negotiated with different groups but with the intention of retaining power rather than agreeing a compromise that would weaken him. The final crisis came when he unleashed the Second Civil War. In explaining ‘How far...?’, candidates might examine the roles of other groups, such as Parliamentarians, divided between Presbyterians and Independents, the Army, divided between officers or grandees and the rank and file, and the Scots. Each of these had a different agenda. Answers might refer to the various solutions that were offered to reach a settlement, such as the Newcastle Proposals, the Heads of the Proposals and the Agreement of the People. Charles I was not consulted about the latter but he was unwilling to consider seriously the other programmes. His negotiations with the Scots, including the agreement to accept Presbyterianism for three years, and the renewed hostilities, proved to Cromwell and the army officers that he could not be trusted, resulting in his execution.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Interregnum 1649-1660

- 19(a) Assess the reasons why, in 1653, Oliver Cromwell preferred the Instrument of Government to rule by the Rump and the Parliament of the Saints (Barebones). [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important political development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question allows for different balances in the argument. For example, there might be more on the attractions of the Instrument of Government than on the Rump and Barebones. Alternatively, a valid approach would be to organise a very different balance. The question allows for a discussion of the background to 1653 in order to explain Cromwell’s dissatisfaction with the Rump but 1653 must be the end point. It is difficult to see how later developments can be made relevant unless they are used briefly in a conclusion. The question does not ask about the success of the Protectorate. Cromwell became impatient with the Rump’s inability to introduce a general settlement. By 1653, the linked issues of elections and perpetuation were important. The Rump had embarked on a war with the Dutch of which Cromwell disapproved. Barebones was probably never envisaged as a long-term solution but the radicalism of some of the members and its attention to issues that seemed dangerous and less important to Cromwell soon lost it his support. The Instrument of Government promised to provide a settled government because of its balance between rule by a single person, the interests of the army and civilians in Parliament. A written constitution might avoid the quarrels of the past. Credit should be given when candidates can explain the reasoning behind some of the main terms of the Instrument of Government. For

example, Cromwell believed that it would settle the vexed question of finance for the army. It referred to a degree of religious toleration.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

19(b) How successful was foreign policy during Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate (1653-1658)? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a ruler's success in foreign policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might conclude that Cromwell was very successful or that he achieved limited success. Among successes might be the end of the Rump's war with the United Provinces. He made commercial treaties with Sweden, Denmark and Portugal. The navy cleared the Mediterranean of pirates. He sided with France against Spain and intervened in their continental war, winning the battle of the Dunes and gaining Dunkirk. However, although he approved of the Western Design against Spain to capture Hispaniola, the venture failed. Jamaica was acquired but this was not seen as a significant gain at the time. It might be argued that Cromwell was uncertain about the direction of his foreign policy. Candidates might argue that the defeat of Spain was Cromwell's priority but there are alternatives that can be considered and even preferred. It is possible to argue that he was uncertain whether to ally with France or Spain. Some of the aims were unrealistic, for example the European Protestant alliance. There is an argument that he was unsure for a long time whether to side with France or Spain. Another motive was to build a Protestant alliance that would include the Dutch and Sweden. This failed. Economic factors might be examined; his foreign policy proved expensive. By 1658, England had a high reputation as a European military power but there few tangible gains.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Society and the Economy 1603 – 1660

20(a) How important was religion as a reason for the growth of radical groups after 1640? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the growth of radicalism in a specified period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue the greater importance of other factors but answers in **Band I or Band II** will normally require a sound paragraph on religion. The question is based on the third Key Issue and associated Content in the Specification, 'The breakdown of censorship and the authority of the Anglican Church, the multiplication of religious sects, the effect of the Civil War and the parliamentary army on religious and political radicalism, the Levellers'. The Anglican Church's religious dominance and its linked political importance were seriously weakened during the relevant period. Censorship broke down particularly during the reign of Charles I in spite of the efforts of the King and William Laud to enforce it. The Anglican Church censored the press. Church courts became more unpopular. An important turning point might be seen in the

punishment of Prynne, Burton and Bastwick (1637) for their attacks on bishops. Their punishment seemed excessively harsh to the general populace. The abolition of the Court of High Commission, a prerogative court, in 1641, removed one of the most powerful controls of radicalism. The Civil War provided the conditions that encouraged the formation and propagation of radical ideas. Cromwell was a comparative libertarian but even he was suspicious of the extreme ideas and doctrines that developed, largely free of the constraints of authority. More controversial political views emerged that led to the growth of republicanism and advocacy of the view that power should be based on the people. Candidates might have knowledge of the Levellers, referred to in the Specification, but not necessarily the Diggers, whose omission should not disqualify answers from **Band I**. Reference to Leveller pamphlets and other writing should be given high credit if accurate.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

20(b) How far was the English economy still dominated by agriculture during the period from 1603 to 1660? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the basis of the economy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

‘How far..?’ invites candidates to consider alternatives. Answers that deal only with agriculture will find it difficult to merit more than **Band III** although they might well conclude that it was more important than other features of the economy. Most of the people depended directly or indirectly on agriculture. It provided a living for a wide range of classes from nobility to peasantry, including women. Much of England was still unenclosed. Traditional methods prevailed. However, towns and industry were becoming more important. London was the dominating urban centre. Although it depended on agriculture for food, its main wealth was based on other economic activities. Even small towns had a variety of non-agricultural activities. Coal and iron were important to some regions such as the north-east and the smelting industry of Sussex and Kent. Wool production might be seen as agricultural but the activities of merchants and foreign traders were perhaps too advanced economically to be described as such. Some candidates might prefer to see the economy in regional terms, most of the provinces being very highly dependent on agriculture but others less so.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Mark Scheme 2584
June 2007**

2584 ENGLISH HISTORY 1780-1964

The following question-specific content is indicative only. Candidates would not be expected to include all the possible points referred to here.

England 1780 - 1846**The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783 - 1830****1(a) Assess the reasons for the varied success of Pitt's reforms to 1793. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons affecting Pitt's reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to pick up on the reference to 'varied success', noting reasons for failure and limitations as well as success and effectiveness. An indication of the relative importance of various factors is also to be expected for the three higher bands.

Much depended on the extent to which he challenged vested interests such as the West or East India lobbies. Also, as the King's minister, Pitt was aware of what George III would and would not permit. In 1783 he was chosen by the King for a particular purpose - to respect royal interests and policies. Royal support gave Pitt votes in both Lords and Commons, especially for financial, economic and some administrative reforms. Such reforms were also well thought out, reasonably moderate and ably presented by Pitt to Parliament. Both Parliament and King were opposed to reform on Irish, Parliamentary and slavery issues where Pitt faced powerful opposition. Here success was limited or lacking. For example both Westminster and Dublin forced him to drop mutually reduced tariffs between Britain and Ireland. That he tried in three controversial areas raised his credit in some circles but he failed in all of them.

Other reasons for some success included some acceptance of the need to reform after the shock of the loss of the American colonies and the need to readjust trading relationships (the Free Ports in 1787 and the Eden Treaty with France). There was also peace between 1783 and 1793 and a booming economy which enabled debt to be controlled. The Whig opposition, at least until the first Regency Crisis, was out manoeuvred and was less effective on matters where Pitt specialised (finances and the economy). Where Pitt encountered unpopularity, as he did with 'luxury' taxes, they were dropped.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

1(b) How successful were Lord Liverpool's governments in meeting the radical challenge in the period from 1812 to 1822? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the relative success of the Liverpool governments in handling the radicals.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to have some understanding of the extent and nature of the radical challenge (building on French and English revolutionary ideas and made more telling by severe post-war economic disruption after 1815), and the limited nature of the means of effecting law and order (a reluctance to use the army, reliance on unpaid JPs, lack of a police force etc.) if they are to assess government response to the challenge.

If the challenge was considerable, then their approach in defending the status quo to 1822 merits some praise. If not, then the accusation of over reaction and 'black' repression of the poor are more appropriate. Did they push radicals into action whom they should have discouraged with a more moderate policy and fail to understand genuine economic protest like the March of the Blanketeers? Candidates need to assess the suspension of Habeas Corpus in 1817 and the new Seditious Meetings Bill in this light. The Peterloo 'Massacre' and the so called 'Black Acts' of 1819 would be useful examples to discuss.

Those candidates who stress a lack of success could point to the Home Secretary Sidmouth whom, it could be argued, overreacted given the information he received from anxious JPs and spies prone to exaggeration. The radicals scored many propaganda triumphs (the corn laws, Peterloo and the Queen Caroline case). However the Radicals were contained, the Six Acts were sensible by European standards (banning firearms), the leaders rather than the rank and file were targeted, control of the press was by cost rather than censorship, parliamentary majorities were obtained and Lord Liverpool prioritised economic stabilisation and was sensitive to petition (and to incidents like Peterloo). Governments and the social and political structures survived relatively unscathed.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

War and Peace 1793 – 1841

2(a) How important was Britain's involvement in the Peninsula War from 1808 in achieving eventual victory in the wars against France (1793 – 1815)? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the role taken by Britain in achieving victory in the French Wars.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to place the importance of the Peninsula campaigns alongside other factors in achieving victory. They might stress that it created an effective second front ('Spanish ulcer') which diverted over 200,000 men, that it enabled Britain to combine naval and military operation (the Lines of Torres Vedras) and that it worked well in conjunction with Spanish resistance providing a guerrilla war aspect that Napoleon and his generals found difficult to deal with. Eventually its demands led to resistance in South Western France (conscription) and enabled Britain to invade Southern France. Links could be made to diplomacy, the Peninsula commitment giving Britain the European clout she had lacked before, thus enabling her to create more effective coalitions against Napoleon.

However one can criticise its role as well as stressing other factors. Of itself it did not deliver Napoleonic retreat or personal defeat. Some argued the Low countries would have been a more effective deployment of resources, Wellington remained on the defensive until 1812 whilst political and military conditions were often chaotic. It could be argued that other factors were more important. The economic blockade was one reason why Napoleon was involved in the Peninsula in the first place, as it was to be with Russia. His defeat came in Central, Eastern and Northern Europe and had much to do with his own inability to make peace. The Grand Armee was destroyed there. Britain's naval power, linked to the blockade, could be seen as more important, as could diplomacy and financial subsidy.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

2(b) 'Palmerston's successes outweighed his failures in the period from 1830 to 1841.'
How far would you agree? [45]

Focus: An assessment of Palmerston's success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Palmerston was much criticised in the 1830's, for his inexperience, his handling of France (of whom he remained very suspicious) and the US and his risking of war, especially at the end of the decade when it seemed likely that Britain would go to war with France, China and the US simultaneously. Candidates might argue that by 1841 the stress was more on failure, especially if one looks at how he was unable to curb US power and slavery. He was disliked by ministerial colleagues (he had not been a Whig until 1830), not least because of his alleged duplicity and links to the press. However candidates could point to the weak situation he inherited in 1830, especially in the Eastern Question, that he had to compensate for the distrust shown by aristocratic colleagues by a bluff approach and that considerable patience was shown, culminating in success. He was able to check French and Russian ambition in the Near East, eliminating the threat posed by Mehmet Ali to the integrity of the Ottoman Empire after force was used at Acre. By careful diplomacy he did manage to reverse the diplomatic defeat in the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi in 1833 by the Straits Convention of 1841. In Western Europe he faced the more compliant regime of Louis Philippe in France and was able to block absolutist rulers in both Spain and Portugal, creating an arguably effective balance to the Holy Alliance through the Quadruple Alliance of 1834. The problem of Belgium and its separation from the Netherlands proved a success and could be a useful focus to demonstrate the question's assertion. Similarly China, trade and the Opium War of 1839 – 42 usefully demonstrates both success and failure, on the one hand creating new trade opportunities, on the other controversial 'gunboat' methods and 'moral' arrogance picked up on by a significant minority.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Age of Peel 1829 – 1846

3(a) To what extent did Peel regard Ireland as a law and order problem in the period from 1829 to 1846? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of Peel's attitudes to Ireland.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There are various lines of argument that can be developed - the problem of law and order which involved containing popular opposition, preventing both agrarian criminality (tithes) and the possibility of an uprising against the Act of Union versus the issue of reform, especially religious and economic and its role in Peel's Irish attitudes. Did Peel simply see Ireland as an issue of government and administration and how best to secure this?

The case for law and order could be made by examining the reasoning for Catholic Emancipation in 1829 and stressing the threat from O'Connell's Catholic Association, electoral rebellion of the Irish freeholders and the repressive aspects of the Emancipation Act. In the 1840's the Repeal Association and O'Connell's Monster meetings at Tara and Clontarf are seen

as threats by Peel to be met by the law, arrest, state trial and force (use of the military and especially the by now extensive Irish police). There is much evidence to suggest that Peel saw the Irish as in need of punishment.

However candidates could also argue that Peel looked to reform. He was prepared to concede, reluctantly, to emancipation and to examine the position of Irish tenants (Devon Commission and the Land Bill) and Catholic education (Maynooth). His actions during the Famine contrast well with those of the Whig government that followed. A case can be made for a constructive policy towards Ireland rather than simply a reactive one concerned simply to impose law and order.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

3(b) 'The main obstacle Peel faced in repealing the Corn Laws was his own party.' How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the obstacles to repeal of the Corn Laws.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most candidates are likely to agree with the assertion given the Tory rebellion over the Corn Laws and Peel's resignation following repeal. However there were other obstacles – the Cabinet, landowning opinion as expressed by the Anti-Corn Law League, the House of Lords and even the activities of the Anti-Corn Law League whom Peel did not want to appear beholden to. At certain stages these could appear to be more of an obstacle than the Tory party. Peel was inviting party conflict by deciding to repeal before another general election. The 1841 election had been fought on the issue of defending the Corn Laws from Whig change. The Tories had been alerted by Peel's lower duties in 1842 and by a series of policy conflicts between themselves and Peel since then. Peel failed to embark on a campaign to persuade them of the need for repeal (changing European and global food supplies and the need to cheapen food costs in Britain) and instead moved rapidly to introduce it.

Better candidates may discuss possible strategies here – to hand over to the Whigs and then return (made impossible by Russell's Edinburgh letter), or to wait for a general election in 1847 or 1848 and fight on the issue of repeal etc. To push ahead would ensure a large scale party revolt and hence dependency on Peelites, Whigs and Radicals. Once back-bench opinion received leadership (Buckingham, Richmond, Bentinck and Disraeli) who stressed betrayal Peel was doomed. However he also faced initial Cabinet opposition (with only a few resignations) and the problem of a landowning parliament. Here he was lucky that MPs were economically diversifying and parliament represented large scale agriculture, less threatened by Repeal and more open to reconciliation with commercial and manufacturing property. He secured Wellington's support (reciprocation for emancipation) and this helped with the Lords, as did royal support (Prince Albert). Repeal itself was also phased-in, with concessions in the Bill to Agriculture. The Anti-Corn Law League's campaigns were limited to certain agricultural areas.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Economy and Industrialisation 1780 – 1846**4(a) Assess the relative importance of the factors enabling Britain to become the first industrial nation during the period from 1780 to 1846. [45]**

Focus: An assessment of the factors driving the industrial revolution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must compare the pros and cons of the various factors, geographical (especially Britain's comparative size when it came to transport), a developed trading structure that was at the forefront of integrating world markets, rising population (production and consumption), the role of government (especially in promoting commercial wars, protecting trading routes and latterly de-restricting the economy), the issue of inventiveness, religious toleration and nonconformists and the question of social opportunities.

For each factor there is a possible counter argument which minimises its importance. One way of dealing with this is to look at developments throughout the period eg war might stimulate demand at one point in certain areas (Iron and textiles) depress at others. Some factors might be more influential when operating together (transport and raw materials, the availability of capital etc.). Candidates are more likely here to take a variety of stances with better ones perhaps more nuanced to certain areas and particular trades or industries (not all grew for the same reason). Nonetheless it is likely that trade, capital and the availability of water power and transport could figure highly as the more important factors.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

4(b) To what extent did factory work become the most important form of labour in the British economy in the period from 1780 – 1846? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the factory's alleged dominance of labour in the period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most candidates are likely to argue that factory labour remained untypical throughout the period. The factory was the product of the textile industry and even there was largely confined to Cotton until the 1810's when the Power loom was applied to wool. Its untypicality and questionability is demonstrated by the debate on conditions, hours and female and child labour. The only other areas affected were the Iron Industry and engineering after 1800. Some candidates might also include the Coal industry but much here remained traditional in form. In these areas the form of labour was new - more regulated hours, new types of exploitation, accidents and new types of division (did a new working class emerge?). However most remained employed in traditional trades and occupations, the vast majority, throughout the period, in Agriculture. In manufacturing the workshop or the home was more typical but just as exploitative of women and children, demanding long hours and just as open to accident as the factory. Even here most factories remained small in scale, especially in London. By the end of the period machinery and steam power was being applied to more trades but this was a trend associated with the period after the Great Victorian depression.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Britain 1846 – 1906**Whigs and Liberals 1846 – 1874**

5(a) Assess the reasons why the Whigs, Peelites and Radicals transformed themselves into the Liberal party during the period 1846 – 1868. [45]

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for the emergence of the Liberal Party to 1868.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most candidates are likely to see this as an inexorable process but better ones may stress that from 1846 to 1859 such groups were content to form a coalition headed by either Whigs (Russell and Palmerston) or Peelites (Aberdeen and ultimately Gladstone). The component parts did not have to stay together. The Peelites especially were expected to rejoin the Conservatives. A loose coalition could have continued in the 1860's. Issues that united them were a commitment to reform (economic and administrative for the Peelites; Civil, religious and constitutional for Whigs; political for the Radicals), a defence of free trade and a determination to exclude the Tories from power.

Better candidates could point out that they were also divisive issues and moments when quarrels between and within groups threatened the development of a liberal party. They could be Whig arguments over office (in 1852), misjudgements of the popular mood (Orsini affair 1858) and disagreements over foreign policy (Peelites and Radicals increasingly disliked Whig foreign policy on the Crimea, Greece, France and especially China).

Some candidates may examine each group, stressing the reason why they were prepared to be subsumed into a liberal party. The Whigs had always been prepared to co-operate with radicals and the reform minded, they were 'advanced' economically and were not challenged as the aristocratic leaders of society. They did not fear dilution and had espoused 'liberal' ideas on liberty, the constitution and civil rights. The Peelites were attracted by government and power but by the 1850's were a diminishing force. Constantly wooed by the Tories, they preferred, on the whole, to stick with the Whigs. By 1859 their surviving 'leader', Gladstone, was prepared to permanently associate with the Liberals, deterred as they were by the Tory presence and prominence of Disraeli, the destroyer of Peel. The Radicals were changing. No longer working class Chartists they were now urban and middle class, often ex-Anti Corn Law League (Cobden and Bright). A relatively small group of MPs, they could command nonconformity and the growing artisan skilled working class. Their best chance to influence policy was in association with Whigs and Peelites. If they all kept together they could exclude a growing Tory party even when that party introduced Parliamentary reform in 1867. The key issue on which they could unite was support for Italian unification (the occasion of the creation of the Liberal Party).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

5(b) How appealing was Gladstonian Liberalism to different groups in society in the period to 1874? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the appeal of Gladstonian Liberalism

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some candidates may examine the various groups in society during the period and their susceptibility to Liberalism (Upper Class, Middle Class, skilled working classes, Urban society, Nonconformity, the Celtic Fringe etc.). Others may approach the question through Liberal issues and the extent to which they appealed to various groups (peace, retrenchment, reform, free trade, foreign policy issues etc.).

Candidates will need to establish the limits to their appeal ('how appealing') and careful judgement is expected. They could point to growing appeal to 1872 and then a diminution given the unpopularity and divisiveness of some of the Gladstone ministry's reform (electoral defeat in 1874). Foreign policy issues could be attractive to some groups (the Nonconformists) but off-putting to others (Whig and Upper Class attitudes on the Crimea and later the Alabama arbitration). The same was true of Irish policy after 1868 which attracted nonconformity, the Celtic Fringe, radicals and the moderate Irish but alienated Whigs, Land, the radical Irish and the working class. Nonconformists were attracted by individualism, the moral energy and religious freedom but were alienated by Forster's Education Act and the Licensing Bill. In practice Gladstonian Liberalism found it difficult to reconcile freedom with some of the activist pressures of the period (on health, sobriety, literacy etc.). On the whole the Upper Working class found it appealing but did not want peaceful picketing. Candidates are likely to stress its appeal given liberal triumph for most of the period but careful qualifications on specific issues and an awareness of change will distinguish the better candidates.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Conservatives 1846 – 1880

6(a) Explain which was the more important reason for Disraeli's support for parliamentary reform in 1867: the need for constitutional change or political opportunism. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for Disraeli's support for Parliamentary reform.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to compare the two reasons. Although most are likely to argue for political opportunism they will need to demonstrate this. They could point to the speed of reform following the Liberal 1866 Bill – Disraeli feared another Whig – Liberal Reform Act to promote their electoral dominance and was determined to demonstrate conservative ability to pass and control major electoral reform. He was especially concerned to preserve core Tory county votes and may have hoped to make inroads into Liberal boroughs. On a personal level Disraeli was anxious to secure the succession to Derby, by no means a certainty until the success of the Reform Act, and to obstruct Gladstone's chance of succeeding to Russell. His tactics might also suggest political opportunism, especially his flexibility on the Borough franchise to woo the radical vote and his treatment of Gladstone's interventions. Fancy franchises were there to defer a Conservative revolt. Candidates could also use the evidence of the Rent v. Rate controversy or the Hodgkinson Amendment.

On the other hand there is much to suggest that the need for constitutional change was recognised by all. Disraeli and the Conservatives were the first to run with it (Palmerston and Gladstone were opponents in the 1850's) introducing a Bill in 1858. The evidence could suggest opportunism (the way out of the wilderness) but it did chime with a need to recognise other developments – prosperity, skilled artisans, a growing middle class, respectable radicalism (the Reform League and Union). A little discussion on Tory Democracy could be useful here. It could be argued that developments in popular politics (the press, the New Unions) played an important

role in Disraeli's support for reform, underlined by mass meetings like the Hyde Park Riots which pointed to the dangers of resisting constitutional change. Disraeli knew he would face opposition from his own party, especially the aristocratic right. The call for changes in the Borough was a strong one, yet Disraeli did little to recognise demographic change (redistribution) or the continuance of corruption (electoral methods).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

6(b) How far was imperial policy the main reason for Conservative defeat in the election of 1880? [45]

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for Conservative defeat in the 1880 election.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to assess the relative importance of imperialism in a disastrous conservative defeat in 1880 (353 to 238). Gladstone's Midlothian campaign focussed on the evils of Disraeli's imperialism, building on the disasters in South Africa (defeat by the Zulus) and Afghanistan. Coming almost together, Gladstone was able to mount a very effective campaign which reactivated Liberalism and cleverly made the link between budgetary surplus in 1874 and an £8 million deficit in 1880 caused by Disraeli's extravagant and costly Imperialism. It could be argued that it eclipsed earlier successes and the image of triumph created after the Congress of Berlin in 1878. It was difficult for Disraeli to transfer the blame onto others (Lytton and Frere) and he made no attempt to do so or even respond to the Midlothian Campaign, possibly because he thought, as in 1876 over Bulgaria, Gladstone's campaign had peaked early (it was for a by election).

However it is possible to challenge the importance of imperial mistakes in the election loss. Party managers predicted only a modest loss with a smaller conservative majority. Gladstone was vulnerable on Imperialism as 1877 – 78 demonstrated. Defeats could be wiped out by victories. Other factors, particularly for a domestic electorate, could be more important. Disraeli mistimed the election by going to the polls unnecessarily early, annoying Tory MP's who faced more expenses. Personally exhausted and increasingly ill, the campaign was a lacklustre one focussing on the dangers of Liberalism and an alleged sinister alignment with Parnell's Irish (he misread the Liverpool by-election). The Conservatives did badly in the Celtic Fringe (where they faced new Irish militancy) and also lost in the English Boroughs, clear evidence that the social reform of 1874 – 75 had been superficial and remained undeveloped politically and electorally. Possibly of more importance was the Agricultural and industrial depression of the late 1870's, especially given erosion in the Tory County core. Disraeli did nothing to help Land (ironic given 1846) and his own conclusion on the election was that he lost due to 'hard times'. Tory villadom (the retention of London and the South East) had yet to spread elsewhere. Candidates could also stress a revised Liberal organisation in comparison to Gorst's declining conservative one when faced with Disraeli's relative lack of interest.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846 – 1902

7(a) To what extent did the fear of Russia remain the most important consideration of British foreign policy during the second half of the 19th century? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the aim and priorities of British foreign policy 1846 – 1902.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to examine whether fear of Russia (navally and in terms of military expansion) remained the overriding priority for British foreign policy throughout. Clearly she was a priority at certain periods – 1853 – 56, 1870 – 78, 1884 – 85 but it could be argued that France replaced her in 1859 – 63 (Italian Unification and the Naval scares) and in the 1880's and 1890's (Egyptian and African competition culminating in the Fashoda Incident), or Germany at the end of the period (1898 – 1902 or possibly in the early 1870's over the DreiKaiserbund). Fruitful areas to test priority (most important?) would be the Crimean War, the Eastern Question as it developed after 1856 (especially the 1875 – 78 Crisis) and the Polish Revolt in 1863. Although not necessary given its imperial slant candidates may also refer to the Russian threat to Central Asia and Afghanistan (fears for India). Russia was, throughout, seen as the other great European power, first manipulating the Holy Alliance and then the DreiKaiserbund to dominate central and Eastern Europe. Although Britain's priorities are the strategic importance of the Straits and from 1869 the Suez Canal (warding off the possibility of a Russian naval threat in the Mediterranean) the Balkans were also crucial (invaded twice by Russia in 1854 and in 1877). Candidates could usefully discuss the Ottoman Empire's importance for Britain with Russia as the clear danger. Here later German penetration could be a useful counterpart to continued fear of Russia. Britain, as a global power, had many considerations (the US for example) and plenty can be used to balance fear of Russia.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

7(b) Assess the view that governments were less enthusiastic about Imperialism than the people during the period from 1880 to 1902. [45]

Focus: A comparison between governments and people as to who was more imperially enthusiastic.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to compare popular and governmental views on imperialism with a particular focus on whether government were influenced or pushed into imperial policy as a result of popular pressure. Could popular pressure ever be organised enough to determine policy?

The evidence for popular imperialism is mixed. On the one hand candidates could point to considerable popular enthusiasm – the mass circulation press backed it, the growth of education found Empire a useful means of instruction, comics stressed daring deeds and the need to rescue upholders of the flag. Exploration, geographical curiosity, a continued enthusiasm to counter the Slave Trade, the networked support for missionaries, the Diamond Jubilee in 1897 and the hysteria of Mafeking Night built on a growing sense of race, the White Man's burden and of splendid isolation. However there were groups who resisted this – Gladstonian Liberals, Nonconformists, Little Englanders, the Trade Unions, the skilled working class and traditional Middle Class radicalism.

The evidence suggests that, with some exception, governments were much more reluctant to commit themselves and were suspicious of men on-the-spot manipulating press and opposition to ensure metropolitan backing. Gladstone sought a tactical retreat in Afghanistan, South Africa and the Sudan in the early 1880's; the Conference of Berlin in 1884 was more of an attempt to limit and control a process that seemed out of control. Interventions were prompted by specific crises. Salisbury was notoriously reluctant to compete for areas of 'light soils', the press blowing the Fashoda incident out of all proportion in 1898. However candidates could point to the rise of the Liberal Imperialists who sought a more active policy in the Liberal Party and to the role of Chamberlain in Conservatism as evidence to suggest government initiative. The latter is a useful corrective to the question's assertion and his link with Milner and Cecil Rhodes could be developed. Did responsibility for the 2nd Boer War lie with Chamberlain or with men on the spot? Similarly Gladstone's occupation of Egypt in 1882 would suggest that governments could be proactive. Neither Conservative nor Liberal governments could neglect public opinion as Gladstone found to his cost over the death of Gordon at Khartoum in 1884. Imperialism was a vote winner for the Conservatives amongst the Lower Middle Class throughout the period.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Trade Unions and Labour 1867 – 1906

8(a) To what extent did Conservative and Liberal governments change their views on Trade Unions in the period from 1867 to 1906. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of government views on Trade Unions over time.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to examine both governments throughout the period. It could be argued that both were suspicious of Trade Unions in practice, fearing an intrusion upon the sanctity of the labour market, but both could see the value in tying the labour movement into their respective parties. The liberals, the party of the urban middle class where business was prominent, reflected such views throughout, although Gladstone became convinced that the skilled working class were moral and had demonstrated self help and restraint (the New Model Unions). He supported them getting the vote in 1866 – 67 and won the 1868 election. Liberal Trade Union Legislation in 1872 was prepared to legalise Unions fully, bringing them under Friendly Society legislation but he and Bruce were not prepared to sanction picketing as a strike weapon.

Disraeli's Conservatives took a very similar line. Whereas liberalism was absorbing lib-labbery and the new T.U.C were impeccably Gladstonian, Conservatives, more rooted in the rural areas, had less to lose and were prepared to put employer and employee on the same legal basis and allow peaceful picketing. Thus the TUC and the New Model Unions were accepted in Victorian civil society in the 1870's. Candidates could argue that such attitudes remained until the 1890's. Neither party accepted the more radical New Unions of the 1880's, despite 'Tory Democracy', Lord Randolph Churchill and Chamberlain. Nor did they seem worried by its links with a developing Socialism and large scale 'general' unions. Despite the Workmen's Compensation Act the Conservatives changed in the 1890's condoning a legal employer association and Employer Federation backlash against ever larger Unions which saw a drop in Trade Union membership after 1891. It could be argued that many liberals felt the same about this. The Taff Vale judgement in 1901 and the Blackburn Weaver's case in 1903 saw the move to found the LRC by some of the Unions prompting a re-appraisal of liberal policy, indemnifying Unions against financial liability for strikes in the 1906 Trade Union Act. The New Liberalism, lacking much of an equivalent in the Conservatives (who were condemned over 'Chinese Slavery'), was

prepared to move on issues that the Trade unions campaigned upon and liberalism moved to reabsorb labour and Trade Unionism, as it had in the 1860's and 1870's.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

8(b) Which was more important in the emergence of the Labour party from 1886 to 1906: new political groups or the Trade Unions? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: A comparison of two factors in explaining the emergence of labour to 1906.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Whilst candidates may refer to other factors the focus needs to be on the comparative importance of the political groups (Fabians 1884, the Scottish Labour Party in 1888, the SDF in 1884 and the ILP in 1894) and the Trade Unions. Candidates are likely to argue that the latter were the more important. The groups were divided, not least on methods and although socialist ideology remained undefined in the Labour Party in this early period reflecting undocrinal Unions, their very socialism could be seen as off-putting to a working class whose leadership tended to be liberal. Much separated the SDF and the Fabians who argued amongst themselves. The SDF soon left the LRC. The groups were dominated by middle class intellectuals.

However candidates could point to the importance of the ILP and to Keir Hardie's leadership. His insistence on independent labour representation was of definite importance and he acted as a model Labour MP from 1892 although his election itself was a stroke of luck. He sought to bring the political groups together but was unable to avoid the disaster of 1895. Similarly Fabian methodology (reformist gradualism) had a huge impact on the development of Labour and candidates could usefully refer to the Webbs to illustrate this. It was Hardie's initiative to bring the Unions and the political groups together in 1900. Candidates could also stress that the groups provided most of the leadership of the LRC. Better candidates might stress that the Trade Unions were resolutely liberal before 1900 and many large Unions like the Miners and other crafts remained so in 1906. Unlike the groups, their leadership was not socialist and it is unlikely that they would have moved to 'independence' without the employer and Conservative backlash of the 1890's and early 1900's (Taff Vale, Lyons v Wilkins and the Blackburn Weaver Case), or the Liberal reluctance to rescue them. The Trade Unions were as divided as the political groups. However there was huge potential, both in finance and in the size of their membership (2 million by 1900). It was the TUC which made the decision to bring Unions and parties together. The Unions could deliver constituencies and determined the growth of the party between 1900 and 1906. Better candidates might stress the limits to this.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Britain 1899 – 1964**Liberal and Labour 1899 – 1918**

9(a) 'Tariff Reform was the most important problem the Conservatives faced in the period from 1899 – 1905'. How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the problems facing the Conservatives 1899 to 1905.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to establish the problems facing the Conservative governments of Salisbury and Balfour. Some may refer to weak leadership (the 'Hotel Cecil'), to a declining party organisation and to the impact of the Boer War – questions about its handling, the 'methods of barbarism' and the peace settlement (was too much conceded?). Some may refer to social issues, especially the controversy surrounding Balfour's Education Act of 1902 and the alienation of the working class by employer attacks on Unions and the issue of Chinese Slavery. However equally candidates could argue that these had less impact on the Conservatives than they did on the liberals, albeit by rallying traditional liberal support (Nonconformists over Education, the Unions over Chinese Slavery and the old liberals via opposition to expensive and failed imperial wars). Tariff reform will be seen by many candidates as the most important problem for Conservatism although it was not launched until 1903. It threatened to split them and lose them votes. Chamberlain's Fair Trade attacks on Free Trade split the party into the traditional Free Fooders and those who advocated Tariff Reform to achieve Fair Trade and a revenue, paid by foreign consumers, to fund social reform. Chamberlain failed to win the Tariff Reform argument, of particular importance given a growing working class electorate whose votes would be sought by New Liberalism and the LRC. The Conservatives were saddled with the image of the small loaf, with little answer on social issues and with the fact that now the Liberals had no monopoly on damaging splits.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

9(b) How far did Liberal governments mishandle Irish issues during the period from 1909 to 1916? [45]

Focus: An assessment of the liberal handling of Irish issues to 1916.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to demonstrate an understanding of the issues the Liberals faced. Ireland had the ability to split the party so that a commitment to Home Rule could be dangerous, both electorally and in terms of party. Dependence on Redmond's Nationalists would make this very difficult to avoid after the 1910 elections and liberal abolition of the Lord's veto now made Home Rule inevitable. Similarly a commitment to Home Rule would antagonise Ulster, now linked to Conservatism. It threatened to resist the imposition of Home Rule, just as the South threatened resistance if the Liberals failed to impose it. The Liberals (and the Nationalists) also faced a rise in revolutionary nationalism, articulated by Sinn Fein and culminating in the Easter Rising.

Some may view Asquith as having mishandled these issues. In the Irish sense the two elections of 1910 forced Asquith to introduce Home Rule in 1912. He failed to take account of Ulster or make separate legislative provisions for it (either temporary or permanent exclusion from it or grant two separate Home Rule parliaments in Belfast and Dublin). As a result he faced a serious backlash from Ulster in the form of the Solemn League and Covenant and militarisation via the

UVF. Bonar Law's Conservatives appeared to back this, yet Asquith failed to exploit their dangerous tactics. Similarly Seely at the War Office appeared to condone 'mutiny' at the Curragh, implying that the government would not use force to impose their Bill. Redmond's support it could be argued, was taken for granted and he was in turn undercut by Sinn Fein. Asquith's Amending Bill (exempting Ulster for 6 years) was shot down by the Lords. Asquith was only 'saved' by the onset of the 1st World War. Then it appeared he was conceding too much to the men of Ulster – Carson joined the cabinet in 1915, Ulster was allowed its own Division on the Western Front. In 1916 again (of exemption for 6 years of Ulster) he could be blamed for overreacting to the Easter Rising via martial law and repression.

However it is possible to mount a defence of the liberal governments. Asquith was, arguably, right to avoid a commitment before 1912 to Home Rule given its devastating impact on post 1886 liberalism. He may have been right to see that Redmond had nowhere else to go and would have to look to the liberals. Before 1916 Sinn Fein remained a small party and liberal secretaries in Dublin had done much to solve traditional Irish problems (large sums had been spent). One could not necessarily have foreseen the eclipse of Redmond's nationalists. Asquith may have been right to let the Conservatives take the consequence of their support for Ulster extremism. His preference for a 'wait and see' policy with continued negotiation (Buckingham Palace conference) can be justified. 1912 was passed in 1914 pending the War's duration. Redmond's reaction in 1914 was a patriotic one. In 1916 Asquith moved quickly, after General Maxwell's repression, to resume negotiations on Home Rule. It was the Unionists (but not Carson) who blocked it and any defence of the liberal governments will involve the difficulties they faced with the Lords, the Conservatives and especially the Unionists.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918 – 1939

10(a) Assess the most important problems that led to the fall of Lloyd George's government in 1922. [45]

Focus: An assessment of the most important problems leading to the fall of Lloyd George's government in 1922.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

It is likely that most candidates will stress the importance of the unusual nature of Lloyd George's government ie a largely conservative one (382 out of the total number of 515) the rank and file of which remained distrustful of the Welsh wizard, tolerant only because of their fear of socialism post 1918. Lloyd George was the man who won the war and an enormous electoral asset. Once the Conservatives saw that he was diminishing in electoral importance they would pluck up courage to end the government. Some candidates may stress Lloyd George's own mistakes in encouraging this – his preference for presidential power, his contempt for Tory values (over Honours for example) policies (doing deals with Irish Republicans and Terrorists like Collins) and promotion (the older generation of Tory leader and Coalition Liberals were preferred), his so called 'stage army' and Garden Suburb (annoying and wasteful). Candidates could also stress divisions over the economy and the problems created by the Slump after 1919. Lloyd George lost much support from the Liberals over the Geddes Axe applied to Housing and Education whilst his intervention in Coal and other Industries annoyed the Tories. Many of the latter wanted to reassert control over their own party and considered their own leadership, after the retirement of Bonar Law in 1921 as too much beholden to Lloyd George. Those candidates who wish to stress this as the most important reason could point to the Carlton Club rebellion which triggered the fall of the government. Here the key was less Lloyd George than the

mishandling of the meeting by the new Tory leader, Austen Chamberlain. The Government might have survived if Chamberlain had agreed that Lloyd George would go as PM at the next election. The Newport by-election proved an independent, non coalition, Conservative could defeat a Socialist. Better candidates could stress how all these factors are inter-related (policy, Lloyd George's character, Conservative fears, the conservative leadership, post war circumstances). A judgement over the most important problems is expected.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

10(b) Assess the claim that social change did more to solve the economic problems of the 1930's than the policies of the National governments. [45]

Focus: A comparison of the role of social change and policy in solving the economic problems of the 1930's.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to achieve a balance between social change and government policy although it is to be expected that more will be known about policy. Given that social change could easily have more effect than government policy pre 1939 the question's premise may be correct. National governments, largely Conservative, remained cautious under MacDonald, Baldwin and Chamberlain but it could be argued specific policies had a considerable impact on solving economic decline in old staple industries, deflation, unemployment, regional problems and investment. The Steel industry is a good example of relative success. In 1932, as part of the end of Free Trade, a 33% Tariff was imposed and integrated Steel works were encouraged (Corby). Government subsidies to shipbuilding saw modest revival. Policies could have a considerable impact – the currency was stabilised after the 1931 crisis, with Sterling at a more competitive value once gold was abandoned, cheap food and falling prices were maintained via the Ottawa agreements, benefit cuts were restored in 1934 with transitional benefit recognising long term unemployment and investment became more focussed on regional economic problems (special Areas Act of 1934). Of particular importance was Chamberlain's policy of cheap money. Interest rates were cut from 6% to 2%, facilitating one of the key growth areas of the 1930's, Housing, of great importance to the unskilled unemployed. Government rearmament in the second half of the 1930's was also crucial in industries like aircraft. However textiles remained depressed and government could not counter excess capacity, out dated machinery nor encourage sufficient amalgamation. In shipbuilding government subsidy was countered by weak management and restricted work practices.

However candidates could agree with the question's assertion, seeing some of these successes as more due to social change. This is particularly true of housing growth which in turn benefited new fuels like electricity and then new consumer products. A social trend towards such growth in the Midlands and South or within a region to certain newer towns or suburbs encouraged employment, especially in the newer industries which exploited the home market more than unstable export ones. With falling prices those in work gained, especially if family size declined. Yet social change could benefit some areas and social groups, like the salaried middle class, a key factor in housing demand. It could not solve the economic problems of those concentrated in some older industrial areas (Jarrow, Cotton based Lancashire or Welsh coalfields) where the unemployed were concentrated. For those workers employed in industries providing for middle class demand there was also a rise in living standards (vehicles, chemical, electrical and retail industries). Better candidates might point out that government policy merely followed and reflected social change such as the rise of leisure industries (radio, film, holiday camps, paperbacks, dancing etc.). However governments paid the dole whatever the controversy over means testing.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Foreign Policy 1939 – 1963

11(a) How far would you agree that the influence of the Suez Crisis (1956) was the most important event in encouraging decolonisation in the period from 1945 to 1960?

[45]

Focus: An assessment of the relative importance of the Suez Crisis in decolonisation 1945 – 1960.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates could point out that until 1959 governments remained committed to the Empire rather than to decolonisation. What could encourage it were general factors – the strength of colonial opposition, British military and economic power, external factors (UN, US, Soviets etc.) or public opinion at home. Suez demonstrated the importance of external factors, especially the US application of financial pressure on Sterling, and of domestic public opinion. British governments regarded the Canal as an essential imperial asset, guarding trade routes to the East, the Empire in general and especially Middle Eastern Oil. However they had already lost the Suez military base between 1954 – 56, hence the need to invade in 1956. 1954 had been the result of pressure from Nasser and the US, some of the new competing powers to replace British dominance of the region (the other was the USSR, clearly the reason for US involvement).

Better candidates might argue Suez was more about the means of dealing with change (force v. diplomacy) than about decolonisation, given that Britain had already left Egypt (technically in 1922). However it explicitly demonstrated Britain's military weakness (the expedition failed) and her dependence on US support (hostile to the continuance of Empire), although Britain continued to commit forces abroad - the Anglo-Malayan Defence Agreement was signed only a year later in 1957. Did it mentally change British opinion on Empire, directly leading to the 'winds of change' in Africa or was it just a symptom of an inevitable dissolution, obvious from the end of the Second World War and underlined by the withdrawal from India in 1947?

Indeed, some candidates may well argue that this was of more importance (loss of the 'brightest jewel') in encouraging decolonisation. Suez, it can be argued, had a more direct impact on Africa than India or Palestine. It helped to trigger French withdrawal which in turn encouraged change in British Africa. Nasser offered aid to African nationalists and himself embraced Soviet aid. Britain continued to cut her military bases overseas. MacMillan, Eden's successor, was able to use Suez to change the direction of the pro Empire Conservatives. 1959 did reflect a formal decision to get out of Africa, the post 1945 imperial hope, and move towards Europe.

Candidates however can either argue that Suez forced change or that it merely reflected pressures there since 1945 and was a symptom rather than a cause (Britain had already provided self rule to her colonies but hoped economically and politically to tie them in to the Commonwealth, trade and Sterling). More specific factors could be seen as far more important in decolonisation – nationalism, US pressure, the nature of the Global economy, difficulties in managing the Commonwealth etc.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

11(b) How far would you agree that a desire to influence the USA was Britain's main motive for involvement in the Cold War from 1945 to 1953. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of Britain's motive for involvement in the Cold War to 1953.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to balance influence over the US against other factors that involved Britain in a developing Cold War in the period. Better candidates may well try to stress change within 1945 – 53, especially given the need to readjust to political, economic and military realities. Of more importance might be fear of extended Soviet influence, particularly in Europe, confirmed by Soviet behaviour post Yalta in her occupied zones. It was clear that the USSR was Britain's major enemy and Cold War involvement was there from the inception, although it was also clear that if the Empire was to be maintained then the US could also be a problem.

However initially it was necessary to influence the US into taking Soviet threats seriously. If Britain could no longer sustain global capacity or even her agreements over spheres of influences in the Balkans and Eastern Mediterranean with the USSR, then the US was needed to block Soviet influence (Persia, Italy, Greece and Turkey between 1946 – 1947). Britain did not want the US to lapse into isolationism. Both Marshall Aid in 1947 (Britain was the main recipient) and NATO in 1949 could be seen as successful British attempts to tie the US into European economic and defence commitments. However, Britain's pursuit of an independent nuclear capacity, having been frozen out by the US, showed the limits and failures of influence – could the US be trusted to come to Britain's aid before 1949?

Some candidates might argue that as far as Britain was concerned a Cold War was bound to happen given the growth of Soviet power and fear of Communism. This could be relied upon to involve the US. Against this candidates might point to Britain's strategy to maintain great power status and a place at the top table. A 'special relationship' with the US enabled Britain to 'punch above her weight' as the Bevin-Truman understanding demonstrated, but Korea and China underlined the limitations of influencing the US. Britain was acutely aware of her economic and financial position vis a vis the US. This dictated close co-operation and influence. The Cold War was a card that could be played, although Keynes did not use it in his Washington negotiations. Over Greece and Turkey in 1947 a British announcement on ending financial aid to both was a clear hint for the US to pick up the bill which she accordingly did via Marshall Aid. Other factors in the Cold War would be British involvement in Germany and her concern over West European defence. Better candidates could point to the latter as an example of how interlocking the factors affecting British policy were, as she was convinced of the need to involve the US in underwriting European defence.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Post War Britain 1945 – 1964

12(a) To what extent were the Labour party's internal divisions the main cause of its defeat in the 1951 general election? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the causes of labour's defeat in the 1951 election.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Internal divisions had worsened in the years before the 1951 election. There was considerable personal dislike between Bevin and Morrison and whereas Atlee had successfully contained division before 1950 by being moderate and anti communist, from then on division between left and right did emerge. This focussed around the rearmament proposed by Chancellor Gaitskell to deal with Korea and Britain's Cold War Asian commitments. To save elsewhere meant welfare cuts, notably the breach in Bevan's Health Service 'free at the point of care' (prescription charges). Bevan, Wilson and Freeman all resigned in protest from the government in April 1951, but only Bevan was a heavyweight figure at this stage. The rest were moderates and accepted the need to preserve Britain's great power status. Another divisive issue had been the nationalisation of Iron and Steel in 1951.

Examination of the election however might serve to downplay internal divisions. The main electoral issues were linked to continued 'austerity'. Wartime rigour and continued economic difficulties allowed Conservatives to attack government finances and their social spending programme. Devaluation benefits had yet to work through in 1951 and the experience, despite a 'bonfire' of controls in the late 1940's, was one of restriction, rationing shortages and red-tape (the 'Housewives' League). Conservatives stressed a need to reduce the State's rule whilst failures to deliver sufficient Housing contrasted with the Conservative promise of 300,000 new homes to be provided by the private sector. Indeed candidates could also point to considerable Conservative recovery since 1945 – an increased membership, re-organisation and better funding. This image (more youthful and democratic) was stressed in the Maxwell – Fyfe report of 1949. Conservatives under Butler accepted the mixed economy and the popularity of many labour reforms. The Conservative Industrial Charter stressed balance between labour and Industry, losing their association with the 'wasted' years of the 1930's. However better candidates might stress how close the 1951 election was. Labour secured its highest poll to date and gained a larger share of the vote (49% to the Conservatives 48%). The Conservative majority was not of the order of Labour in 1945. This might suggest that labour was more the victim of a pendular swing and exhaustion than either internal or economic difficulties.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

12(b) How far would you agree that effective leadership was the main reason why the Conservatives remained in power from 1951 to 1964? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the reason why the Conservatives were in power 1951 – 1964.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

It could be argued that Conservative leadership was the main reason. Churchill, Eden and MacMillan could all be effective. In the Cold War 1950's Churchill and Eden were vote winners, whilst the former's illness was kept carefully hidden. Eden's blunder and his failure to command the trust of his colleagues over Suez were not exposed to the verdict of a general election, just as his successor Macmillan's mistakes over Profumo similarly avoided the electorate's judgement. Macmillan was able to combine aristocratic pedigree with a sure economic touch and a 'modern' feel bolstered by an effective use of TV. He could also be ruthless as the Night of the Long Knives demonstrated. Candidates could usefully examine how he weathered the economy's downturn 1957 – 58 and the resignation of Thorneycroft and the entire Treasury team. It illustrates both the importance of economic factors and effective leadership. Only Alec Douglas Hume proved to be a mistake, at the end of the period. The Conservatives always moved quickly to remove weak leaders before they faced an election. There were also plenty of talent and ideas for the Conservatives to choose from - Butler, Maudling, Powell and MacLeod as leaders and especially the property owning democracy within a mixed economy as the key

policy. Hailsham and MacMillan also paid attention to new election methods – opinion polls and modern public relations.

However candidates might stress that Conservative dominance was underpinned by economic prosperity and relative affluence. This enabled them to dismantle the bureaucracy of ‘austerity’ and gain the credit. Taxes were reduced but social expenditure could continue to grow, allowing NHS spending to grow and the early completion of the promised 300,000 homes. Full employment spread the gains more widely. Although there were blips in 1958 the boom had resumed by the time of the 1959 election, another Conservative victory. Labour divisions and weakness were evident (Bevanites v. Gaitskellites) but unlikely to be the main reason for Conservative electoral dominance. The Cold War also played into the hands of the Conservatives – Churchill and MacMillan were able to exploit their relationship with Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy to good effect and whether imperial challenges like Suez or Africa. Social change also aided the Conservatives – the move towards a service economy and the consolidation of a firmly middle and lower middle class electorate who looked to moderate conservative leaders and a working class that could also be attracted to Conservatism.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Mark Scheme 2585
June 2007**

2585 EUROPEAN HISTORY 1045-1718**Europe 1046-1250****The Reform of the Church 1046-1122****1(a) Assess the reasons why Henry IV and Gregory VII clashed in the Investiture Contest. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of role of individual in context of major historical event

No set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question.

Gregory's personal responsibility can be interpreted broadly. He was strong-minded, wilful, volatile, temperamental and assertive. Candidates will need to move beyond this, however, to engage with his principal ideas, putting these into context of prevailing ideological positions of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, a developing programme of reform ideas, imperial attitudes and practices. Gregory's ideas included: paramountcy of *justicia*, sovereignty and so supremacy of the pope over Christian society (including bishops and kings); the necessity for 'suitability' of office-holders in ordered society; the illegitimacy of lay control over clerics. Such ideas had a powerful impact, above all the attack on lay investiture and the idea of the deposition of a king.

Henry IV was strong-willed, determined and principled (as he believed). He was fiercely jealous of his perceived powers and primacy as Emperor over Church affairs. To him, the Pope was at best an ally, more a servant, of Imperial needs. He would not compromise over key rights, not least investiture. Some of the context was political. Other factors which might be mentioned include: the effects of events before 1073; the establishment of a reforming Papacy and its initial measures; the minority of Henry IV and the retreat of the German Crown and advance of the Papacy during those years; the internal problems of Henry IV once he attained majority; and so Gregory VII's agenda and the threats to traditional German monarchical practices, including those relating to the Church. Candidates who dwell wholly upon **EITHER** Henry IV **OR** Gregory VII, no matter the strengths of their answer, will **not be able to go above Band III**.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. 'Assess ...' will be strong in focus. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

1(b) Assess the reasons why the Cluniacs lost much of their appeal in the period from 1046 to 1122. [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of religious change

No set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question.

Here candidates need to focus on the Cluniacs and any references to other Orders need to be used only as contextual evidence. The religious-spiritual context was important in respect of, for example, the Benedictine Rule, prayers, good works, ways to salvation, traditions of patronage, family connections, benefactions, the appeal of monastic life to the younger members of families. Increasingly, the Cluniacs were criticised for pursuing a 'contaminated' form of Benedictinism; they had, it was said, lost the true and pure nature of the Rule. Their leadership, it was alleged, had become lacklustre and too closely identified with lay society and its leaders, accepting too readily extensive endowments. They were over-centralised and too formalised, even formulaic. They were no longer committed to key aspects of the *Opus Dei* and it was felt, not least by their Cistercian critics, that they had lost their sense of brotherhood and become

over-institutionalised. Other Orders offered (or appeared to offer) alternatives, not least a pure, strong commitment to the Benedictine ideal. A strong focus upon 'Assess ...' and a good sense of prioritisation will be features of the **top Bands**.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

France and the Empire 1152-1250

2(a) How successfully did Frederick Barbarossa intervene in Italy? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of policy area

No set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question.

A strong focus upon 'How successfully' is important. Candidates are likely to conclude there was little success but evaluation of levels of success (or failure) matter. Frederick had territorial and ideological interests and ambitions. Between 1156 and 1158 he asserted a range of regalian-imperial prerogatives putting him on a collision course with both the North Italian towns and the Papacy. In 1162 he destroyed much of Milan and forced Alexander III out of Rome between 1160 and 1166. But the Lombard League wore down his forces, culminating in a major defeat at Legnano in 1176. In 1182 he recognised urban liberties while in 1177 he was publicly forgiven by the Pope after being forced to compromise. Quiescence with the Papacy and Lombard League might be seen as partial success and he retained control of areas of the North and the wealth there. That said, Papal authority was strong and Frederick had to make important concessions in 1177. Barbarossa made six expeditions to Italy and these subsumed a high proportion of his reign. The levels of commitment and involvement were high. He had inherited both an interest and an involvement in Italian affairs and in dealings with the Papacy, in part the product of his imperial position. Such were heightened by his Imperial Coronation in 1155. Reasons for involvement embraced the obvious attractions of wealth and material gain allied to a boost to power, location and prestige; issues of control, not least over the Papacy (events of 1159-76) and over the growing power and pretensions of the Lombard Communes. Frederick saw himself as Emperor and was ambitious; there were profits in involvement in Italy; he probably had imperial ambitions and dreams (evidenced in a view of Italy as German by conquest and not Papal gift, clashes with Pope Alexander III over 'imperial' actions and decisions, the use of Roman law and lawyers and imperial theory against Papal ideology). The context of Emperor-Pope clashes will need to be adduced too.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

2(b) How far was Philip Augustus able to strengthen the French monarchy? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for developing French royal power

No set answer is required, but candidates will need to focus strongly and well upon the nature and extent of development ('How far ...?') of the power of the monarchy.

Some sense of context, of inheritance and legacy, would be useful but is not a pre-requisite for even full marks. The inheritance from Louis VI and VII undoubtedly helped. Philip's personality

was a strong one and he displayed a range of skills, military, diplomatic and political. He was aided by the problems of his opponents, above all the Angevins, and he manipulated a favourable context, using his position and authority as a feudal suzerain and using an expanding resources-base. A developing administrative structure, good use of royal lands, alliances with towns, the skilful use of law, the mobilisation of wealth (aided by territorial additions and a much enlarged revenue base) all helped Philip. There was a clear sense of ambition allied to energy, purpose and ruthlessness on occasion and the development of, for example, the *baillis* and *sénéchaux*, a provincial network, a powerful royal Court, the mixture of sacral and seignorial powers, all enhanced the royal position. Some sense of contrast between 1180 and 1223 would be useful here.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Crusading and the Crusader States 1095-1192

3(a) Assess the reasons why the Crusader States were able to survive in the period 1100-43. [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of success within context of Crusading States

No set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question.

A strong sense of 'Assess ...' allied to a prioritisation of factors will be important. The new states faced a range of serious problems, including climate and terrain, a shortage of settlers, geographical location and vulnerability, internal divisions and rivalries, uneasy relations with the Byzantine Emperor. But they were able often to avoid open, pitched battles, build castles as key defence points, deploy a range of diplomatic as well as military skills to keep opponents divided and, indeed, rely upon those opponents to remain disunited (at least until 1143). There were some strong personalities and feudal bonds provided a backbone of resistance to pressures. Rulers such as Baldwin and Fulk of Anjou or Bohemond of Antioch; military successes (for example 1102, 1105, 1123, 1125); the handling of the rising threat of Zangi after 1137-8, might be cited.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

3(b) To what extent can the Third Crusade be viewed as a total failure?

[45]

Focus: Evaluation of outcome of major historical event

No set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers in the top Bands will have a strong focus upon 'To what extent' as well as upon the sense of argument here, namely whether the Third Crusade was a complete failure or not. Candidates may well argue that it was a failure and well-presented points will reach the top Band. A balanced answer, assessing possible successes as against failures, will be worthy of reward in the **top two Bands**. There was failure in terms of the ultimate goals, the outright defeat of Saladin's forces and the recovery of Jerusalem and the Holy Places (etc.). The tensions between Richard I and Philip Augustus as well as the consequences of the untimely death of Frederick Barbarossa could well be assessed; Christian disunity and suspicions were features. Then again, Richard I in particular fought Saladin to something of a standstill and there was a truce, with a promise (nothing more) of a return to crusading action later. Cyprus was acquired; there was success at Acre; the peace settlement confirmed Jaffa (itself a useful port) as Christian and allowed Christians access to Jerusalem; some blows to Muslim morale were delivered; the existing Crusader States were preserved for a while longer. However, territorial gains were not great; survival alone was the future for the States; the strengths of Muslim power and the importation of further rivalries were evidenced.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good, persistent focus upon 'To what extent' and the needs of the question. Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century.

4(a) To what extent was the rise of the merchants the most important social development of the twelfth century?

[45]

Focus: Assessment of social changes

No set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question.

No set answer is required, but candidates will need to assess the rise of the merchants as a definable social group as against other social changes in the period in order to answer the focus of the question 'To what extent?'. A focus solely on merchants is not expected and proper evaluation does require a broader contextual approach. The number of merchants, their commercial activity, their importance, indeed their wealth, did grow in this period, for a variety of reasons. Risks were considerable but profits and status were commensurate – urban locations, markets, international connections, expanded trade routes were all important and candidates might cite area examples (for example Italian Communes, Low Countries or French merchant successes). Merchants were valuable to rulers and important to the transmission of wealth and ideas. However, other social changes need consideration: for example, the further definition of the knightly class, the growth in intellectuals and teachers, the development of a recognisable administrative class.

Answers in **Bands III and above** will need to examine the merchants' place alongside several other changes within society. Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

4(b) How far was there a Renaissance in learning during the twelfth century? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of character, extent and nature of major historical event

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may argue about the validity of the term ‘Renaissance’, though most may accept its usage. A broad time span (c. 1050-1250) is possible, though the focus in illustrative content should be primarily on the twelfth century. Some contextual sense is to be expected, for example, growth in government and law; the need for well-trained and literate administrators/officials for kings, nobles, merchants; the Investiture Contest and its effects on scholarship and the search for the means to buttress arguments; developments in canon law; contacts with the Muslim world; a greater sense of critical enquiry. ‘Learning’ may produce a focus upon literary areas, but references to arts and culture and architecture are also fine. Revived scientific interests, a strong interest in classical learning, maturing humanism, the roles of masters and teachers may be mentioned, as also activities from a wide field of Northern Europe (especially Paris) and Southern Europe (Bologna, Montpellier, Salerno).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. There will be a strong focus on ‘How far ...’. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Europe 1450 – 1530

The Italian Renaissance 1450 – 1530

5(a) Assess the importance of economic factors in the development of the Renaissance in Italy from 1450 to 1530. [45]

Focus: An assessment of the factors in an historical development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should examine economic factors such as trade, the wealth of particular groups and states, banking in Florence and the use made from these sources for cultural purposes. Candidates may provide specific examples of families or groups or institutions who used their wealth to promote the Renaissance, for example the Medici family, the role of guilds or the papacy. Candidates may also consider the role of trade in providing materials and money for the developments. Candidates should also consider the role of other factors such as political (the city states and civic pride) and cultural ones (the interest in classical ideas) as well as the effects of patronage. There should be some linkage of factors to access the higher levels and some statement of the relative importance of economic issues compared with others.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

5(b) Compare the contribution of Florence and Venice to the development of the Renaissance from 1450 to 1530. [45]

Focus: The significance of two states in the development of a key movement

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates are likely to focus on the origins of the Renaissance in Florence compared with its late flowering in Venice. They may draw attention to the difference in the nature of the governments of the two which nevertheless resulted in support for cultural developments for the same reasons. Comparisons are likely to be made between the early emphasis on the visual arts particularly architecture in Florence with artists such as Titian in Venice building on earlier developments in art and emphasising colour with the first use of oil-based paints from the Netherlands. Candidates may well draw attention to the increasing importance of the Printing press of Aldus Manutius in Venice. Candidates who dwell wholly upon **EITHER** Florence **OR** Venice, no matter the strengths of their answer, will **not be able to go above Band III**.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Spain 1469 – 1520

6(a) How successful were Ferdinand and Isabella in their handling of the nobility ? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the monarch's success in managing a key group in society

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to review the range of techniques used by the monarchs to assess their effectiveness. Such issues are likely to include success in the Civil war in Castile, the mixture of concessions and firm action meted out to the nobility, the war in Granada and Ferdinand's control over the religious orders amongst others. Whilst candidates are likely to suggest that there is a considerable amount of success as demonstrated by the largely peaceful reigns of Ferdinand and Isabella, there are nevertheless problems, both at Isabella's death in 1504 and at the accession of Charles I.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

6(b) To what extent did Ferdinand and Isabella succeed in achieving their religious aims from 1469 to Isabella's death in 1504? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of success in a key area

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to outline the aims of Ferdinand and Isabella in order to measure success. Such aims are likely to include the desire to control the strong political, military and financial power of the church, deal with the corruption and lack of spirituality amongst both the religious

orders and secular clergy, extend the *reconquesta* and introduce *limpieza de sangre*. Some distinction might be made between the aims of Ferdinand and the much more pious Isabella, particularly in attitudes towards Muslims in their various territories. For higher grades, candidates must achieve some balance in adducing success or not.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Ottoman Empire 1451 – 1529

7(a) ‘Expansion was the main aim of Ottoman rulers from 1451 to 1520.’ How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the aims of the Ottoman rulers

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will probably deal with each ruler separately, though a thematic approach is equally acceptable. There is no requirement in the specification to deal with Bayezid so candidates should be able to access the full range of marks without reference to him. Candidates are likely to focus on the development of Constantinople for Mohammed II as well as conquests in S.E. Europe and Anatolia but might conclude that Selim was more interested in consolidation in Europe though he did make conquests in Egypt and Syria. Candidates will probably consider aims of Empire to be more important than other issues.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

7(b) To what extent was the structure of government the main factor in controlling and expanding the Ottoman Empire from 1451 to 1529? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the factors in the development and expansion of the Ottoman Empire

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should give consideration to the control afforded by the absolute power of the Sultan and the benefits this brought against the divided powers of Europe. They may also discuss the *devshirme* and *timar* systems which formed the backbone of local and central administration as well as meeting the military needs of the state. Such factors however will need to be set against others such as economic and religious ones and conclusions reached as to their relative importance for higher grades.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Exploration and Discovery 1450 – 1530

8(a) 'To serve God and grow rich.' How far does this statement explain the motives for Spanish exploration and empire-building from 1450 to 1530? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the factors in Spanish exploration and empire-building

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should focus on the references to religious and personal economic motives alluded to in the quotation but will also need to see these in the context of wider economic and political issues such as the search for new markets. When considering religious issues candidates might refer to the idea of crusading prospects, particularly when considering their contact with Islam or to the religiosity of individuals such as Isabella. Candidates may refer to such issues as the Spice and sugar trade, the search for gold and competition between Spain and Portugal which initially ended with the Treaty of Alcacovas in 1479 and then the race for the Indies which ended in 1529 with the treaty of Zamora. Some answers may mention curiosity in the natural world or the need for new settlement. Some consideration should be given to the notion 'how far'.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

8(b) How important were the contributions of individuals such as Diaz and da Gama to Portuguese exploration and discovery from 1450 to 1530? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the role of key individuals

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should show an appreciation of the discoveries of these two men – Diaz in his contribution to knowledge of the Cape and the significance of its conquest and Da Gama for achieving his goal to India.

They may also refer to other explorers such as Cabral who opened the way to the lucrative market of Brazil and the supportive work of Henry the Navigator who collected knowledge with maps and supported and promoted voyages. Better candidates may point out that each built on the work of others, in assessing their contributions. Some links may be established with other factors such as technical equipment but the balance should focus on the explorers.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Europe 1498-1560**The Holy Roman Empire 1517-1559**

9(a) How successful was Charles V in increasing his power within the Holy Roman Empire in the period from 1519 to 1559? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An assessment of the problems for Charles in increasing Imperial power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Factors considered may include: his position when elected, the consequences and impact of the reformation, the growth of local divisions and the development of the power of individual princes and their unwillingness to allow an imperial victory, his absences and Ferdinand's preoccupation with Hungary, Bohemia and the advances of the Turks, the development of the Schmalkaldic League, the princes' fears of Charles' ambitions.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

9(b) To what extent did the German economy grow in the period from 1519 to 1559? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the development of the German economy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many may argue that the economy appeared to flourish in this period, pointing to textile production, manufacturing and mining; trade did boom and towns expanded and the growth in population stimulated demand. Particular attention may be drawn to metallurgy, particularly silver mining. However, this may be balanced against other developments, for example the Hanseatic League was losing its predominance, the lack of a merchant fleet was a weakness, the dependence on herring fishing in the Baltic had been hit and the Baltic economy was being challenged by the Atlantic economies. Agricultural problems may also be considered as Germany struggled to respond to population growth.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Spain 1504-1556

- 10(a) Assess the reasons for the failure of Spanish agricultural and industrial development in the period from 1516 to 1556. [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the failure of the Spanish economy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should consider a range of reasons and reach a balanced conclusion. Answers may include reference to some of the following when considering agricultural development: drought and scarcity which affected the Mediterranean world, population growth, the dependence upon sheep farming at the expense of grain and arable farming, the role of the Crown and aristocracy in agricultural developments and the power of the *mesta*. When considering industrial development mention may be made of: levels of technology, lack of investment, capital being put into the *mesta* or *juros*, inflation and the lack of royal support. However, some may point to the successes of industry in northern Spain, but even here it did not flourish as it might.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

- 10(b) To what extent was the foreign policy of Charles I a failure? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of Charles' foreign policy as king of Spain.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The quality of the answer is likely to be determined by the criteria used to assess success and failure. Candidates may judge his success against his aims, or consider long/short term success. Another approach may be to compare the success/failure of his policies towards France and in the Mediterranean; if they take this approach they may conclude that his policy in the Mediterranean was less successful. There is a school of thought that argues that Spain was too weak to have a foreign policy in this period and that any wars fought were imperial in nature; credit should be given for this argument. In dealing with the Mediterranean, candidates may focus on the loss and failure to recapture Algiers, the loss of Tripoli and the loss and subsequent recapture of Tunis. In dealing with Italy, candidates may focus on the success of the 1520s with Milan and Pavia; after 1529 the Valois wars shifted north and Habsburg interests predominated, but candidates may consider the ultimate triumph of Philip, who advanced as far as Rome and the ultimate domination of Spain in Italy.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

France 1498-1559

- 11(a) 'The main ambition of the French in the Habsburg-Valois wars was to be master of Italy.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1499 to 1559? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the aims of the French in the Italian wars with the Habsburgs.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should consider a range of reasons for French involvement in the Italian wars before reaching a balanced conclusion; the focus must be on the reasons for French involvement and not Habsburg. Candidates may consider issues such as rightful inheritance, family honour, including the defence of the Valois inheritance, and personal glory (better candidates may point out that it was the aims of the French King, rather than the French people that were being pursued), the threat to France by Habsburg encirclement and rivalry with Charles V. The latter point may be supported by Francis' willingness to ally with anyone who an enemy of Charles, but this needs to be placed in the context of the struggle for Italy. Candidates may also refer to Renaissance ideals of kingship. Some answers may try to draw a distinction between Francis and Henry, suggesting that the latter was particularly motivated by revenge following his captivity.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

- 11(b) 'The lack of unity was the most important political problem facing the French crown.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1515 to 1559? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the political problems facing the French crown.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should evaluate a range of problems facing the French crown and reach a balanced conclusion; it is not expected that all problems will be addressed. Candidates should assess the problem of the lack of unity and may refer to the areas of northern and eastern France and Brittany. In many areas old laws and customs continued. They may also consider the lack of linguistic and legal unity. Other areas that may receive consideration are the powers of the nobility, the bureaucracy, the power of *parlements* and the estates. Some may argue that the political problems were limited and this is reflected in the lack of political crisis in the period, and that strong foundations for the monarchy had been laid since the Hundred Years War.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Warfare 1499-1560

- 12(a) Assess the impact of the development of artillery on warfare during the period from 1499 to 1560. [45]**

Focus: An assessment of artillery.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may consider the impact of the developments of effective siege artillery, suggesting that it gave a great advantage to the besieger, whereas the impact of field guns was later in the period and did not see their full worth until 1515 at Marignano. Artillery developments also forced a change in defensive fortifications and candidates may discuss these changes, referring to the lowering and thickening of walls, the widening and deepening of ditches, bastions and *trace italienne*. Candidates may also argue that the developments also resulted in the growth in the size of armies. As a result of the changes in artillery and the response candidates may also suggest that it resulted in a change in the nature of warfare, with sieges replacing open battles.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

- 12(b) Assess the reasons for the increased importance of infantry during the period from 1499 to 1560. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the rise in importance of infantry.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should consider a range of reasons for the increased importance of infantry before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates may consider the issue of cost; infantry were cheaper than armoured or mounted knights. They may point to the technological changes that allowed infantry to survive cavalry charges, which made them more effective (this may include consideration of discipline and pike), the importance of the Battle of Morat in showing the effectiveness of infantry, technological changes that allowed infantry to defend a fixed position, the development of the arquebus and handguns and the reforms of Cordoba and de Avalos. Candidates may also refer to the need for large armies to fight the large-scale wars and this could be linked to the problem of cost.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Europe 1545- c.1600**The Counter Reformation 1545 – c.1600**

- 13(a) Assess the reasons for the Counter Reformation. [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for a key historical development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Consideration should be given to the state of the Roman Catholic church in terms of both administration and doctrine, though better candidates might point out the long-term nature of this situation. Candidates may consider criticisms such as absenteeism, pluralism, simony, the wealth of the church and the behaviour of priests and popes. There are some obvious links to be made with the growth of Lutheranism, particularly with the loss of territory controlled by the catholic church, but there needs to be some recognition of the fact that some elements preceded Luther and some answers might refer to the notion of a 'catholic reformation', pointing to the emergence of some of the earlier reforming new orders such as the Oratory of Divine Love. Some answers may consider the role of individuals such as Popes or rulers. For best results candidates will need to give weighting and linkage of factors.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

13(b) How important was the Council of Trent in bringing about a Catholic revival to c.1600? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of a key event

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to demonstrate a knowledge of the decisions made and their effectiveness in bringing about a Catholic revival ie how far the decisions were implemented. Candidates may refer to the clear definition of doctrine, condemnation of Protestant beliefs, the issue of clerical abuses, the education of the clergy and their behaviour, the strengthening of papal authority and the role of the bishop. In order to access the higher levels candidates will need to set the Council of Trent against other issues such as the new orders, particularly the Jesuits, the revival of the papacy from Paul V onwards, the role of individuals, the Index and the Inquisition in assessing importance but must consider the issue in the question thoroughly.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Reign of Henry IV 1589 – 1610

14(a) How important was the Edict of Nantes (1598) in helping Henry IV to establish himself on the throne of France? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the significance of a key event

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to demonstrate an understanding of the Edict in dealing with the issue of the Huguenots and why it was important. Some may see this as central in underlining the end of the Civil wars and reaching a lasting agreement with a troublesome minority. However, they might equally well argue that Henry had already been crowned King and that foreign opposition and that from the Catholic league was already much diminished. Problems however still remained even with the religious settlement that Nantes offered in terms of a much depleted treasury following the lengthy wars and untamed powerful nobles. Whilst candidates will be expected to set the Edict alongside these other factors there should be substantial discussion of the Edict itself within the terms of the question.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

14(b) Assess the importance of Sully in strengthening royal authority from 1598 to 1610. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the role of an individual in a key development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to examine Sully's considerable achievements in terms of finance and the economy and explain how these strengthened royal authority. Answers may consider how he increased royal revenue, with reference to taxation, a decrease in royal extravagance, the sale of offices, the salt tax and the paulette. Sully also helped strengthen royal authority by improving trade and candidates may consider how improved communications were encouraged and the development of agriculture and industry. These will need to be set against other ways in which Henry strengthened royal authority such as limitations of noble power, the settlement of the religious question and the context of peaceful relations with foreign powers. Some linkage will be recognised between these factors by more able candidates and some conclusion reached as to the relative importance of Sully's work.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Dutch Revolt 1563 – 1609

15(a) Assess the reasons for Philip II's unpopularity in the Netherlands. [45]

Focus: Assessment of an individual

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to examine a range of issues such as his foreignness compared with his father, his religious policies such as reform of abuses, the introduction of the Jesuits and the reorganization of the Dutch church which deprived the nobility of patronage, his neglect of traditional institutions and alienation of the nobility by depriving them of influence in the Council, his employment of foreigners such as Granvelle, his maintenance of an army of occupation after the Treaty of Cateau Cambresis and the taxation it necessitated, continuing oppressive policies particularly with the failure to recall troops once the subsidy had been granted, the issues of centralization and taxation. Some linkage and ranking of issues will be present in the best answers.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

15(b) 'Military superiority was the main reason for Dutch success in the Northern provinces by 1609.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for a key historical development

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to set Dutch military capabilities against other factors in bringing about Dutch success in the North by 1609. Military issues are likely to focus on the abilities of Maurice of Nassau to exploit the geography of the country, particularly the rivers and waterways although there may be some credit given to William of Orange in establishing a basis for future development. Some answers may consider the role of Calvinism as a unifying factor and the confidence and enthusiasm it provided. Candidates may compare Maurice's position with that of the Duke of Parma and the limitations placed on him by lack of funds and other foreign commitments of Spain. Financial issues and the part played by other countries provide some obvious linkage for better candidates who should also rank issues.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Spain as a Great Power 1556 – 1598.

16(a) Assess the problems which Philip II inherited from his father. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the problems facing Philip on his accession

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to address a range of issues which could include the separatist nature of Spain with its ethnic divisions or they may focus on the over-dominance of Castile and the dissatisfaction of Aragon. Problems with finance and the economy may feature in many answers and candidates may point to the debt of 36m ducats or the distorted tax system; this may lead to comments about bankruptcy in 1557 and that short term measures had been adopted at the expense of long term success for finance and the economy. There may be reference to the inadequate nature of government systems, particularly the clumsy conciliar system.

Relationships with France and the Turks may be considered and candidates may suggest that Cateau Cambresis left Spain secure and that the Turkish threat had diminished, although the Barbary pirates were still an issue and this could be linked to the Morisco threat. Religious problems, including the need for reform and particularly the issue of the Moriscos might be considered. In order to access the higher levels candidates will give some weighting and linkage to these issues. Emphasis should be on the problems rather than solutions.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

16(b) Assess the impact of the Dutch Revolt on Spain's policies towards England and France. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of a key event in Spanish relations with foreign powers

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates are likely to point out that it brought increasing conflict with England and France, though better candidates will recognise that this is linked with other issues such as religion and increasing Spanish power. Reference is likely to be made to French and English attempts to provide a ruler for the Netherlands, and thus increase their influence, as a cause of conflict but this should be set in a wider context of increasingly poor relations related to other factors such as Spanish power, the fear of a catholic crusade and European domination. Candidates should reach some conclusion on the importance of the Dutch Revolt in relation to other factors in determining policies towards France and England. Treatment of only one country will not go beyond **Band III**.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Europe 1598 - 1661

Richelieu and Mazarin 1622 – 1661

17(a) To what extent did Richelieu succeed in increasing the power of the monarchy within France by 1642? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a minister's success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should limit themselves to domestic issues; the terms of the Question are clear. Only a brief reference, for example in an introduction or conclusion, should link to foreign policy and this is not necessary. Candidates might consider Richelieu's aims as a means of assessing his success. Answers in **Band I** should examine the limits of his success even if they conclude that he was very largely successful. For example, they might refer to the continued strength of provincialism in spite of Richelieu's attempts to exert more central control. His economic and fiscal policies were not very successful. The end date of 1642 should be noted. Again, the conclusion might mention the problems faced by Mazarin but this should not be part of the main argument and discussion of the Frondes is not a requirement. Candidates might consider the difficult circumstances in which he worked for part of his ministry. Historiography is not an AS level assessment criterion although accurate references should be given credit. Some AS candidates might know that recent opinions of Louis XIII have modified previous opinions of him as ineffective but answers that view him as a weak king should not be 'penalised' for this.

Richelieu was successful in taming the Huguenots. Their rebellion, centred on La Rochelle, ended with the Grace of Alais (1629). The minister secured the political domination of the state over the Huguenots. Their military and political independence ended; their continued religious rights were less important at that point. He curbed the *parlements* especially through the use of *lits de justice*. There were noble conspiracies against him (eg the Chalais Conspiracy (1626) and the Day of Dupes (1630)). Their suppression indirectly enhanced the authority of the monarchy by protecting Louis' choice of minister. The *intendants* were strengthened but with mixed results; nobles and town authorities retained considerable authority in the provinces.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

17(b) To what extent was the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) a success for France? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the significance of an important treaty for a major power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In one sense, it might be difficult to argue against the claim that Westphalia was a success for France but the most successful candidates, certainly those awarded **Band I**, might be expected to consider alternatives. 1648 did not end the conflict between France and Spain; this continued until the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659). Westphalia was also a success for other countries such as Sweden, the United Provinces and Brandenburg-Prussia. However, examiners will note that the Study Topic from which this Question is drawn is on Richelieu and Mazarin 1622 - 1661 and the Key Issue asks 'How far did Richelieu and Mazarin extend the power of France'. Therefore, candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of other states. Westphalia saw considerable gains for France, especially in the Rhineland and in the borders with Italy. Its influence was extended over Alsace. The weakness of the Austrian Habsburgs benefited French power. Candidates are not expected to show knowledge of the period after 1661 but might note that Westphalia laid the firm foundation for French power in the second half of the seventeenth century. Some candidates might take a broader approach and compare the outcome of the Thirty Years' War with France's earlier aims: a success inasmuch as France achieved its aims. This will be a valid approach but should not be used to provide an extended account of the war.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Problems of Spain 1598 – 1659

18(a) 'Spain's domestic problems were not solved because its governments lacked the will to tackle them.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1598 to 1659? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a country's problems.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Examiners might expect in the most successful answers worth **Band I** and perhaps **Band II** a reasonable balance between explanations of Spain's problems and of the reasons why they were not solved. The attention given to governments will depend on the arguments that candidates offer. They can disagree and claim, for example, that the underlying problems were insoluble, but answers in **Band I** and **Band II** should normally need at least a sound paragraph on the stated factor. They might be expected to consider the roles of the kings (Philip III and Philip IV) and their ministers / favourites / *validos* such as Lerma and Olivares. An alternative claim might argue that Olivares was very aware of the domestic problems of Spain, such as regionalism and economic / fiscal weakness, but that his attempted solutions only made things worse. Examiners will not require an equal balance between the two reigns but answers on Olivares alone might well be limited to a maximum mark in **Band III**. The Question is on domestic problems. It will be relevant to examine the impact on Spain of foreign wars or the cost of the Empire but this should not lead to extensive descriptions of campaigns. The Question

does not ask about the extent of the problems as such: has Spanish decline been exaggerated? This comes within the possible scope of the Question but should not form the main part of the answer.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

18(b) To what extent was Spain's international position in 1659 weaker than in 1598? [45]

Focus: Comparison of a country's international position at two dates.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The basis of the Question is the comparison of Spain's positions in 1598 (accession of Philip III) and 1659 (Treaty of the Pyrenees). 'To what extent..?' allows candidates to challenge the idea of complete decline. In 1598 Spain was clearly a very powerful state, perhaps the major European state in international terms. However, there were problems such as the continuing struggle with the Dutch. The economy was already under strains that would weaken Spain's international position. Up to 1659, Spain's power declined relative to that of France. Successive wars against France and the United Provinces and support for the Austrian Habsburgs contributed to the problems. Cerdagne and Roussillon were ceded in the Pyrenees region. Spain gave up claims to Alsace. Dutch independence was recognised. However, Spain was still a major international state in the middle of the seventeenth century. It retained its interests in parts of Italy. Its overseas empire was largely intact.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Thirty Years' War 1618 – 1648

19(a) Assess the importance of Wallenstein to Habsburg success in the Thirty Years' War to 1629. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the importance of a general to a major war at a specified date.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The Question arises from the second Key Issue and associated Content, 'Why could the Habsburgs not maintain their early successes [in the Thirty Years' War]? The development of the war to 1629, Danish intervention, the role of Wallenstein, the Edict of Restitution'. The assessment of Wallenstein's importance to Habsburg success allows candidates to examine other factors that contributed to Habsburg success by 1629. He became the commander of the Imperial army, winning a succession of decisive victories. For example, he defeated Mansfeld and made a major contribution to expelling the Danes from Germany. He provided an army that allowed the Emperor some independence from the troublesome princes. Other factors that might be considered include the relative weakness of the enemies of the Habsburgs. The German Protestants were divided. Denmark, under Christian IV, was not strong enough to turn the tide against the Habsburgs. Its supporters, including England, France and the United Provinces, gave insufficient support.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

19(b) Assess the reasons for the continuation of the Thirty Years' War after the Edict of Restitution (1629). [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the continuation of an extended war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might consider the importance of foreign intervention, especially by Sweden and France. They might examine the unpopularity of the imperial cause within Germany; many Catholic princes were suspicious of Habsburg power after the Edict of Restitution. The multiplicity of participants, for example the number of German states that were involved, as well as external participants that included Spain and indirectly the United Provinces, prolonged the war. No side was able to win a decisive victory; negotiations began in the late 1630s but were desultory. The question does not require a detailed study of the Treaty of Westphalia but some candidates might use its terms to illustrate the complexities of the conflict.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Social Issues in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century

20(a) Assess the reasons for witch-hunts during the first half of the seventeenth century. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important social phenomenon.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might consider a variety of reasons for the witch-hunt phenomenon and answers in **Band I** can usually be expected to offer some priority of importance. Moderate answers might concentrate on descriptions of witch-hunts, or the alleged activities of witches; the reasons for the persecutions might well be implicit rather than explicit in these answers. However, examiners should not undervalue the answers that link description with explanation or analysis. Some candidates might take issue with the Question on the basis that witch-hunts were not universal throughout Europe. This point would be creditable but not a requirement for the highest mark. Answers might consider the role of religion (some have seen it as a reaction to the rationalism that was increasing elsewhere), geography (with witch-hunts being more prevalent in the remoter regions) and social and economic structures (the phenomenon was more frequent in more backward areas).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

20(b) To what extent did the social structure of France limit economic success in the first half of the seventeenth century? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the links between social structure and economic success in a major country.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The Question arises from the fourth Key Issue in the Study Topic, 'What were the main characteristics of the French economy and society? The social hierarchy, attempts to promote economic change'. Candidates might examine in particular Richelieu's attempts to introduce economic reforms. Henry IV and Sully are less likely and their omission should not be regarded as a serious weakness in answers. France was overwhelmingly agrarian in its social structure. There were some important towns but their populations exerted little influence in shaping the economy. Traditional authorities were able to resist change. There were also alternatives to economic innovations that were more attractive and profitable, including the income from office-holding and *rentes*. Although the strength of the crown increased during the specified period, kings and ministers were not able to transform the economy (even Henry IV and Sully if they are referred to). Centralised officials such as the *intendants* were unpopular and usually ineffective. Interest groups were too strong. Therefore, schemes to promote foreign trade or to reform the inefficient fiscal system had little success.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Europe 1660 – 1718

Sweden and the Baltic 1660 – 1718

21(a) To what extent was the increase in royal power in Sweden the main aim of Charles XI from 1672? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the aims of a ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

From 1660 to 1672, Charles XI ruled as a minor; hence the starting date of the Question. However, it will be very relevant to discuss the implications of the Regency when the crown was weakened. The reign of Christina is before the beginning of the Study Topic and candidates are not expected to have knowledge of it.

By 1672, the position of the crown had worsened especially through the sale of crown lands. One of Charles XI's major aims was to reverse the losses. The *Reduktion* was a means to regain crown land. The increased income allowed him to widen his aims. He sought to exert more authority over the political power of the nobles in the Council. He aimed to strengthen the King's Council. He sought to bring the Rikstag under closer control. He wished to widen the support of the crown by winning the co-operation of the clergy, townspeople and rural peasantry.

Another aim was to improve the administrative machinery or bureaucracy. A Table of Ranks was introduced to secure promotion by merit rather than by influence and social status. The terms of the Question also invite candidates to discuss foreign policy. This is referred to in the Specification, 'What were the aims of Swedish rulers to 1718? The domestic and foreign aims of Charles I (from 1672)'. However, examiners will not require an even balance between domestic and foreign aims. As a broad guide, one would expect some reference to foreign aims in

answers worth **Band I** but, as always, this will depend on the quality of the argument. He participated in wars in the 1670s but the rest of his reign to 1697 saw him taking a neutral line, harnessing rather than dissipating the power of Sweden. Examiners will note that the Question does not ask candidates to assess Charles XI's success in achieving his aims. Brief references would not be too irrelevant but this aspect should not be part of the main explanation.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

21(b) How far was Charles XII responsible for the decline of the Swedish empire by 1718? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the responsibility of a ruler for a country's external decline.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far...?' invites candidates to discuss and assess the stated factor (Charles XII's responsibility) and compare it with other factors. Charles XII (1697-1718) was at war for virtually all of his reign, fighting against Russia, a growing power under Peter the Great, Denmark and Poland. Incessant warfare put enormous pressure on Sweden's resources. However, candidates might argue that Sweden's control over its empire was already imperiled by the time of his accession. The population was comparatively small. The economy was weakening. Sweden lacked effective allies.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

France and Europe 1661 – 1715

22(a) How far did Louis XIV's foreign policy become more aggressive after the end of the Dutch War (1679)? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the characteristics of the foreign policy of a major ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates might argue for the prevalence of change or continuity after 1679. The Dutch War was possibly the peak of Louis XIV's success in Europe. There followed the Reunions claims and war to 1684, the War of the League of Augsburg / Nine Years' War (1689-97) and the War of Spanish Succession (1702-13/14). One might expect discussion of the War of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession issue but possibly not the Reunions for **Band I**. Some answers might argue that these represented an increase in French ambitions and aggression; others might see them as a development of, but not fundamentally different from, earlier policies. For example, the death of Charles II was the immediate cause of Louis' claims to the Spanish throne but he had a long interest in Spain and the terms of his marriage agreement to Maria Teresa allowed some claim because the dowry was not paid. Continuity might be seen in the wish to secure glory and to secure borders through foreign policy. There might be discussion of policies towards Austria, the United Provinces and England.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

22(b) 'Little more than imitation of Versailles' architecture.' Assess this view of the influence of France on European culture during the period from 1661 to 1715. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the influence of French culture.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The Question is based on the fourth Key issue in the Study Topic, 'How far did France influence European culture? Louis XIV's France as a model in European culture, Versailles and court culture'. Examiners will not expect much detail about Versailles architecture but a general appreciation of its elaboration - including the effects of its gardens and the use of architecture to glorify Louis XIV personally - and the impression that it made on the French court and visitors. It was copied elsewhere, for example in the United Provinces and Brandenburg-Prussia. Some might argue that French culture had a wide influence, for example in the use of French as the polite language of courts. There might be some understanding of the influence of music and painting. Others might argue that influence was limited because it affected minorities; the majority retained their different cultures. The top-down influence had a limited impact on European populations as a whole.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Development of Brandenburg-Prussia 1660 – 1713

23(a) To what extent was separatism in his provinces the main problem faced by Frederick William, the Great Elector, in ruling Brandenburg-Prussia? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the problems faced by an important ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can disagree and claim, for example, that the Great Elector's main problem was provincial separatism, but answers in **Band I** and **Band II** should normally need at least a sound paragraph on the stated factor. Frederick William ruled over provinces that were separate geographically, socially, politically and economically. They ranged from Prussia in the east to Brandenburg roughly in the centre and Cleves-Mark in the west. The position of Frederick William was the only common factor and his authority over the provinces varied. Other factors that candidates might consider include a comparatively weak military situation, the lack of defensible boundaries, the effects of war, a small army, an inefficient bureaucracy, difficult institutions such as the Brandenburg Estates, and the power of particular social groups, especially the Junkers. The Question does not ask candidates to assess the Great Elector's success in dealing with his problems but some answers might consider how far the problems changed in the course of the reign. Examiners will note that, although Frederick William ruled from 1640, the beginning of the Study Topic is 1660. The Specification states, 'While the Specification does **not** require a detailed knowledge of the reign between 1640 and 1660, candidates would find an overview useful'.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

23(b) 'His achievements depended entirely on the work of Frederick William, the Great Elector.' Assess this view of Frederick I of Brandenburg-Prussia. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the achievements of a ruler.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can disagree and claim, for example, that Frederick I's achievements were not based entirely on the work of the Great Elector, but answers in **Band I** and **Band II** should normally need at least a sound paragraph on the stated factor. Certainly, no mark will rely on an equal balance between the two rulers. Following a treaty with the Austrian Emperor in 1700, Frederick I was entitled King of Prussia in 1701. This was largely his own doing. He also built new palaces with a more ostentatious court than his predecessor. He promoted the arts and the sciences. On the other hand, his bureaucratic methods and interests followed closely the pattern of the Great Elector. He continued a policy of religious toleration to Huguenot refugees. He continued the foreign policy of the later years of his father by supporting the alliance against France. Whilst he was less energetic than his father, Frederick I's rule was based largely on his predecessor's achievements in reforming and strengthening his state and his authority. Frederick William had improved the bureaucracy, lessened but not destroyed provincial separatism and secured the co-operation of the Junkers.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century

24(a) Assess the reasons why merchants were important in Dutch society during the second half of the seventeenth century. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the social importance of a social class.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The Question is based on the third Key Issue and associated Content in the Specification, 'What were the main characteristics of the Dutch economy and society? The influence of the merchants in the United Provinces'. Their social position depended primarily on the important and trade and commerce in the United Provinces. This determined the prosperity of the state. Social importance was enhanced by the absence of a powerful nobility. The United Provinces were a republic; the house of Orange was prominent but not a monarchy. This meant that the merchants were not as socially subservient as in other major states. They dominated Amsterdam and this city in turn dominated Dutch society. As the Question states, the focus should be on the social importance of the merchants but the links between society and other features of the United Provinces, as indicated above, were such that candidates can be allowed some latitude as long as the more successful answers in **Band I** or **Band II** make some connections with social status. The Question does not require a comparative approach but it would not be irrelevant to take a line that involves comparisons and contrasts with other countries.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

24(b) 'The work of Newton was the most important proof of a scientific revolution during the second half of the seventeenth century.' How far do you agree with this view?
[45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a scientific development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is based on the second key issue and associated content in the Specification, 'Was there a 'scientific revolution' in the seventeenth century? The new scientific methods, influence of individual scientists (especially Newton), evidence of a 'scientific revolution'. Isaac Newton was influential because of his demonstration of the importance of observation and experiments with and developments laws of motion and gravitation. However, candidates might refer to developments by other scientists and in other scientific fields. As well as astronomy and physics, there were advances in mathematics, chemistry and biology. Candidates will probably not argue against the idea of a scientific revolution - although it can be claimed that its influence was limited to a few in the seventeenth century itself. Some might consider other factors as more important, such as the declining authority of the Church.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Mark Scheme 2586
June 2007**

2586 EUROPEAN AND WORLD HISTORY 1789-1989**Europe 1789-1849****The French Revolution 1789-1795**

1(a) To what extent did Louis XVI bring about his own downfall during the period from 1789 to 1792? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for downfall

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to consider Louis' role in his own downfall. They may refer to: Louis' indecision, his reluctance to embrace change, his views on the issue of and use of the veto, the failure of Flight to Varennes, his role in the decision to go to war. Such discussion needs to be set in the context of other factors, such as: the role of political factions, advisers at court, the growth of republicanism; economic crisis; divisions over the Church, war; defeat in war; Brunswick Manifesto.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

1(b) How important were the people of Paris in determining the course of the Revolution during the period from 1789 to 1795? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of role of one factor

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to consider the role of the people of Paris. Relevant elements may include: Grand peur, Champs de Mars, storming of Bastille, October Days, Cordeliers and Jacobin Clubs, *sans culottes*, *Journées* of June and August 1792, September Massacres, pressure for Maximum etc. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as: war, religious division, fear of counter-revolution, economic problems, political factions, and loss of influence after the purge of Hébertists during 1794 and end of reign of Terror.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815

2(a) 'The main effect of Napoleon's reforms during the Consulate was to bring order and stability to France.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of impact of change

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In considering the arguments in favour of the quotation candidates may refer to: reforms to create ordered and efficient government, stable finances and economy, law and order, police, religious toleration/Concordat, reforms to the Civil Code, the emphasis on creating loyal and able servants in education and so on. This could be balanced against consideration of other effects

such as: centralisation of power in Napoleon's hands, lack of freedom, other positive benefits of education, meritocracy, codification of law.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

2(b) 'Napoleon was successful in Europe because his enemies were incompetent and divided.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for success

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In favour of the contention candidates may consider the evidence drawn from the Austrians in 1805 (Mack at Ulm), the Prussians in 1806 (Jena-Auerstadt), poorly constructed coalitions (second and third), coalitions which never included all the great powers, divisions between generals and rulers at Austerlitz, separate peace treaties, the deficiencies of Napoleon's enemies in warfare (old generals, outdated tactics, slow movement etc). Such consideration needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: the strengths of the French army – size, tactics, organisation, conscription, morale; Napoleon's generalship and 'diplomacy'; unity of command; available resources.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

France 1814-1848

3(a) To what extent were the causes of the revolution of 1830 short term? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of causes of revolution

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

One issue here is the definition of short term and we can be flexible here – some may see short term as referring to 1829-30, others to the reign of Charles X – both are acceptable. The key is a balanced evaluation of short term versus longer term. In relation to short term, therefore, candidates may consider: the role of Charles X, the Ultras, religious policies, censorship etc. as well as the return of economic problems/crisis, the events of 1830. Such discussion needs to be balanced against discussion of longer term causes: the heritage of revolution, long existing political divisions in France, inadequacies of the 1815 settlement, lack of 'glory' after defeat of Napoleon.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

3(b) How successful was Louis Philippe's foreign policy? Explain your answer. [45]Focus: Evaluation of success

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success may be assessed against aims, impact and/or context. Candidates may well argue on balance foreign policy was unsuccessful. On the success side candidates may consider that Louis Philippe operated within the international context, there was no war and he backed down from potential conflict in Mehmet Ali crisis and so on. Some of the former, of course, can be argued both ways and candidates may also point to the lack of glory and action ('France is bored') and Louis Philippe's failure to take opportunities re: Belgian independence, Mehmet Ali.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Revolution and Repression in Europe 1815-1849**4(a) To what extent was liberalism the main cause of the revolutions in the German Confederation in 1848? [45]**Focus: Evaluation of causes

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Liberalism must be dealt with as a cause. Candidates may point to development of liberal movements from Napoleonic period and, despite repression, increasing influence in 1840s (better candidates may differentiate between strength of liberal movements in different parts of the Confederation). Connection between liberalism and nationalism may be dealt with. Other causes discussed may include nationalism, economic crisis, impact of Zollverein, French Revolution, fall of Metternich, other revolutions.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

4(b) 'The revolutions in 1848- 49 in the Austrian Empire failed because they lacked mass support.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]Focus: Evaluation of reasons for failure

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

For: mass unrest helped revolutions occur but mass of population did not actively support revolution and as soon as economic crisis weakened the masses were docile. Revolutionaries always in minority as masses not interested in the issues of nationalism/liberalism which excited the student and middle classes. Revolutionary activity centred on the major cities and was urban-based.

Against: the revolution failed for other reasons – Austrian army remained loyal, revolutionaries divided in aims and against each other (Austria v. Hungary), Emperor and government recovered nerve/never actually toppled, economic recovery.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less

balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Europe 1825-1890

Italy 1830-1870

5(a) 'The main reason the revolutions of 1848-49 failed was because Austria was too strong.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for failure

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with Austria and balance against other factors. Austrian opposition clear from start, but early defeat – however, Radetsky's army intact and, with Austrian recovery at home, suppression of revolution in Lombardy and Venice followed. Austria's defeat of Piedmont effectively ended chance of successful revolution in north and gave encouragement to conservative forces elsewhere. Other factors include position of pope, disunity amongst revolutionaries, lack of popular support, economic recovery, intervention of France.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

5(b) 'Despite the creation of the Kingdom of Italy, there was no real unity.' How far do you agree with this view of Italy from 1861 to 1870? [45]

Focus: Assessment of degree of unity

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to balance evidence of 'unity' – creation of the kingdom, the system of government/parliament – against the evidence suggesting disunity – Brigands' war, language, lack of representation, North-South divide. Positives could also include: single army, uniform coinage, weights and measures and education policy. There may also be discussion of Piedmontisation, the legacy of separatism, the impact of lack of education, the limited penetration of the concept of Italy and so on.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Germany c.1862-1890

6(a) To what extent was diplomacy more important than military strength and war in Prussia's unification of Germany? [45]

Focus: Assessment of relative importance of two factors

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Diplomacy – there will be some assessment of Bismarck’s diplomacy in relation to the key developments of the 1860s – especially dealings with other great powers (particularly France, Italy and Russia) and the German states. There will also be discussion of the development of Prussian military strength and the three wars against Denmark, Austria and France. Candidates may argue that the two factors were mutually dependent – the effectiveness of diplomacy was dependent in part on the military strength of Prussia and the demonstrated effectiveness of force in the wars; wars occurred/were successful at least in part because of the diplomatic preparations made by Bismarck.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

6(b) To what extent should Bismarck’s foreign policy in the period from 1871 to 1890 be regarded as a failure? [45]

Focus: Assessment of success/failure

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

For: Candidates may provide an assessment of Bismarck’s foreign policy from the perspective of the breaking down of the attempt to keep both Austria and Russia as allies and demonstrate its longer term failure as a strategy. There may be assessment of the Bulgarian crisis.

Against: Candidates may suggest that Bismarck was largely successful in ensuring that Germany remained on good terms with Austria and Russia for the majority of the period and managed to keep France isolated.

There may also be assessment of relations with Great Britain, Italy, imperial policy and the survival of the German Empire.

France 1848-1875

7(a) ‘Napoleon III’s foreign policy was a failure from start to finish.’ How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of success/failure

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Analysis may evaluate foreign policy in terms of his aims, the context, and the results. Expect treatment of the key elements of Napoleon III’s foreign policy – Crimea, Italy, Mexico, Prussia, Spain, perhaps also reference to Free Trade treaties. Lines of argument may agree, or, perhaps more likely, argue that whilst policy in the 1850s can be seen as broadly successful, that of the 1860s were largely unsuccessful.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

7(b) Assess the reasons why France was politically unstable in the period from 1870 to 1875. [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for instability

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The starting point for any discussion may well be the overthrow of the Second Empire and Napoleon III, the impact of the Paris Commune and defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, the political divisions and frictions in French politics in the early 1870s (eg Republicans v. monarchists) and the role of key personalities like Gambetta, Thiers, MacMahon.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Russia 1825-1881

8(a) How serious a threat did opposition present to Nicholas I and Alexander II? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of opposition

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Opposition included that of westernisers and liberals, *narodniks*, anarchists and nihilists. There may also be mention of nationalist opposition (especially Poles). Seriousness may be judged from assessment of government responses (repression, reform etc.), and/or assessment of threats posed by different groups. Some may argue that opposition was divided, haphazard and relatively small-scale, largely contained by repressive measures, yet a personal monarchy was always vulnerable to the assassin – as Alexander II found out.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

8(b) How successful was the emancipation of the serfs (1861)? Explain your answer with reference to the period to 1881. [45]

Focus: Assessment of success

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success may be evaluated in terms of the scale of the problem, the aims and the impact. There should be some detailed discussion of the nature of the reform and its effects both immediate and longer term in Russia. Candidates may deal with the scale of the reform, land, redemption, the *mir*, impact on lords/nobles, attitudes of peasants, extent of progress in agriculture etc.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

America 1846-1919**The American Civil War 1861-1865**

9(a) To what extent was the election of Lincoln the main reason for the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861? [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for war

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Although the specification does not require detailed knowledge of the longer term causes of Civil War, we can credit candidates who bring such material to bear effectively. Candidates may refer to perceptions of Lincoln and what he stood for and use the details of the election to show how he lacked any support in the South. Arguably Lincoln's election can be seen as the occasion rather than the cause of war. Attempts to prevent secession during the winter of 1860-61 all failed and Lincoln's inaugural address, despite holding out the hope of peace, failed. Candidates will need to examine why this was so – the reasons for secession and why this was unacceptable to the northern states – slavery, states rights, northern Republicanism, economic division and so forth.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

9(b) To what extent was the North's victory in the Civil War the result of superior military leadership? [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for North's victory in Civil War

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates must deal with the issue of military leadership even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. Candidates may demonstrate the North's superiority in leadership by discussion of the role of Grant and Lincoln's support for him. They may also discuss Sherman and refer to the military campaigns following Gettysburg, and show how that by 1864 the North had the strategy and leadership to produce victory. However, others may argue that before the appointment of Grant the North's military leadership was poor, whilst that of the South (particularly Lee) was more effective. They may also argue that other factors were as or more important than military leadership – such as the balance of resources (which began to tell by 1863/4), issues of morale, the role of Lincoln, the South's international isolation.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Politics and Reform 1877-1919

10(a) Assess the impact of Populism on American politics in the 1880s and 1890s. [45]

Focus: Assessment of effects of a political movement

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may discuss the nature of populism but the key emphasis must be on its impact. In the 1880s the Alliance movement exerted pressure on Congress to aid farmers, but proposals had limited success. There was some success in securing seats in Congress (eg 'Sockless Jerry') and governorships and in 1892 the populists sought to devise a platform to contest the presidential election. It failed. Attempts to carry on the campaign to 1896 failed as political attention was focused on currency issues. Defeat in this election marked the end of populism and the victory of urban over rural America.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

10(b) To what extent did Woodrow Wilson achieve his aims in domestic policy to 1919?
[45]

Focus: Assessment of domestic policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Wilson's presidential campaign spoke of New Freedom – and had a broadly progressive tone – anti-trust, lower tariffs, breaking up the financial power of Wall Street, social reform. We can expect candidates to evaluate some of the following: There were lower tariffs (1913), there was banking reform (1913), there was anti-trust legislation (1914), but there was little social reform partly because Wilson was not fully committed to it, but he did return to this issue in his 1916 campaign and one result was child labour legislation (1916). After 1916 issues relating to the First World War dominated.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Western Expansion 1846-1900

11(a) How far did developments in transport and communications change the West during the period 1846-1900? Explain your answer.
[45]

Focus: Assessment of impact of change

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The main issue is the impact of transport and communications – candidates may evaluate what developments did and did not do, or may seek to balance the impact of transport and communication against other factors to address how far?. The role of developments in opening up the west should be addressed – Cumberland road (completed 1852), the various trails, stage coach routes, mail and Pony Express, the telegraph (1861 onwards), steamboats, and of course the railroads. Candidates may stress links, communication, development of towns, land sales associated with railroad development etc. and may suggest the symbiotic relationship between developments and other factors (eg mineral discoveries created demand and transport followed, but then acted as stimulus to further development).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

- 11(b) How successful were Federal governments in dealing with the problems arising from Western expansion in the period from 1846 to 1900? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success of policies

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to identify problems. They may refer to: Plains Indians, communication/transport, land, establishment of local government, law and order and conservation. In relation to Native Americans candidates may consider attempts at peaceful solutions and treaties, policing the frontier, Indian Wars, reservations and Americanisation. In relation to transport and communications, the issues of telegraph and railroad promotion may be discussed. In relation to land, the effectiveness of such legislation as the Homestead Act may be discussed. Issues of local government are not directly covered by the specification, but we can reward candidates who discuss the establishment of territories and states. Law and order was largely a local issue but there may be discussion of the relative absence of federal policy. Conservation became an issue towards the end of the century.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Race Relations in the South 1863-1912

- 12(a) Assess the reasons why many white Americans opposed the advancement of Blacks in the period 1863-1912. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for opposition

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to discuss the reasons for racial discrimination and prejudice that pervaded American society, especially in the South. They may point to social and economic reasons for white opposition, especially amongst poor whites competing for low paid work and amongst plantation owners concerned about profits and cheap labour. They may also point to historical tradition and beliefs about white supremacy. They may also discuss the heritage of the Civil War and the fears about a changing culture/way of life. Candidates may also consider white reaction to reconstruction.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

- 12(b) How far was the position of Blacks better in 1912 than it had been in 1877? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may point to the erosion of civil rights during this period to suggest that in many ways the position of Blacks had got no better and had perhaps deteriorated since 1877 – Jim Crow Laws, re-emergence of white vigilante organisations, erosion of voting rights. On the other hand, candidates may also point to the efforts of many Blacks to improve their lot, pointing to the

work of leaders like Booker T. Washington and his drive to improve the education and social and economic lot of African Americans by their own efforts. However the contrasting views of du Bois and the Niagara Movement might suggest Washington's efforts had negligible impact when Blacks were faced with segregation, discrimination and lynchings.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Europe 1890-1945

Russia 1894-1917

13(a) 'The 1905 Revolution never seriously threatened the position of the Tsar or his government.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of impact of revolution

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question requires an assessment of the threat posed by the revolutionary events of 1905. Candidates may contrast the apparent violence and threat posed by some events in 1905 with the varied aims and divisions of those involved and the reasons for failure of the revolution. On the other hand, candidates may point to the concessions made by the Tsar, the puncturing of his image as the 'Little father' and so on.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

13(b) To what extent was continuation of the First World War the main reason for the overthrow of the Provisional Government in the October Revolution (1917)? [45]

Focus: assessment of reasons for revolution

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to focus on the Provisional Government from February 1917, although they may suggest there were longer term reasons why it was unlikely to survive. The continuation of the war needs to be balanced against other factors such as Dual Power, the 'provisional' nature of the Provisional Government, the role of key personalities (Lvov, Kerensky), social and economic problems, bread, land, the July days, the activities of the Bolsheviks and the threat posed by Kornilov and the coup of October.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Causes and Impact of the First World War c. 1890 - 1920

14(a) To what extent was the stalemate on the Western front during the First World War a result of military strategies pursued by both sides? [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for stalemate on Western Front

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates should discuss the role of military strategies even if they wish to argue others factors were significant. In relation to military strategies candidates may refer on the German side to the decision to dig in on the Western Front after the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, the battle of the Marne and the 'race to the sea', and the creation of a strong defensive line (such as the Hindenburg line). There may also be reference to the attempt to "bleed France white" at Verdun. On the *entente* side there may be reference to the attempts to break the German defences by mass attacks over no man's land which played into the hands of the German machine guns and artillery and may also refer to Haig's strategy of wearing the enemy down by constant attacks, however costly (such as the Somme and Passchendale). On the other hand, candidates may refer to the constraints placed on strategy by technology and mass armies (machine guns, artillery, barbed wire, trench warfare, gas, railways, mass armies and so on). Candidates may also suggest that only when technology and strategy developed was the stalemate broken (tanks, air power, calibration of artillery, storm troopers etc).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

14(b) Assess the reasons why the Britain, France and the USA differed in their attitudes towards peace with Germany at the end of the war. [45]

Focus: Assessment of attitudes towards peace

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates must deal with all three to score highly. Whilst the different attitudes may well be described, the focus is on the reasons for these different attitudes – expect treatment of the relative length of time involved in the war, where the war was fought, casualties, economic and social strain, longer term factors related to history (French fears of German attack, British economic concerns, American isolationism), public opinion, strategic position, personalities of the Big Three.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Italy 1919-1945

- 15(a) How successful were Mussolini's foreign and colonial policies from 1922 to 1940? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success in foreign policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success may be assessed in relation to the aims of Mussolini, the problems that emerged, the results of policy. Candidates may refer to Corfu, Locarno, the Stresa Front, Abyssinia, the Rome-Berlin Axis, the Spanish Civil War, the Pact of Steel, Munich and the outbreak of war. Candidates may argue that Mussolini succeeded in some of his aims and point to 'successes' like Corfu and Abyssinia and even Munich, but overall there was failure as Italy lost its independence of action in the late 1930s and could not cope with the strains imposed by Abyssinia and Spain.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

- 15(b) How far did Mussolini succeed in achieving his political aims in Italy from 1922 to 1940? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success of political aims

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The key to a good answer is likely to be the candidate's ability to identify Mussolini's aims. Aims may focus on establishing personal power and a one party state, but candidates could consider wider ideological aims and social and economic change. Some candidates may argue that Mussolini wanted to establish a personal dictatorship, others may suggest that his concern was simply power or to make Italy great and respected. Whatever argument they follow, the focus must be on domestic issues; this may include the destruction of the opposition, (the Acerbo Law, Matteotti and the Aventine Secession, the abolition of the party system), his relationship with the church and the Lateran Treaties, the establishment of the Corporate state, the implementation of his economic policies, autarky and restrictions on the power of monarchy.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Germany 1919-1945

- 16(a) 'The main reason for the rise of the Nazi Party to power in 1933 was Hitler himself.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for rise of Hitler

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may point to Hitler's speaking and propaganda skills, his ability to charm and press the 'right buttons' as well as his leadership qualities. These undoubted assets may be set in the context of the organisation of the Nazi party and the skills of Goebbels, as well as the 'catch-all'

programme the Nazis propagated. Such aspects may be balanced against other factors such as the impact of the Depression, the longstanding disillusion with Versailles and with the Weimar system of government and its politicians, the growth and fear of communism and the weakness and divisions amongst the other political parties as well as the 'backstairs intrigues' of the elite and their misjudgement of Hitler.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

16(b) To what extent were terror and persecution more important than propaganda and indoctrination in Nazi control of Germany from 1933 to 1939? [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for success of Nazi control

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may well argue that the factors identified are interdependent and that one would not have worked without the other. In relation to the former, there may be discussion of aspects of the police state associated with coercion such as proscription of political parties, censorship, the Gestapo, SS, concentration camps. They may refer to the persecution of political opponents, church leaders and others who spoke out and so on. Some may also refer to anti-Semitism and other aspects of race policy but discussion of these and the former aspects all need to be linked to the question focus on Nazi control. Under propaganda and indoctrination there may well be discussion of the role of Goebbels, the control and use of all forms of media to promote the Nazi message and the attempt to indoctrinate the German people, particularly the young through the education, leisure and youth systems. These aspects too should be linked back to the question focus of Nazi control of Germany.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

International relations 1919-1941

17(a) Assess the impact of the Treaty of Versailles on Germany to 1923. [45]

Focus: Impact of the Treaty of Versailles

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to demonstrate a clear understanding of how the Treaty impacted on Germany up to 1923. Main issues that may be considered include: territorial disputes and the non-application of self determination (East and West boundaries and German speaking minorities that were outside the new borders, this may include West Prussia/Polish Corridor and the Sudetenland, prevention of Anschluss). Reparations could consider how far Germany could afford to pay and its impact on inflation, perhaps linking it to their failure to pay reparations by the end of 1922, wider economic issues such as the loss of industrial areas such as Alsace Lorraine or areas of Silesia could be considered as their loss made it harder for Germany to pay, the loss of the Saar coal could also be considered. War guilt could be discussed and how far this would be a useful weapon for right-wing groups within Germany, attempts to disarm Germany unilaterally, the exploitation of these issues by the nationalist right. Some candidates may link this to the difficulties created for the new government and the idea of a Diktat, weakening the position of the Republic.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

17(b) How successful was the League of Nations? Explain your answer with reference to the 1920s and the 1930s. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the League of Nations

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Consideration of the League's relative successes during the 1920s with some examples can be made. Candidates may refer to events such as the Aaland Islands, Greece/Bulgaria and Yugoslavia/Albania to illustrate the successes, although better answers will suggest that these involved only small nations. Candidates may refer to events such as Vilna, Corfu and the Ruhr to illustrate failure and suggest that this happened when they were dealing with larger nations. Answers will attempt to consider the evidence of the League's increasing inability to deal with the deteriorating international situation of the 1930s. A main focus might well be on the two crises of the 1930s, over Manchuria and Abyssinia, as examples of the dilemmas faced by the League and how these incidents influenced the growing challenges provided by Japan, Italy and Germany. In discussing the success of the League candidates could consider the work of the various agencies, particularly refugees and mandates, but may consider any of the social achievements on health, labour and working conditions.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The USSR 1924-1953

18(a) 'The Five Year Plans failed to achieve their aims during the 1930s.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of Stalin's central planning

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may outline the aims of Stalin's Five Year Plans; this may include security and ultimately preparation for war and the need to catch up with the west, the need to develop industry and agriculture for exports to raise capital, the control it would give Stalin over workers, they may categorise his aims as political, economic and social. These criteria could then provide a basis against which they can judge success. Candidates may also consider the relative success of each of the Five Year Plans or they may consider the success in terms of Stalin and the communist party or for the workers and kulaks. Answers may refer to the increase in production in key industries and the support received from groups such as the Stakhanovites, the increased opportunities for women and the education developments, but for workers they may mention conditions, hours worked and the internal passports and the failure to increase consumer goods. When considering agriculture they may consider production and the famine, the destruction of the kulaks could also be used to show that for Stalin it was a success. Some candidates may consider the issue of propaganda and whether targets were actually met or issues such as wrecking groups or the use of forced labour to achieve the aims.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

18(b) Assess the impact of the Great Patriotic War on the USSR to 1945. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the impact on the USSR of the Great Patriotic War

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to focus on the impact of the War on the USSR. Issues to consider will include: economic and military readiness (including the effect of the purges) and the development of these factors as the war progressed, the contribution of all Russians to the war, dislocation of industry and agriculture. The political impact might be considered, particularly with regard to the position of Stalin. Candidates may also look at how the impact varied over time with the initial loss of land and then the recovery. This may lead to a discussion of the human cost, numbers killed and injured in places such as Stalingrad. Candidates may also consider the wider impact of the Great Patriotic War on the Soviet Union's international position by 1945, such as achieving great power status and providing security through a buffer.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Cold War in Europe 1945-1989

19(a) To what extent were disagreements at Yalta and Potsdam in 1945 the main cause of the Cold War in Europe? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of relative importance of the causes of the Cold War in Europe.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to show clear understanding of both Yalta and Potsdam meetings, with particular attention given to the evidence of disagreement between the wartime allies. In order to achieve the higher levels other factors for the development of the Cold War will need to be considered, this may include some of the following: a discussion of the ideological differences, suspicions before 1945, particularly over the failure of the west to open a 'second front', the impact of victory and the human cost for the USSR and their desire for future security, the policies of the USA and USSR over the future of Germany and the USSR concerns over Nazism and over eastern European countries that had been 'liberated', the issue of reparations, the atomic bomb and the USA refusal to tell the USSR, the personalities of the leaders, particularly following the death of Roosevelt and his replacement by Truman.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

19(b) Assess the reasons why the Cold War in Europe ended by 1989. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the ending of the Cold War

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In order to access the higher levels candidates should examine a variety of reasons and evaluate their relative importance in the ending of the Cold War. Candidates may consider some of the following: Internal pressures for the USSR, particularly Gorbachev's modernisation and economic problems, particularly financial over the Arms Race, consideration may also be given to the ideas of *glasnost* and *perestroika*. Although candidates are not required to look outside events in Europe those who consider the USSR's relations with the wider world should be credited, events in Afghanistan did have an impact. Candidates may also consider Gorbachev's desire for international trust and co-operation. Candidates should balance developments within the Soviet Union with a consideration of events in the satellite states; this may include the difficulty of maintaining satellites and Gorbachev's policy towards Eastern Europe, particularly his decision not to maintain communist states with the Red Army. There are a wide range of issues that could be considered and it is unlikely that answers will be able to cover all issues, reward quality of argument and assessment.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

The Cold War in Asia and the Americas 1949-1975**20(a) Assess the reasons why the USA intervened in the Korean War. [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the USA's decision to intervene in the Korean War

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers may consider the importance of the USA's strategy of containing communism, particularly following the challenges posed by the success of Mao's communists in China. Candidates may also consider the Domino theory, clash of ideology between democracy and communism and the strategic importance of Korea after WWII. Candidates may consider events in Korea in 1950 that led to the outbreak of war and the situation by September 1950. The Soviet absence from the Security Council may also be considered as this allowed the USA to influence the UN decision. Better answers may point out that the force sent was a UN force, but the overwhelming part of the force was from the USA. Candidates may therefore suggest that the initial aim was to achieve the UN objective of removing North Korean troops from South Korea and back to the 38th parallel. However, candidates can also go on to say that for MacArthur and Truman there was the opportunity to drive communism from the whole of Korea. There are a large number of reasons that candidates may consider, but in the higher bands they must evaluate the relative importance of the factors.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

20(b) Assess the reasons why the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) was resolved peacefully. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the Cuban Missile Crisis and its resolution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to consider the causes and course of the Crisis in order to fully evaluate issues. Candidates may consider USA and USSR's involvement in Cuba, examining some of the military, economic and political considerations. Candidates may consider some of the reasons for the placing of nuclear weapons on Cuba, including bargaining with the USA, trapping the USA, testing the resolve of the USA and in particular Kennedy and winning a victory in the arms race. All of these could then be linked to why there was a peaceful outcome. Candidates may also consider the importance of the immediate circumstances of military escalation and how brinkmanship had nearly ended in nuclear war, they may also consider that communication between the two super powers was developed a sign of concern about brinkmanship. Candidates may consider the fact that both superpowers gained something from the crisis and were therefore willing to reach a peaceful agreement; this may include some of the following: Cuba remained communist and was still a useful ally for the USSR close to the USA, for Khrushchev and Kennedy their reputation as responsible statesmen improved. Answers in the higher levels will consider a range of factors, but those in the top bands will evaluate the relative importance of the reasons.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Generic Mark Scheme 2587/88/89
June 2007

Units 2587-2589: GENERIC MARK BANDS HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Examiners are reminded that

- in Bands I-III they should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- in Bands IV-VII they should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down
- are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5].

Answers require some broad understanding of historical debate, but never depend on any reference to the views of particular historians (pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit - as in any AS/A2 Unit). **Demonstration of a broad understanding of historical debate does not involve anything very sophisticated: even hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the top Bands.**

PASSAGES QUESTION

NB

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge may not be put in Band I.
- Answers which use own knowledge but make no use of the Passages may not be put in Bands I or II.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- Glosses in [] have been added to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the mark scheme.” (*Code of Practice*, #4.17).

BANDS I-VII/45: Contextual Evaluation

- I (36-45) The response **focuses very sharply on the key issue** in the question, using good and very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. Contextual knowledge is used **very appropriately and effectively** in relation to the question. (This contextual knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.). The answer **contains a very good balance** between Passage and contextual evaluation in **reaching a judgement** about the issue. There is **clear and substantial evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved by comments on the validity of the arguments in the Passages using the other Passages or own knowledge (**not** all the Passages need to be evaluated). The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[‘A very good balance’ means that evidence for the final judgement is drawn both from the Passages and from contextual knowledge but not that the whole response must be equally balanced between use of the Passages and contextual knowledge. Own knowledge need not be extensive or exhaustive as long as it provides supported evaluation of the views in the Passages. The Passages need not necessarily all be evaluated, although the main views expressed in them should be. The degree to which this is done successfully may help to decide where in the Band the answer should be placed.]

II (31-35) The response **focuses on the key issue** in the question, using very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. The quality of the contextual comments and some aspects of the internal analysis of the Passages, whilst sound, will be **less rigorous** than in Band I. There is a **fairly clear and fairly full evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved and a **judgement is reached**. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[Answers in this Band are likely to be less well developed in some way. The Passages may be less well used, one view may be barely evaluated, the judgement may be based mainly on the Passages or contextual knowledge may not be equally well linked to the Passages. The Passages should be the main focus of the answer and there should be some supported evaluation, but it does not need to be lengthy.]

III (27-30) The response **considers the interpretations** in the Passages and deploys some contextual knowledge. The argument is clear, but comments will be **thinner** and overall **judgements less effective** than in Band II. The organisation of the answer is **uneven**. There is a **reasonable degree of evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing is generally fluent and historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

[Answers may consider the views in the Passages in general terms without much detailed reference. The judgement may be incomplete or not made at all or all the factors/arguments may be seen as equally valid/important. There may be quite limited use of contextual knowledge, or it may not be wholly relevant to the key issue, leading to incomplete, unsupported evaluation. The argument should be mostly clear.]

IV (22-26) The response shows **considerable imbalance between** Passage evaluation and contextual knowledge. A **basic argument** is provided. The Passages may be largely used to **illustrate the argument** put forward and not as the focus of the answer. There is **some attempt at evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

[Imbalance means a response where the contextual knowledge is the main focus and the Passages are glanced at in passing, often to confirm the arguments put forward from own knowledge. Alternatively there may be some interpretation of the Passages which is linked to the key issue but no real evaluation. Some confusion may creep into the argument.]

V (18-21) The response shows **some evidence of knowledge** of the key issue, but may make **little use** of the Passages. The answer **lacks coherent structure** but the direction of the attempted argument is **mostly relevant**. There is **little evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer contains frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[Answers may describe the Passages, perhaps with little reference to the key issue or to the interpretations in the Passages. The argument may not carry much conviction or be made clearly. Contextual knowledge may not be well related to the key issue or indeed to the Passages. Evaluation will probably be slight.]

VI (10-17) The response shows **serious weaknesses in knowledge** and ability to handle contextual questions. The argument may be **fragmentary**. There may be **serious irrelevance**. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[These answers are not likely to be focused on the key issue and the argument may be impossible to follow. There may be misunderstanding of the Passages.]

VII (0-9) The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding. There is no attempt to answer the question. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

ESSAY

NB

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- Some topics by their very nature are less strongly focused around historical debate. Question-specific mark schemes will provide the necessary guidance on this.
- Answers require some understanding of broad schools of historical debate, but NEVER depend on any reference to the views of particular historians; pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit, as in any AS/A2 Unit.
- Demonstration of an understanding of broad schools of historical debate need NOT involve anything very sophisticated: hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet in full the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the high Bands.

BANDS I-VII/45

- I (36–45) *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions.* The response is **focused clearly** on the demands of the question, even if there is **some unevenness**. The approach is clearly **analytical rather than descriptive** or narrative and, in particular, there is a **clear and evident** (but not necessarily totally full) **evaluation** of the historical debate bearing upon the topic which is **carefully integrated** into the overall approach. The answer is fully relevant. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate *factual* material - the degree of that support will help to distinguish between answers higher and lower in the Band. The impression is that a **good solid answer** has been provided. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (31–35) The response is **focused clearly** on the question but there is **some unevenness in content**. The approach is **mostly analytical and relevant**. The answer is generally *structured* coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. However, the answer will **not be equally thorough throughout**, for example evaluating the relevant debate less well. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (27–30) The *response* reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt** to provide an appropriate argument and factual knowledge. The approach contains **analysis or explanation but it may be inadequately supported**. There is a reasonable grasp of the elements of the debate which bears upon the topic, and this is to a degree integrated into the overall approach. The answer is mostly relevant. The answer may **lack balance and depth** in factual knowledge. Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

- IV (22–26)** The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly**. The approach may depend more on **some heavily descriptive or narrative sections** than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. There **is some knowledge of the historical debate** which bears upon the topic, but this may be **'bolted-on'** to the other material. Alternatively, the answer may consist largely of **description of schools of thought** that is not well directed at the specific question and is not well supported factually. Factual material may be used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly** the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (18–21)** The *response* offers **some elements of an appropriate answer** but there is little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of a question. The approach **lacks analysis and explanation** and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, **is not linked effectively to the answer**. There may be **some hints of the historical debate** which bear upon the topic, but it will probably be poorly understood. Alternatively, there may **be extensive description of schools of thought** that is only slightly directed at the specific question. The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (10–17)** The *response* is not **properly focused on the requirements** of the question. There may be many **unsupported assertions**. The argument may be of very **limited relevance** and there may be **confusion about the implications** of the question. There will be **no sense of the historical debate** on the topic. The answer may be largely **fragmentary and incoherent**, perhaps only in brief note form. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding of the general topic and of the historical debate on it. There is **no attempt to answer** the question. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Mark Scheme 2587
June 2007**

2587 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS 768-1216**Charlemagne****1 Study all the Passages.**

Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Charlemagne was a great ruler. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Charlemagne's reputation has always stood high, and in a sense he has been reinvented generation by generation, as a crusader in the twelfth century and a 'Father of Europe' in the twentieth. This in part rests on the source-material, particularly the literary sources. However, candidates will know that Charlemagne heavily influenced sources notably the *Royal Frankish Annals*, which Einhard (Passage **A**), who was in any case closely associated with the emperor, probably made use of.

Charlemagne's achievements, especially in conquest, were remarkable and his remarkable range of activities seem to have had an ideological drive based on a deep conviction that he was chosen to erect a 'truly Christian society'. Candidates will, however, notice the degree to which King's assessment (Passage **D**) is influenced by that of Einhard. Two kinds of criticism are represented here. In Passage **B** Ganshof comments on the problems of the later reign, implicitly suggesting that the old emperor was losing his grip. More radically, in Passage **C** Fichtenau suggests that Charlemagne failed to base his empire upon a firm and just administrative structure, leaving his subjects at the mercy of self-interested officers. This strikes at the very heart of Charlemagne's reputation, for if the great ruler could not protect his people, how great was his achievement? Candidates may be aware of other criticisms by historians, notably that Charlemagne exhausted his lands by war. Using all these they should be able to conclude with an assessment of Charlemagne.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

2 Assess the view that from 800 Charlemagne regarded the imperial title as very important. [45]

Focus: An analysis of the importance with which Charlemagne regarded the imperial title.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Few issues in Charlemagne's reign have so divided historians. With regard to the matter of whether he sought the imperial title before 800, which is a secondary element in this question but one with some bearing, the *Annals of Lorsch* and other sources, of which the candidates should have some knowledge, suggest that Charlemagne and his court sought the imperial title. Much has been made of the creation of an 'imperial' capital before 800, which points in the same direction. On the other hand, the most intimate portrait we have, that of Einhard, suggests that Charlemagne regretted the events of Christmas Day 800. It is possible to interpret this as regretting the manner rather than the fact of the coronation, but there is here an obvious ambivalence.

With regard to the period after 800 which is the main thrust of the question here, historians have pointed out that in the *Divisio* of 806 when Charlemagne made provision for his inheritance, he made no mention of the empire or the imperial title. This suggests that he perhaps saw the title as something of little importance or merely as a personal distinction which could not be passed on. On the other hand he fought the Byzantines for the right to use the title of emperor – though he adopted a form acceptable to them, and in 813 crowned his sole surviving son Louis as emperor with his own hands.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3 Assess the view that Carolingian expansion largely ended after 800. [45]

Focus: An analysis of the reasons for the reduction in Carolingian conquests after 800.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates can rightly point out that conquest did not quite cease, because in 801 Louis the Pious conquered Barcelona, while there continued to be considerable Frankish pressure on the peoples in the Danube area. A major expedition was raised against the Danes, but events in Denmark meant it was never launched and, thereafter, the Franks treated with the Danes. There was no major advance.

Historians have viewed this in a number of ways. There has been a tendency to regard it as a natural consequence of Charlemagne's advancing age – he was too old to campaign and so the impetus to conquest failed. The idea has been advanced that there was a deliberate decision not to advance accompanied by a reorganisation of the army for defence – so that territorial forces rather than small professional warbands became important. It has also been suggested that there was simply no realistic possibility of expansion – that the empire had run out of possibilities.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

King John

4 Study all the Passages. Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that King John was the aggressor in the quarrel with Innocent III over the Canterbury election. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The question asks about responsibility for the bitter and long lasting quarrel over the Canterbury election. The traditional view was that John was a greedy and domineering king who rode roughshod over others and thereby precipitated the dispute, and this is enshrined in the quotation from the *Margam Annals* (Passage A) calling him a tyrant. But candidates should show awareness of the special interests of monastic chroniclers, and especially Cistercians. Moreover, even here in the mention of the election of Prior Reginald there are indications of the complications which any election at Canterbury raised, and the rights of the crown, condemned

by the annalist as profane customs, but regarded by John as ‘his royal rights and liberties’ (Passage **C**). Moreover candidates should be able to set the dispute in the context of church development under Innocent III and, thereby, analyse the view put forward in Passage **B** that Innocent III may have been the aggressor – though even here they need to recognise that the pope temporised in choosing Langton. A quite different motive is suggested in Passage **D** arising out of the loss of Normandy, but even this writer acknowledges that the king was moderate in his pursuit of the quarrel and **C** stresses his willingness to negotiate. Moreover the Margam annalist admits that public opinion was with John in this matter – something which should give pause for thought to any simple assumption that John was acting as a tyrant. Providing the main lines of the controversy are understood and appropriate external knowledge is used, the actual conclusion drawn by candidates is not crucial.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

5 Assess the view that John was a poor general and leader of men in war. [45]

Focus: An analysis of John’s record as a military leader.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Historians have differed sharply about John’s military ability and sweeping judgements have been made frequently, and much has been made of his title of ‘Softsword’. There needs to be a careful survey of the evidence, which is ambiguous. Richard I had been little disturbed when John rebelled against him, considering him not the kind of man to win a kingdom and this has been much quoted. John has been much reproached for his absence in the latter stages of the campaign in Normandy 1202-04. Subsequently it has been said that he failed to react and delayed an expedition to recover the lost lands. When he finally did attack in 1213-14 it has been said that he showed cowardice and little real sense of urgency. Against this it has to be said that when war broke out in 1202 John won Mirebeau, while his scheme to relieve Château Gaillard was intelligent, and he may have lacked resources to defend Normandy and to compensate for the treachery of the Norman barons. In 1205 he was only with difficulty persuaded to abandon a major expedition to the continent. He then became involved in complex problems with the Celtic countries and his own barons, but always pressed forward his scheme to recover his continental lands. The strategy for 1213-14 was intelligent and the defeat of Bouvines hardly his fault, and though his Poitevin campaign was inglorious it did tie down enemy troops. In the civil war in England John could be very decisive, as at Rochester. Overall, candidates may well lean to the view that John was inconsistent, or suggest that he was a good military thinker, but a poor leader in the field.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 ‘King John’s determination to recover his continental lands lost in 1204 was the main reason for the deterioration of relations between king and barons’. Assess this view of the causes of the John’s disputes with the barons. 45]

Focus: An analysis of the reasons for John’s difficulties with his barons.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

In the past historians tended to attribute John's problems with the barons to his personality, seeing him as a cruel tyrant, and there is still debate about his personality. Even the most revisionist historians regard him as having had an unfortunate personality, and this is best exemplified by his treatment of the de Braose family. However, Angevin treatment of opponents and overmighty subjects was always fairly brutal.

More recently historians have seen that John was administratively competent and much concerned with law and justice, but it has been suggested that his continuous presence – his father and brother were notable absentees from England – may have caused problems. But historians have come to a recognition of the scale of his problem in seeking to recover his continental lands from Philip who was probably much richer – something which as an Angevin (rather than English) ruler he could hardly avoid. This necessitated enormous financial pressure on England, the worse as inflation was growing. This explains the heavy taxation. However candidates must be clear that there was more than taxation in the normal sense here. John used 'feudal incidents' – and candidates must make it clear they understand what these were - to raise money. Wardships, marriage of heiresses etc were legitimate occasions for the king to raise money, and John's predecessors had used them. But they were not, as much else was, subject to law, and so John was ruthless in his exploitation and this impinged heavily upon the barons who were the political class. Moreover, historians have recognised that some barons, from a very early time, hated John and were quite irreconcilable. Overall, John was probably hated for a variety of reasons which interacted with one another.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Mark Scheme 2588
June 2007**

2588 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS 1556-1725

Philip II

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Philip II deserved his reputation as champion of the Catholic faith. [45]

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages. A supported and evaluative judgement should be reached.

There is debate on whether Philip deserved his reputation as champion of the Catholic faith. Was he primarily inspired by religious fanaticism, or by political, economic or dynastic motives? Central to his reputation are the obligations of his titles, inherited from Ferdinand of Aragon, of 'Catholic King' and 'King of Jerusalem'. His duties as 'Catholic King', in a Catholic / Counter-Reformation context, included revitalising the national Church spiritually, recovering previous Catholic territories lost to heresy, acting as the political arm of the papacy and reconverting lapsed converts or heretics within Spain. As 'King of Jerusalem' he inherited crusading duties against the infidel Muslims and Jews.

All four Passages refer to Philip's duties towards the Spanish Church, but whereas Passages **A** and **B** confine their scope to the national Church, Passages **C** and **D** extend also to his international duties. Passage **C** refers to crusades against heretics and infidels, while Passage **D** discusses his relationship with Rome in the light of the international Jesuit mission. As a set, the Passages cover four relevant areas of debate. Passage **A**, written by Motley, an example of the Black Legend, establishes Philip's traditional fanatical reputation, claiming his tyrannical use of the Inquisition within Spain to support his absolute power. However, though this Passage supports the negative view that Philip used the Inquisition as a political tool, it also positively suggests that heresy was stamped out in Spain. This might lead to discussion of the impact of the Spanish Inquisition in the light of Philip's religious duties and historians' interpretations. Revisionist historians suggest a more social, cultural and educative role for the Inquisition, though there are still some who adhere to the traditional view. Argument should focus on how far defence of the faith was his motivation.

Passage **B** refers to Philip's effective revitalisation of the Spanish national Church by implementing the Tridentine decrees, supported by the claim in Passages **C** and **D** that Philip was devoted to Spanish Catholicism. This view should be evaluated with balance, using knowledge of church reforms such as new bishoprics and seminaries, the removal of decayed monastic houses and the creation of new orders, such as the Discalced Carmelites and of his defence of his political powers and those of the Inquisition. Revisionist historians argue that Philip's reforms were ineffectual, some stressing his social and political motivation.

Passage **C** suggests that Philip's religious duties were more effectively fulfilled when they placed Spanish interests first. This claim should be evaluated using knowledge of his international role, against Turks, Dutch, French and English heretics. Passage **D** also highlights Philip's national approach to his religious duties, undermining Papal authority by trying to limit Jesuit influence in Spain. Own knowledge might include the cases of Carranza and Perez, Lepanto and the Turkish truce, peace with England until 1585, the motives of the Armada and intervention in France. It is stressed that there is a very broad range of relevant material, and the selection of balanced and pertinent examples is what is required. A balanced discussion should lead to a supported evaluative judgement on how far Philip deserved his reputation.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

2 Assess how far it was Philip II's personal weaknesses that most undermined his attempt to exercise absolute power over Spain. [45]

Focus: Discussion of the historical debate on Philip II's character and its effects on his exercise of absolute power.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate on Philip II's character sets his strengths: such as determination, intransigence and religious mission, against his weaknesses, mental and physical: such as mistrust, conservatism, indecisiveness, and inconsistency within a personal, sedentary, paper-based administration. The debate on his absolutism focuses on whether he had such power in reality or merely in theory. Some candidates may question whether he did, in fact, attempt to make himself absolute.

His conservatism and respect for his father's Instructions of 1543 led him to maintain the inherited administrative system, expanding the number of councils by 3 to 14. This system itself undermined absolutism: overlapping conciliar jurisdictions, factional rivalry, distance, *fueros* and local grandee power weakening his control of mainly Castilian Viceroy, *letrados* and *corregidores* in his provinces. The deficiencies of the financial system, including inherited debts, foreign loans, *juros*, *asientos*, and corruption further undermined his power, aggravated by his lack of financial expertise, bankruptcies and export of bullion. The inherited economy also had flaws, such as an adverse balance of payments, import of arms and grain.

The Black Legend stresses his tyrannical use of the inherited Inquisition, his reputation for cruelty, religious and racial bigotry, which his intransigent orthodoxy aggravated in a Counter-Reformation context. Revisionists see the role of the Inquisition as social and educative rather than political. Some historians view him as indecisive, mentally / physically weak and financially inept, others as authoritarian and cruel, causing the Aragonese and Morisco revolts. A supported evaluative judgement should be reached on the relative significance of his personal weaknesses in limiting his power compared to other factors, such as the inherited system or pressure of imperial commitments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3 To what extent was Philip II's foreign policy aggressively imperialist? [45]

Focus: Discussion of the historical debate about the motives of Philip II's foreign policy.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate centres on whether Philip II's foreign policy was defensive, aggressive or opportunistic. Some historians have stressed the consistency of his religious motivation, for example in fighting the Turks in the 1570s, acquiring Portugal in 1580 and waging war against the English and French heretics in the late 1580s and 1590s. Others have emphasised his political and imperialist ambitions, citing his acquisition of Portugal and its empire, his attempts to dominate England by sending the Armadas, and to absorb France, continuing war with Henry IV after 1593 despite Rome's recognition of his Catholicism.

The suggestion that Philip followed a Grand Strategy of religious imperialism, underpinned by pursuit of reputation, dynasticism and national security, is countered by the view that he was opportunistic, merely reacting to crises as they arose, and so had no imperialist strategy. Evidence is likely to include peace with France in 1559, war against the Turks in the Mediterranean until the truce of 1578, the acquisition of Portugal in 1580 and war against England and France thereafter. An evaluative judgement should be reached on the extent to which war or peace, defence or aggression, imperialistic strategy or opportunism guided policy. The main focus needs to be on the *nature* of his foreign policy, argued with a sense of debate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Elizabeth I

- 4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Elizabeth's gender was a crucial factor in shaping her image. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passages **A and C** argue that Elizabeth consciously presented a very feminine image. **A** argues that she used her gender to control and manipulate as well as to create a cult of Elizabeth. Both the aspects described are based on female models: the courtly lady and the eligible spinster. In support of this, candidates could use details of her courtships as well as the imagery of a range of art forms.

This interpretation could be challenged on the grounds that it ignores contemporary theories of monarchy and the problems associated with making a female ruler acceptable in the 16th century. Passage **C** focuses particularly on pictorial images of the queen, arguing that these were based on female symbolism, but that the symbolism became dominant and references to gender less overt as Elizabeth aged. Candidates may refer to specific portraits to illustrate this, or challenge the view using the alternative argument presented in Passages **B and D** which argue that there was a strong masculine element in the image presented. **D** can, however, be reconciled to the argument in **A** that Elizabeth's gender was the starting point for the image.

Candidates may cite arguments put forward at the time about the masculine side of the queen's image, as well as referring to the speeches of the queen which emphasised her kingly qualities. Passages **B and D** both stress the importance of the efforts made to reconcile the concept of kingship with a female in the role. This interpretation could be challenged on the grounds that Elizabeth was accepted as her father's daughter and had no need of theorising to establish and sustain her power, just as her half-sister Mary had been accepted.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

5 Assess the reasons why parliamentary challenges to Elizabeth were generally unsuccessful. [45]

Focus: The extent to which Elizabeth was able to manage parliament.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates may argue on the basis that the opposition was weak, with a lack of organised tactics, and that MPs tended to focus on local issues. In support of this they may cite the lack of support for the Wentworths on freedom of speech, the lack of support for changes to the Church Settlement and the failure to follow up on requests for Elizabeth to marry. This view could be undermined with reference to successful challenges such as those regarding the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots.

However, candidates may also be aware that on this occasion and others there is evidence that Elizabeth's councillors orchestrated demands. This explanation, however, could also be challenged on the grounds that on occasion the MPs were successful without Council support - the challenge on monopolies being the most likely example. This may be explained with reference to the failing grip of the monarch on government in the last decade of the reign.

Candidates may argue that parliament rarely challenged the queen and that the MPs did not see this as their purpose. They may refer to the Council's effective management of parliament, an argument that reinforces the significance of the more troubled government of the final decade. Candidates may include discussion of the influence of the Lords on the Church Settlement, at a time when Elizabeth was not in a sufficiently strong position to ignore the magnate families. The means by which she gained firmer control over the House of Lords, and hence could control later challenges, may be described.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 Assess how far Puritan ideas had significant support in the reign of Elizabeth I. [45]

Focus: The nature and extent of Puritanism.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates will probably define 'Puritan', dividing the group into three distinguishable sub-sets. This would enable them to distinguish between the level of the support of presbyterians, sectaries and those wanting a more godly lifestyle. In order to access the higher Bands, candidates should also define 'significant'. This may be in terms of numbers, influence, or ability to withstand the efforts of the authorities to eradicate them. Candidates may evaluate assessments of the support with reference to the existence of later Puritan groups or actions such as the Millenary Petition, but this is not required. Candidates may distinguish between the level of support for different aspects of Puritanism at different times in the reign. They may distinguish between clergy support and that of the laity, the latter being more difficult to gauge, whereas the former can be quantified at various times in relation to disciplining of the clergy, refusal to take oaths, wear vestments and so on. The extent of support for Puritans in parliament is likely to figure in many answers, but if an answer relies solely or mainly on this aspect it will be unbalanced.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Oliver Cromwell

7 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Cromwell believed in religious toleration. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **A** identifies the paradox that while Cromwell stated that he supported liberty of conscience, as Lord Protector he became increasingly intolerant. **B** qualifies this somewhat, by defining religious liberty in Cromwell's terms, but the example drawn from the early stages of the Protectorate does suggest toleration. **D** places more emphasis on Cromwell's ulterior motives, of converting the nation to a godly way of life, implying that 'toleration' is not an appropriate term to use in relation to Cromwell, although Macinnes does acknowledge the range of religious groups tolerated during the Protectorate. **C** takes a far more negative view of Cromwell, making it clear that Cromwell was not tolerant. Indeed, Hutton questions whether Cromwell was able to control religion totally in light of the proliferation of sects that had appeared in the late 1640s and early 1650s, suggesting that his policy was more reactive than proactive. **C** does agree with **D** that Cromwell's ultimate aim was for unity of belief.

There are a number of incidents that candidates could cite to show at least relative religious toleration in comparison to many of the MPs in the Protectorate Parliaments. These incidents might include the case of James Naylor, the treatment of the Unitarian, John Biddle or his relations with the first Protectorate Parliament. Candidates may also elaborate on issues referred to in the Passages, such as the continued intolerance of Catholics and the issue of the readmission of the Jews. The Passages concern the Cromwellian regime, but candidates could legitimately include incidents earlier in Cromwell's career that might point to toleration, such as his policy within his cavalry regiments during the Civil Wars, or frustration with the failure of the Rump parliament to produce religiously tolerant legislation.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

8 Assess Cromwell's motives in refusing the offer of the crown in 1657. [45]

Focus: Cromwell's motives in relation to an important decision.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Cromwell took some time to reply to the offer of the crown in the Humble Petition and Advice, leading to speculation on his motives in doing so. The army may have influenced his decision – there are conflicting accounts about the significance of a meeting with some of the leading officers, while Colonel Pride is reported to have threatened to assassinate Cromwell if he accepted the offer. However, the ability of the army to influence Cromwell can be called into question since he was able to contain its enthusiasm on several previous occasions and there was no adverse reaction to his failure to defend the rule of the Major Generals.

Cromwell claimed that he believed it would go against God's providence to accept the crown, but there is some scepticism about how genuine this claim was. There were also constitutional issues at stake: there was no provision for deciding the succession in the Instrument of Government, which might lead to problems on Cromwell's death; on the other hand, Cromwell might be more easily controlled if he had clear limitations as king – there were pros and cons from all points of view if Cromwell did accept the crown. The evidence, in short, can be interpreted in a number of ways, and reference to more general ideas about Cromwell's motives in other instances in order to interpret his reactions in 1657 would be appropriate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9 Why, having fought the Civil War to limit the King's power, was Cromwell eager to execute the King in January 1649? [45]

Focus: Apparent inconsistency of Cromwell's actions towards the king

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The purpose in fighting the Civil Wars was to limit the king's powers. All the proposals put to the king, before, during and after the Civil War suggest this. Although at times the proposals were too extreme for the king to be likely to accept them, the most moderate proposals after the First Civil War were those put to the king by Cromwell on the instructions of the army, that is, the Heads of Proposals. This suggests that Cromwell merely wanted to limit the king's powers.

However, there are various theories about what led Cromwell to change his mind, and also about when this change of heart occurred. The latter is relevant if it is used to explain *why* he changed his mind. Cromwell was certainly frustrated by the king's decision to make the Engagement with the Scots of December 1647, since this was made while the king was ostensibly negotiating on the Four Bills (based on the Army's peace proposals). Besides this, the engagement led directly to the Second Civil War, which the Army judged to be initiated by the king in direct contravention of God's providence. This is clear at the Windsor Prayer Meeting, although it is uncertain whether Cromwell was present at the time. It has been argued that Cromwell decided as early as the Spring of 1648 that the king should be removed, suggesting that it was events preceding this that influenced his decision. However, it is also possible to argue that Cromwell did not make this decision until after Pride's Purge in December 1648 when the Vote of No Addresses had been repealed and, in view of the king's intransigence, he could see no other course of action. Tales of last-minute negotiations for a settlement with the king support this argument.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Peter the Great

10 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the claim that 'Peter did not speed up, but rather slowed down, Russia's economic development' (Passage D, lines 37-38). [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The Passages might be sorted into two groups. Broadly Passage **A** supports the thrust of Passage **D** about the dubious consequences of Peter the Great's economic policies. Passage **A** describes the way in which Peter had to resort to extreme measures. It sees a lack of foresight, or system, in his policies. There is a brief reference to bad harvests which were outside his control but the rest of the Passage largely holds the Tsar responsible for the problems. There is much in common with **D** but the later Passage goes further in claiming that Peter actually harmed the economy and prevented advances.

When assessing Passage **B**, candidates are not expected to have more general knowledge of Stalin than is explained in the Introduction (examiners will not expect any link to be made with Stalin's economic policies) but his view of Peter in Passage **B** is notable for its admiration of the Tsar's achievements. Rady in Passage **C** provides some hard evidence to support his claim for economic achievement. In referring to their own knowledge, candidates might consider Peter's success in increasing industrial output. He invited foreign entrepreneurs into Russia to improve methods of production and develop new resources sources and trade routes. New regions were opened up, for example the Urals. But Peter had to rely largely on state control in a country with an undeveloped economy; the enterprising middle class was very small. The costs of the wars were high. War made necessary changes in the economy but they also emptied the treasury. Little could be done to reform agriculture.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

11 Assess the claim that Peter can be described as 'Great' more for what he attempted than for what he achieved. [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the claim to greatness of Peter I.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

For most candidates, the focus will be on the extent of the distinction between Peter's attempts, or aims, and his achievements. The scope of material that can be considered is wide. Candidates might consider Peter's handling of his personal power. He drove through his policies relentlessly. He inherited a weak and inefficient system of government and administration although the theoretical powers of the Tsar were considerable. New institutions were established, such as the *gubernii* to exercise control over the provinces. The Senate was established. Fiscals were appointed to curb corruption. The Table of Ranks was intended to make the nobility more effective. But how many of these innovations worked effectively in practice? And how many depended on the Tsar's personal influence, to be threatened if there were a weaker ruler? He curbed the power of the Church. Peter also pursued an ambitious foreign policy. No historians would now claim that Peter was completely successful - or unsuccessful - but candidates should consider whether his achievements were sufficient to merit the title 'the Great'.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader. For example, an alternative approach might be to argue that Peter did not deserve the epithet 'Great' and answers might attain any mark by taking this line. But most will accept the description. Another alternative line might be to claim that his greatness lay in other aspects of domestic affairs, for example the economy. Such answers will have to be read carefully to ensure that candidates are not simply repeating material from the printed Passages in Question 10.

12 How far do you agree that Peter the Great's foreign policies were an unnecessary response to external dangers? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about Peter the Great's foreign policies.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The Specification mentions 'Threats from and wars against Turkey, Persia and Sweden'. As a general guide, answers that only mention the struggle with Sweden should normally be awarded a mark in one band lower than would otherwise be given. Based on the material that is probably available in books to the candidates, Persia is likely to be given the least attention and, even for **Band I** examiners will accept an emphasis on Sweden.

In assessing 'an unnecessary response...', one might expect candidates to ask whether Peter went further than was necessary to safeguard Russia's interests. They might recognise both the defensive and aggressive aspects of Peter's policies. There is an argument that Peter was defending Russia's best interests against the threat from Sweden. He began his reign on the defensive against Charles XII and had to reorganise his army after the heavy defeat at Narva (1700). The Baltic offered Peter and Russia an outlet for trade and a means of political influence. On the other hand, the Great Northern War continued long after the decisive victory at Poltava (1709) until Nystadt (1721). He had ambitions against Turkey, beginning with the Azov campaign, hoping for access to the Mediterranean. Here he took on a still formidable enemy and had limited success. The invasion of Persia was intended to capture control of the silk trade and his armies went further east to Siberia. Peter considered these to be important strategic objectives; candidates might consider whether these enterprises were worthwhile. Certainly, Peter was at war during almost every year of his reign. Answers might balance the gains, which were very considerable overall, against the costs, which were also very considerable.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader. Allowable alternative explanations will not include the neglect of foreign policy in favour of extended discussions of domestic affairs but it will be valid to argue that Peter's foreign policies were linked to domestic developments; this point can be made quite quickly.

**Mark Scheme 2589
June 2007**

2589 HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS 1799-1955**Napoleon I****1 Study all the passages**

Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the most important reason in Napoleon's downfall was British resistance. [45]

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages. A supported and evaluative judgement should be reached.

Key Points from passages: Sources **A and D** emphasise the role of Britain – **A**, a somewhat nationalistic and tub-thumping piece from the early 20th century, stresses the key role played by the Royal Navy and cites Trafalgar as decisive. **D** stresses, not British military impact, but the longevity of resistance and the power of British diplomacy and subsidies which kept Napoleon under pressure and eventually, in 1813, resulted in a coalition of all the great powers. **B**, whilst citing a number of causes, takes a more common view that the Russian campaign was the key turning point in Napoleon's downfall. **C** accepts that the Russian debacle represents the beginning of the end, but that Napoleon's downfall was not inevitable even then – Russia was exhausted and uncertain, France could raise another army, her allies remained on board, Austria was neutral, etc. The decisive point for Broers was the combination of the Prussian decision to oppose Napoleon and the British willingness to provide subsidies.

Contextual knowledge that may be brought to bear – candidates may refer in addition to Napoleon's view that The British and the 'Spanish ulcer' were the causes of his downfall. They may also point to the Continental System, the growth of resistance, the loss of support in France, Napoleon's supposed personal decline in ability, his over ambition and the declining quality of the French army. They may also introduce additional material to support and elaborate on points in the passages.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

2 Assess the claim that Napoleon should be viewed as an 'enlightened despot' in his rule of France. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the nature of Napoleon's rule

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The nature of Napoleon's rule has been an issue of debate amongst historians. This approach has two elements that need discussion – 'enlightened' and 'despot'. In relation to the former candidates may introduce elements of the debate about Napoleon and the Revolution and point to 'enlightened' reforms in education, the law and religious toleration. Others may point to efficient and uniform administration and government, elements of taxation and economic reform. (Of course, these areas and how far they reflect 'enlightened' thinking are a subject of debate and candidates should evaluate this). In relation to 'despot' one might expect consideration of the 'constitutions' and the suppression of freedoms and the concentration of power in Napoleon's hands. A contrast may be drawn between the Consulate and the Empire. The main discussion of relevant debate is likely to be over the issue of 'enlightened' rather than

‘despotism’ – although even here there is debate over the extent to which Napoleon’s rule was truly despotic.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3 ‘Napoleon himself was the main reason for French success in Europe in the period to 1807.’ How far do you agree with this claim? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for Napoleon’s success in Europe

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

This may be taken as a question purely about military success and conquest, but better candidates may range more widely to encompass Napoleon’s diplomacy and treaty-making and may also make his rule of France relevant. There may be discussion of Napoleon’s lack of statesmanship in making peace treaties with defeated states, or of his clever isolation of Prussia in relation to the Third Coalition. There may also be discussion of Napoleon’s role both as commander-in-chief and ruler of the French state and the efficient mobilisation of France, her allies and subject states for war. Many, however, will legitimately concentrate on military matters and here we can expect discussion of Napoleon’s supposed talents and abilities (motivator, organiser, strategist, tactician etc.), juxtaposed against the qualities of the French army (Grand Army, *amalgame*, mixed order, artillery, *bataillon carré* and so on) and the deficiencies of his enemies (weak coalitions, mutual jealousies, divided commands, traditional methods etc.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80

4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that it was personal ambition that led Gladstone to become leader of the Liberal party. [45]

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

All four Passages contain hints or more definite mentions of Gladstone’s ambition. Passage **A** refers to his cultivation of mass opinion to back his claims and **B** supports this showing how he was able to impose himself on the party because of his popular support. Passage **C** makes it clear that he resented time out of office and was ready to compromise, even with Palmerston, to regain it. Passage **D** backs up this view but indicates as well that Gladstone wanted power to achieve his aims, not necessarily for its own sake. But the Passages also emphasise other factors, his free trade budgets in **A** and his administrative talent in **B**. Candidates could use their own knowledge to expand these points. Passages **A** and **D** refer to his popularity and, again more detail could be given of the rise of the People’s William. Passage **B** suggests that old age and a high death rate among leading Liberals helped Gladstone and this obviously is a random factor. Candidates could cite Gladstone’s failure to win much support in Parliament, Passages **A** and **B**, as reasons why he had to seek popularity and this might be used to illustrate his personal ambition. **C** and **D** explain why he could not become a member of a Conservative government so he was propelled into the Liberal party. His decision to join the Palmerston government in 1859 and his subsequent achievements are seen by all the Passages as the crucial moment and

historians agree on this. Other factors which helped Gladstone might be his manipulation of the press, which could be used to indicate that he was personally ambitious, and his cultivation of the Nonconformist vote.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**

5 Assess how far Gladstone and Disraeli differed in their policies regarding the British Empire. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the extent to which Gladstone and Disraeli had different policies or had similar aims but different results.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidate comes to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The debate is centred on whether Gladstone and Disraeli really had different approaches to Imperial matters. One view argues that both had doubts about the wisdom of colonial possessions and Disraeli's 'millstone' comment can be compared with Gladstone's similar reluctance to spend money on colonial defence. Before 1872 Disraeli seemed to agree largely with the Liberal policy of withdrawal from continental commitments. Another view is that Disraeli was eager to extend the Empire and his purchase of the Suez Canal shares, making Victoria Empress of India and his acquisition of Cyprus prove this. Some historians consider Disraeli's speeches of 1872 and the Abyssinian war of 1866 show Disraeli as aware of the political advantage to be gained from a strongly imperialist policy. Gladstone was consistently critical of 'forward' policies, especially in South Africa and Afghanistan, and there is debate about how far Disraeli meant this to happen. Candidates may include discussion of the Eastern Question but this needs to be directed at imperial issues to gain much credit. Candidates may well conclude that Gladstone and Disraeli began with similar views and then diverged with Gladstone holding firmly to his moral line and the more flexible Disraeli taking an opportunist stance to win some easy popularity.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 To what extent did the social reforms of Disraeli's government of 1874-1880 succeed in improving the condition of the people? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of Disraeli's success in improving conditions

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

In Disraeli's Young England days he had claimed this as one of his aims. One view suggests that Disraeli had always had this aim and that his 1872 speeches underlined it. In this argument the reforms form an impressive legislative record allowing some limited state intervention, but also encouraging individual responsibility. From the Acts passed in 1875-6 several could be quoted as examples. The references need not be exclusively directed at the working classes as all benefited from legislation to improve the quality of food, end river pollution or to preserve open spaces and woodland for public recreation. Education reforms can also be cited.

The alternative view has also been urged. This suggests that Disraeli did not have a sustained programme, but a piecemeal one, and that individual MPs such as Plimsoll were the main

instigators of reform, or that some Acts derived from the Liberals and were passed with cross-party support implying that the government could not claim the credit for the reforms. Much of the legislation was permissive in nature and so some Acts did not achieve very much anyway. These criticisms need to be supported with examples. Some historians believe Disraeli exaggerated what was being achieved but some, who think little of most of Disraeli's programme, are more impressed with the trade union legislation. Candidates could argue that Disraeli did bring these social issues to the forefront of current debate. The impact of foreign and imperial concerns which took centre stage in the latter part of the ministry could be mentioned as a reason for limited achievement.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-71

- 7 Study all the Passages. Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Bismarck, after defeating Austria in 1866, was not planning another war.**

[45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Candidates should focus their analysis on Bismarck's aims and objectives between 1866 and 1870 and consider to what extent war with France was premeditated. Passage **C** gives Bismarck's own outline of his master plan and links his treatment of Austria with his future plans for France. Passage **A** states that Bismarck was content with his victories of 1866 and had no clear plan in mind as to where he was going next - "the German problem has been settled". Passage **D** suggests that Bismarck's thinking in 1866 was short term and led by immediate practicalities rather than any sense of long term planning. Passage **B** accepts that there would be increased tensions between a fearful France and a strengthened Prussia but claims that war in itself was not a necessity. In terms of own knowledge candidates could refer to: the "secret clauses" of the Treaty of Prague; Bismarck's public pronouncements against forcing the pace (analogy to ripe fruit); the attitude of the Southern States towards Prussia; and the growing pressure from German Liberals and nationalists.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the passages but no own knowledge will have **a ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the passages will have **a ceiling of Band III**.

- 8 'The eventual success of German Unification was achieved more through the weaknesses of other European States than through the strengths of Prussia.' How far do you agree with this view?**

[45]

Focus: Evaluation of the factors that led to the unification of Germany

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates should be aware of the international context of German Unification, the role played by other European states and how Bismarck was able (wittingly or unwittingly) to exploit contemporary circumstances. Candidates are not expected to give an exhaustive list of "other European states" but some breadth of knowledge is expected. Areas of investigation may

include: the decline of Austrian influence since the 1848/9 revolutions and her stance in the Crimean War; the “gullibility” of Napoleon III; Italy’s desire for an ally; the defeat of the Danes in 1864; the relative disinterest of GB and Russia. Against these factors candidates need to consider the relative strengths of the Prussian State (its monarchy, its economy, its leadership of the Zollverein, its army and Bismarck’s diplomacy). In terms of interpretations candidates need to explore the arguments that say Prussia could have achieved unification on its own whilst other interpretations give greater emphasis to favourable external factors as being more important. The best answers may well combine both sets of factors and discuss how they might be interrelated.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 9 To what extent do you agree with the view that Bismarck’s main aim from 1862 to 1871 was to defeat German liberalism rather than to unify Germany? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of Bismarck’s motives for uniting Germany

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates are required to discuss the motivation behind Bismarck’s actions in the years between 1862 and 1871. On one hand they need to evaluate the 'master-plan' theory, promulgated by Bismarck himself and certain German historians, that he was the champion of German Unification. Against this they need to consider the more pragmatic and recent view of Bismarck, as primarily a Prussian Junker and Monarchist, acting out of self-interest and self-preservation. Key evidence might include the nature of the 1867 North German Constitution and that of the new German Reich in 1871 and to what extent these represented the defeat of, or a compromise with, German Liberalism. Candidates might also show knowledge of Bismarck’s personal statements and thoughts which were often at odds with the more public image bestowed on him by the Liberals after the defeat of Austria. Finally, candidates may also bring in and evaluate those arguments which claim that Bismarck did not unite Germany but instead simply imposed Prussian values and ways on the other states.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Roosevelt’s America 1920-41

- 10 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the New Deal had considerable success in bringing about change in the USA by 1941. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages. A supported and evaluative judgement should be reached.

Source **A** adopts traditional left wing criticism of the New Deal which suggests that it did not go far enough and missed a golden opportunity for bringing fundamental social and economic change to the USA.

Source **C** is more generous, suggesting that partial success was achieved, but makes it clear that Roosevelt lacked a clear set of aims and that much of the early New Deal was haphazard.

Source **B** is the most supportive of the view that the New Deal was a considerable success, bringing in social security and limiting the influence of Big Business.

This is supported by Source **D** which also claims that Roosevelt brought fundamental change via the New Deal and this is supported by the view that it was as much the way FDR brought change as the degree of change achieved.

In own knowledge candidates can refer to a wide range of initiatives from banking and economic reform to aiding the poor and unemployed through FERA, the CWA, PWA, CCC and WPA.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

11 'National prohibition divided more than it united US society in the years from 1920 to 1933.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of debate on impact of national prohibition.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates will be expected to evaluate the impact of national prohibition. National prohibition reduced alcohol consumption and united the evangelical protestant communities. It was popular in small town and rural America where it coincided with a religious crusade. In a negative sense it could be argued that national prohibition united large numbers of urban dwellers in opposition to the reform.

In terms of division, prohibition divided small town and rural America from the big urban areas. It also divided White, Anglo Saxon, Protestant America from Immigrant America inhabited by Irish, Germans, Russians and Jews. It divided the Democrat Party along similar lines in the 1924 and 1928 presidential elections.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

12 'FDR abandoned isolationism against his will.' How far do you agree with this view of US foreign policy in the years from 1933 to 1941? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of debate on FDR's foreign policy

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates may mention that FDR was isolationist in foreign policy because that was his accepted view in 1933. US stayed out of the League of Nations and also did not become involved directly in European affairs. FDR saw US economic recovery as a domestic challenge. He helped destroy the London Economic Conference of 1933 by his isolationist stance. USA also did not become directly involved in the Far East where Japanese aggression had taken place in China from 1937.

FDR only accepted a more interventionist line once the dictators became overtly expansionist: Mussolini in Ethiopia but, more importantly, Hitler in Austria and Czechoslovakia. Even after the

German invasion of Poland, in 1939, FDR would not commit the US to the Allied cause other than allowing economic aid through Cash and Carry and later Lend Lease.

However, FDR faced an isolationist Congress and had to move slowly towards a more interventionist stance. FDR's role in the Neutrality acts shows this. FDR also used the Munich Agreement and Kristallnacht to win support for his growing opposition to Nazism in Europe. In 1940 FDR faced his third presidential election campaign and could not commit himself to more intervention abroad until he was re-elected in November 1940. FDR's progressive move towards supporting the Allies, against a reluctant Congress and country, was shown by Cash and Carry, Lend Lease and the Atlantic Charter of 1941.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Lenin and the Establishment of the Bolshevik Revolution 1903-24

13 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the only purpose of War Communism was to help the Bolsheviks win the Civil War. [45]

What matters here is not the conclusion that the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of argument needs to be evident and it needs to be related to the issues raised in the Passages.

Passage **A** makes the case for War Communism being seen as part of the drive towards socialism. This is in part supported by Passage **B** which talks of War Communism as a 'means of making civil war' and as a 'fundamental aspect of the Bolsheviks' revolutionary strategy'. On the other hand Passage **C** emphasises the dire economic conditions in Russia in early 1918, and the overriding necessity of winning the Civil War. Passage **D** agrees with **C** in seeing the introduction of War Communism partly as a consequence of the situation created by civil war, but goes on to argue that War Communism also needs to be seen as part of the broader policy of 'Red Terror' adopted by the Bolsheviks after 1917.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

14 Assess the reasons for the failure of the Provisional Government to retain power in 1917. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

It can be argued that right from the beginning the Provisional Government was fatally flawed as it had little control over the military and was forced to share power with the Petrograd Soviet. The decision to keep Russia in the war proved to be a serious mistake as did their failure to deal with the deteriorating economic situation which radicalised both the peasantry and the urban work force. Kerensky himself underestimated the Bolsheviks and was personally discredited after the Kornilov affair. The Bolsheviks were the only party totally opposed to the war and Lenin was able to tap into both peasant and worker aspirations by promising peace and land redistribution.

The debate is likely to centre on the importance of the role of Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Did they, as pre-*glasnost* Soviet historians would have claimed, ride to power on a wave of popular

support or were they effectively handed power as a result of the mistakes of Kerensky and the Provisional Government and the fact that there were no credible alternatives in October 1917?

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

15 Assess the view that Lenin was motivated more by a determination to retain power than by Communist ideology in the period 1921-1924. [45]

Debate: The prime motivational forces at work 1921-24

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

One major argument that retaining power was of greater importance to Lenin may well be that without power he could not introduce ideological change. The Civil War had resulted in widespread famine and discontent and in 1921 the Bolshevik's hold on power appeared to be very weak. The introduction of NEP can clearly be seen as a pragmatic response to the economic crisis with Lenin himself stating that "we are prepared to let the peasants have their little bit of capitalism as long as we keep power." His use of terror and the Cheka to retain power would provide further support as would the development of the state bureaucracy which did not always pursue Communist ideology but was self-perpetuating. The period 1921-24 sees Lenin ordering a systematic tightening of Bolshevik control over all institutions of government and areas of dissent beginning with the 'ban on factions' in 1921, soon followed by the abolition of all political parties other than the Bolsheviks, a tightening of censorship and intimidation of political opponents. On the other hand, some of these policies were justified in ideological terms by Lenin as the protection of the interests of the proletariat and a necessary and understandable response to the circumstances with which the Bolsheviks were faced. Thus candidates could argue that 'determination to retain power' and 'ideology' were both evident in the period in question and that Lenin faced tremendous challenges in implementing Communist ideology so that some compromises were likely to be needed.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Chamberlain and Anglo German Relations 1918-39

16 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that there is no convincing justification for British policy during the Rhineland Crisis of 1936 and the German annexation of Austria in 1938. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The debate is between those who at the time and subsequently saw the Rhineland Crisis and the Anschluss as the first major challenges to the Versailles and Locarno settlements and the failure of Britain and France to act as being crucial in encouraging further German violations, and those who argued and argue still that there was little alternative to appeasement given Britain's military limitations and that the French were unlikely to take decisive action. Assumptions that public opinion was against any action to stop Hitler 'going into his own back yard' have been challenged – as in **D** which accords with studies of how British governments in the 1930s manipulated opinion. However, there is some contradictory evidence, for example the

Peace Pledge Union and the attitude of Labour to rearmament. **D** is the most firmly critical and might be supported by **A** – Ismay’s obvious disapproval of British failure to maintain defences and to act decisively. However, his pointing out of military weakness may also offer some justification for not acting. Contemporaries like Eden were sceptical of France’s political will and military capacity, given the essentially defensive nature of the Maginot line. **C** seems to be rather close to its subject and defends Eden’s negotiating skills. This might be supported by **B** which sets out the limitations on government action, contradicting **D** in its view of public opinion. However, the debate could centre on consequences – whatever the justifications, did the crisis bring war closer as **D** suggests.

This could be the chance for candidates to deploy their own knowledge of subsequent events and attitudes. With a limited army and sceptical generals, (Ismay is writing with hindsight in 1962) Hitler was vulnerable in 1936 in a way that he was not after the great coup boosted his authority. In terms of re-arming, British governments did not seem to learn the lessons proposed by **B** until later when, arguably, it was too late. Some may know the criticisms of Churchill and perhaps Austen Chamberlain made at the time. Some may expand on the constraints referred to in **B** and justify British inaction.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

17 How far did British policies towards Germany change during the period from 1918 to 1935? [45]

Focus: Considering how far British policy was stable or how far it varied in this period

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The discussion here is about any real change in British policy towards Germany. Initially Britain, or at least sections of the British press, favoured a harsh peace settlement although Lloyd George and others had doubts. Attitudes in Britain changed as the Versailles settlement came to be seen as harsh and there was a considerable criticism of French actions over reparations and the occupation of the Ruhr which supports the view of changing attitudes if not policies. Some rapprochement is evident from 1924 with the Dawes plan, the Locarno Treaty, the better personal relationships between ministers and the admission of Germany to the League of Nations. The settlement of the reparations issue was welcomed by Britain.

It could be argued that this all constituted a gradual shift in relations. If there is a moment of change, for some historians it comes with the death of Stresemann and the economic crisis which hardened the relationship as Germany rearmed and left the League. The advent of Hitler up to 1935 is often seen as having surprisingly little impact on relations with Britain as previous governments had been pursuing similar policies with regard to Austria for instance. The argument that there was little change could indicate that Britain’s priority remained the avoidance of any military commitment in Europe and that relations with Germany were seen within this framework. A chronological approach may be followed, however only sustained analysis can reach top Bands.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

18 Assess the view that the German invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1939 brought about the end of British appeasement of Germany. [45]

Focus: Judgement about the cause of a major change in British foreign policy

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate here is whether the invasion of Prague in March revealed the duplicity of Hitler and the lack of faith in the Munich agreement and changed public opinion, with the result that Chamberlain decided on a tougher line and, in the Birmingham speech, offered the guarantee to Poland, or whether alternative explanations are possible. Some argue that Munich was the cause of doubts sooner; that Chamberlain accelerated rearmament before March 1939; that the pogroms of November 1938 were a major cause of the change in public opinion; that opinion within parliament was changing before Prague.

Alternatively it can be argued that Prague did not bring about the end of Appeasement. The Guarantee to Poland extended only to independence, not territorial integrity; defence preparations made little allowance for possible offensive action; there were still contacts with the dictators and Chamberlain was unwilling to offer an ultimatum even when Poland was invaded. The tardy Russian negotiations might be relevant here, too. It might be argued that the greater ability of Britain to wage war by 1939 was the key explanation of the end of appeasement; the breaking of agreements by a dictator who had revealed himself to be unstable and demanding during 1938 was not a huge surprise to a government who had war as a possibility before Hitler's action in March 1939.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Stalin and the Development of the Cold War in Europe 1941 – 55

19 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Stalin was justified in distrusting his wartime allies during 1941-45 [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

This question asks for an overall assessment as to whether Stalin's view that the western allies delayed the Second Front in order to bleed the Soviet Union dry – to fatally weaken the Soviet Union in order to be able to dominate the post-war world or possibly to ensure the fall of communism as well as fascism is justified. This is suggested strongly in passage **C**. '*Stalin was suspicious that his Allies were content to watch the Soviet and Nazi armies destroy each other on the battlefield and rid Europe of both fascism and communism. Khrushchev confirmed this suspicion and stated that the intention of the Allies was to 'bleed us dry' and, at the end of the war, to 'dictate their will to us.'*' Passage **B** also shows that Stalin suspected his allies' motives: '*Stalin suspected that the two Western powers intended to let the Soviet Union suffer most of the human and material losses in the war against Germany,*' and Passage **D** shows Stalin was still doubtful about his allies in 1944 when told of the D-Day landings. **D** asks whether Stalin's allies wished '*to see Nazi Germany defeat the Soviet Union before they defeated Germany?*' but goes on to state that '*there is no evidence that this was ever seriously considered by the British and US governments,*' and so implies that Stalin's distrust was not justifiable. **B** supports this and states that there were '*important logistical and technical arguments against an early cross-Channel invasion*' and the need for detailed preparation is described in detail in passage **A** -

'Intricate plans for the Second Front were drawn up and special equipment devised'. Passages **B, C and D** all show how the Soviet Union suffered enormously as a result of bearing the brunt of the fight against Germany from 1941 – 44 and show how Soviet suspicions of their allies were aroused.

Candidates might also mention the failure of Stalin's allies to appreciate the impact of the war on Russia fully. They might cite other examples such as the failure of the US to inform Stalin about the atomic bomb, which aroused his distrust. Candidates may introduce historiography into their answer. The contention in this question would most likely be supported by some revisionist historians. It would be refuted completely by the orthodox school. Post-revisionists see the mutual misunderstanding of motives at the heart of the causes of the Cold War and would view Soviet distrust of the allies in this light.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

20 'Brutal and expansionist.' Assess this view of Stalin's foreign policy in Europe during the period from 1944 to 1949. [45]

Focus: Analysis of the interpretations of Stalin's foreign policy in the period from 1944 to 1949.

What matters is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

An understanding should be displayed of how and why Stalin's foreign policy, for example his take-over of Eastern Europe, can **both** be viewed as a response to the need for future Soviet security, **and** as a cold and brutal expansion of the Soviet Union's evil empire. Knowledge as to how the take-over has been subject to various interpretations, both at the time and by historians will be evident. Candidates may make the point that the Red Army freed much of eastern Europe from the Nazis. Candidates are likely to discuss Stalin's attitudes and actions towards Germany. Candidates may use events such as the Warsaw Rising, the Czech coup and the Berlin blockade to support the very orthodox view in the title. Candidates may also display knowledge of undemocratic developments in the satellite states of eastern Europe. They should be able to exemplify their answers by reference to events in more than one country. Candidates may argue against the assertion in the title, and are likely to use revisionist and post-revisionist interpretations when doing so. They may support these arguments by reference to Stalin's need to ensure the future security of the Soviet Union, his fear of his former allies and of a possible German revival.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

21 Assess the view that economic domination was the main aim of the USA's foreign policy in Europe during the period from 1945 to the creation of NATO in 1949. [45]

Focus: Analysis of the interpretations of the USA's foreign policy in the period from 1944 to 1949.

What matters is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

An understanding of the various possible interpretations of US foreign policy must be displayed. Candidates who base their answer around the historical interpretations of this topic are likely to do well. Candidates should be aware of orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist views as explanations for US foreign policy in this period, but should not write generalised historiography that is not grounded in the events and actions that led to its introduction. In support of the revisionist assertion in the title candidates may well refer to the Marshall Plan as ‘dollar diplomacy’, an attempt by the US to implant an informal American Empire in Europe. They may also argue that in many other ways, from the announcement of the Truman Doctrine to the formation of NATO, the US was anxious to increase her ‘sphere of influence’ for selfish economic ends. However, in terms of the Marshall Plan candidates should be able to discuss a variety of other interpretations from giving selfless help to the needy West Europeans, to preventing the spread of communism. Many may argue against the view in the title, by using the predominantly orthodox interpretation – that the main aim of the US in this period was the ‘defence of the free’ from totalitarian communism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Generic Mark Scheme 2590/91
June 2007**

UNITS 2590-2591: GENERIC MARK BANDS THEMES IN HISTORY

NB

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Generic Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- For all answers, examiners should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down according to the particular qualities of the answer [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- Candidates who do not address most of the 100 or so-year period required may not be given a mark in Band I for that essay, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The quality of English is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

The topics are based on Themes covering an extended period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period) with the emphasis on continuity, development and change over time (ie. on breadth of understanding rather than on depth of knowledge). The emphasis is on links and comparisons between different aspects of the topics studied, rather than on detailed analysis.

To support the emphasis on breadth and over-view (rather than depth), candidates are given in the exam a factual chronology for their Theme.

BANDS I-VII/60: Essay

- I (48–60) *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions. There may be some unevenness, but the demands of the question (eg causation, evaluation, change and/or continuity over time) are fully addressed.* The answer demonstrates a **high level of ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. The approach is **consistently analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. The **argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. Ideas are expressed fluently and clearly. At the lower end of the Band, there *may be some weaker sections but* the overall quality nonetheless shows **the candidate is in control of the argument**. The answer is fully relevant. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (42–47) The answer demonstrates clearly the **ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **good awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question, but** there is **some unevenness**. The approach is **mostly analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. **Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. The answer is fully relevant. *The impression is that a good solid answer has been provided.* Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (36–41) The *answer* demonstrates clearly an **attempt to synthesise some elements** to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **reasonable awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument supported** by appropriate factual material. The approach **mostly contains analysis or explanation but** may lack

balance and there may be **some** heavily **descriptive/narrative** passages **and/or** the answer may be **somewhat lacking in appropriate supporting factual material**. The answer is mostly relevant. The writing is generally fluent and usually uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

- IV (30–35)** The answer demonstrates an **uneven attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is an **adequate awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly, but the structure of the argument is poor**. The approach **depends more on heavily descriptive or narrative** passages than on analysis or explanation (which may be limited to introductions and conclusions). Factual material, sometimes very full, is used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly the requirements of the question**. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (24–29)** The answer *demonstrates* a **limited attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **limited awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer but the approach lacks analysis or explanation and there is little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question**. The structure of the answer shows **weaknesses in organisation** and the treatment of topics is **seriously unbalanced**. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (12–23)** The *answer* demonstrates an **unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails to reflect the synoptic nature of the Module. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The **answer is not focused** on the requirements of the question and may be of **very limited relevance**. Any **argument** offered may be **fragmentary and incoherent**, and any **assertions** made may be **unsupported** by factual material. There may be serious irrelevance and/or serious weaknesses in knowledge. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0–11)** The *answer* demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails completely to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. There is **no attempt to answer the question**. There is **no argument** and **no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Mark Scheme 2590
June 2007

2590 THEMES IN HISTORY 1066-1796**England 1066-1228****The Government of England 1066-1216****1 To what extent was Angevin government similar to that of the Anglo-Norman kings? [60]**

Focus: Comparison of Angevin government with Anglo-Norman government.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Henry II maintained that he wanted to restore the Anglo-Norman government of his grandfather, Henry I, and there are certainly similarities. The office of chief justiciar had its origins in William II's reign in the work of Ranulf Flambard, continued to develop in the hands of Roger of Salisbury and was very important in the Angevin period. The Exchequer originated in the Anglo-Norman period and continued in the Angevin, part of the mechanism of the systematic control of finance initiated by the Anglo-Normans. Sheriffs were made to render account at the Exchequer in the Anglo-Norman period as well as the Angevin. Increased control over justice, eyres, juries of presentment all dated from the Anglo-Norman period and were still in use in the Angevin. Above all, throughout the period there was a continued growth of centralisation.

However, while the Exchequer continued to function in essentially the same way once it had been set up, and the Pipe Rolls which first appear under Henry I were still used in John's reign, some aspects of government changed much more. Henry II virtually abolished the local justiciars which Henry I had used and made increasing use of assizes, with their innovatory standardised writs, to deal with crime and dispossession. From Henry II's time the chief justiciar was a great office of state and continued to develop, reaching its height with Hubert Walter. Control of sheriffs existed in the Anglo-Norman period but the great inquests of the Angevin period, 1170, 1194 and 1213, went even further in bringing royal officials into line in judicial, financial and administrative matters. The Chancery had existed in the reign of William I but it underwent great change becoming a great office of state and the powerhouse for the rest of the government in the later Angevin period.

Candidates may argue that despite similarities there were major developments in Angevin government compared with Anglo-Norman, and some innovation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2 To what extent did English local government experience significant change during the period from 1066 to 1216? [60]

Focus: assessment of the extent of change in local government.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Some things stayed the same: shires and hundreds and their courts still existed, the sheriff was still a royal official in the shire, but there were changes, especially from William Rufus' reign. There were repeated attempts to bring sheriffs firmly under central control, through regular accounting at the Exchequer and through inquests of sheriffs, particularly from 1170. The class of man appointed changed too, although in Stephen's reign there was a temporary reversion to

the older, more powerful sheriff. As their power decreased the amount of routine business they dealt with increased. Alongside changes to the sheriffs there was the development of the itinerant justice whose role in the shire grew. They participated in the general eyre, reported to the Exchequer and performed a range of other duties.

Candidates may argue, however, that the biggest change was the growth of royal control over the localities with increased centralisation, and systematic control of finances, justice and administration. These changes began early and continued throughout the period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 'The main impact of the continental possessions of the crown on English central government was to strengthen it.' Assess this claim in relation to the period from 1066 to 1216. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the importance of one impact of the continental possessions on English government compared with others.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The continental possessions of the crown brought with them for English government the fundamental problem of absentee kingship and how to deal with it effectively in an age of personal monarchy. The means developed to deal with this can be seen to have strengthened the crown. The need for someone to run the country in the king's absence led to the development of the office of chief justiciar and to growth of bureaucratic government which functioned according to its rules whether the king was here or not. The expense of maintaining the possessions, or of trying to regain them, led to exploitation of financial rights with an impact on justice, and the development of an Exchequer at which local officials of the crown had to render account, so keeping them under control. Development of government institutions helped to strengthen the monarchy.

However, the continental possessions, and attempts to regain them, also helped to lead to rebellion under Stephen and John. Trying to rule in both England and Normandy prevented Stephen from attending to priorities in England, so letting the situation deteriorate. Attempts to raise money for the war to regain Normandy helped to sour relations between John and his barons. Moreover, the very strength of the government developed by the Angevins in answer to the needs of absentee kingship bred such resentment among the barons that it eventually spilled over into rebellion in John's reign. Thus candidates may argue that in strengthening English government the continental possessions also sowed the seeds of its collapse, for much of Angevin government was dismantled following the rebellion of 1215.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228

- 4 'Relations between kings and their archbishops of Canterbury were much worse under Henry II and his sons than under the Anglo- Norman kings.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]**

Focus: Assessment of how good or bad relations between kings and archbishops of Canterbury were at different times.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may well limit their answers to Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton as these are in the specification. They should not be penalised for this. However, credit should be given to those candidates who make appropriate reference to other archbishops of Canterbury.

Lanfranc enjoyed very good relations with William I as he supported him on the relative authority of church and state, helped William to use the church to establish Norman rule and got William's backing in his claim to the primacy. Anselm and Henry I were able to reach a compromise over investiture so that it no longer posed a problem in England. Stephen initially enjoyed good relations with Theobald of Bec. In contrast, Henry's relations with Becket as archbishop were dominated by their quarrel and John could not accept Langton until 1213. These examples suggest that relations were indeed worse under the Angevins than the Anglo-Normans.

However, candidates may well point out that there are also examples of poor relations with Anglo-Norman kings and good ones with Angevin kings. Anselm and William II argued over a range of matters from the quality of the knights provided by Anselm to the recognition of the pope. Once Anselm was exposed to the full force of Gregorian reform while in exile, he found it impossible to accept the old notions of the relationship of church and state and this led to problems with Henry I until they reached a compromise in 1107. By contrast Henry II got on well with his archbishops before and after Becket and Richard had especially good relations with Hubert Walter.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

5 How far does failure to resolve the primacy issue explain the changing relations between archbishops of Canterbury and York during the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the importance of one explanation of the relations between Canterbury and York compared with others.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Failure to resolve the primacy issue once and for all was certainly one factor in the changing relations. York's recognition of Canterbury's primacy in 1072 was a personal recognition of Lanfranc. The dispute raged again in 1114 to 1115 and Canterbury's later supremacy rested on the archbishop also being papal legate. While this was usually the case it was not always, so undermining Canterbury's position.

There were other factors which affected their relationship too. Papal intervention played a part for popes became increasingly determined to eradicate primatial authority and bring bishops under their centralised control. The pope's support for Henry of Blois, making him papal legate, decreased Canterbury's prestige and papal support for York in 1161 to 1162 weakened Canterbury's primacy by giving York a series of privileges exempting him from Canterbury's jurisdiction, although subsequently the pope confirmed the primacy in 1164. Politics also played a role. Henry II's use of York instead of Becket to crown Young Henry led Becket eventually to publish papal bulls suspending York.

In the later part of the period some of the rivalry went out of the relationship between Canterbury and York because both were having trouble with their own bishops which became a more pressing issue.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 To what extent were the policies of Innocent III towards England typical of popes during the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]

Focus: Assessment of how typical Innocent III's policies were in comparison to those of others.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Innocent III intervened in the Canterbury election, placed England under an interdict, suspended Langton and excommunicated John and received England as a papal fief. He thus went further in demonstrating papal power over England than any previous pope. However, the policies behind this intervention were not dissimilar to those of other popes.

Innocent's insistence that the monks of Canterbury re-elect was in order to ensure a canonically sound election, in line with church reform principles. Likewise, Gregory VII's attempt to persuade Lanfranc to go to Rome had been in the cause of church reform as had Urban II's intervention to support Anselm against William II.

Suspension of Langton was for political reasons in the baronial rebellion: he refused to excommunicate the rebels while the pope supported the king. Similarly the pope intervened for political reasons in the Becket dispute, threatening to place England under interdict in order to bring resolution to the conflict, and Gregory VII's motives were partly political in sending a legate to persuade William I to become a papal vassal.

The fundamental reason behind all these interventions is arguably the pope's determination to strengthen his own position, either over the church or in relation to the monarchy or both. This can also account for other examples of intervention, for example, papal support for Stephen in the hope of winning increased freedom for the English church, or undermining Canterbury in favour of Henry of Blois partly because popes were anxious to get rid of primatial authority as it detracted from their own.

Candidates may argue that although there were superficial differences there was much similarity in reasons for papal intervention throughout the period and that Innocent III's policies were atypical more in degree than in substance.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England 1485-1603**Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603****7 Assess the reasons why Tudor governments were able to deal with popular disorder so effectively. [60]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for government success in dealing with popular disorder.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

One line of approach that candidates might take is to consider ‘popular disorder’ in terms of action taken by sheriffs, JPs, clergy and local officers to quell minor disturbances before they got out of hand, as well as measures taken by the central government in peacetime and times of unrest. Statutory measures, poor relief schemes, Books of Orders and state commissions all sought to remedy social and economic distress and reduce the potential for popular disorder. The absence of an army and police force meant that the government relied on a mixture of persuasion and force to disperse a rebellion. Promises were made but rarely kept, ringleaders were taken to London and executed, and nobles led armies to round up, disperse and exact punishments on the rebels.

Some candidates may focus on the limited and often non-violent protests, the lack of unity, size and weak leadership of most rebellions, widespread support for the government among the landowning classes and an implicit understanding that rebellion was both treason and a sin. A thematic explanation of causes rather than a chronology of rebellions will probably characterise the better essays.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

8 Why did 1549 mark a turning-point in the frequency of rebellions in England in the period from 1485 to 1603? Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: Explanation of why 1549 was a turning point in the period for rebellions.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

1549, the ‘year of commotion’, saw more rebellions than any other year between 1485 and 1603. In July-August, 25 counties reported disturbances across much of central and southern England; though most were suppressed in a few days, those in Devon and Cornwall and in Norfolk and Suffolk proved to be very serious. Until 1549, there had been 4 rebellions under Henry VII and 2 in Henry VIII’s reign; after 1549, Mary experienced 1 rebellion and Elizabeth 3, but the latter were spread over 45 years and none was serious after 1569.

Candidates may offer the following explanations: Henry VII’s reign was marked by financial and political instability; Henry VIII faced the consequences of the Reformation; and Protector Somerset dealt incompetently with economic, religious and foreign affairs during a royal minority. After 1549, Northumberland took a much tougher view of popular protests and he and Mary began to tackle the root cause of many disturbances – economic and social distress. Elizabeth further reduced the likelihood of rebellion by overseeing a moderate religious settlement and introducing poor laws. After 1549 the political position of the crown became stronger – the introduction of lords lieutenants, expansion of JPs, increase in landowners as

crown servants and the use of parliament as a channel to air grievances all helped to reduce the frequency of rebellions.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9 Assess the role of political factors in causing rebellions in Tudor England. [60]

Focus: Assessment of political factors as a cause of rebellion.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

To an extent, each rebellion had political undertones since the government was first seen to be responsible for causing difficulties and then for not redressing them. In the case of Yorkshire, Cornwall and Amicable Grant disturbances, government taxation was the political issue; in 1536, 1549 and 1596 there were complaints about economic and religious reforms (or failure to reform). However, some rebellions were entirely political in origin, notably Simnel, Warbeck, Wyatt and Essex, and political disenchantment was the main reason for the Northern Earls rebellion.

Some candidates may look at the conditions surrounding rebellions and conclude that politically weak and vulnerable governments were more likely to experience a rebellion, particularly if the nobility and gentry became disaffected. This was the case at times in the reigns of Henry VII, Edward and Mary. A detailed assessment of other factors is not required, however, it is likely that good answers will focus on political factors and make some comparative assessments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603

10 Assess the importance of the Netherlands in shaping Tudor foreign policy from 1485 to 1603. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the importance of the Netherlands in English foreign policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The Netherlands was important to England throughout the Tudor period. Its close proximity to London ensured that economic and political (and later religious) issues were key considerations in the development of foreign policy. Henry VII established trade links with Burgundy, which grew stronger as time passed and held firm in spite of interruptions in 1493-6, 1503-6, 1527-8 and 1562-4, until the Dutch Revolt in 1572.

Burgundian support for the Yorkists brought political security to the fore in Henry VII's reign but Henry VIII's friendship with Charles V, and Mary's marriage to Philip, lessened its political significance until the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt. This necessitated Leicester's intervention in 1586-7, which hastened war with Spain. The growth of Calvinism in the Netherlands in the 1550s onwards brought religion as an issue – Elizabeth's implicit support for Sea Beggars and Dutch rebels (explicit after Nonsuch) ensured the Netherlands after 1572 was central to Tudor foreign policy and remained important enough for Elizabeth to secure Dutch cautionary towns in the 1590s in return for English aid after the Armada.

Better essays should assess the importance of the Netherlands thematically; weaker essays are likely to offer a chronological narrative and comment, with the balance of material on Elizabeth. Some answers may compare the Netherlands with other factors such as national security but this is not essential for any band.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

11 'Elizabeth I was more skilful than any of her Tudor predecessors in dealing with Scotland.' To what extent do you agree with this judgement? [60]

Focus: Assessment of Elizabeth's handling of Scotland in comparison with the earlier Tudors.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Arguments that might be made in favour of this statement are: Elizabeth pursued a non-aggressive policy towards Scotland, after 1560 the Guise were expelled from Edinburgh and never again exercised a divisive influence, and her diplomatic treatment of Mary Stuart ensured that James VI and Scottish nobles had no excuse to disturb Anglo-Scottish relations.

An alternative line of approach could be that Henry VII skilfully avoided war (given his domestic and foreign problems), prevented James IV from supporting Warbeck and concluded an alliance at Ayton. Henry VIII also had successes, defeating Scottish armies at Flodden and Solway Moss, but at great expense and never resolving the problem of French influence in Edinburgh. Edward VI had no success after Pinkie in 1547, suffering military defeats and border insecurity, a situation that Mary did little to resolve.

Better essays should focus on Elizabeth and compare her reign with other rulers across the whole period before reaching a reasoned judgement.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

12 'The aims of Tudor foreign policy from 1485 to 1603 were characterised by continuity rather than change.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of foreign policy aims in terms of continuity and change.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The main aims behind Tudor foreign policy were national security, trade agreements, continental expansion and dynastic alliances. National security and trade agreements were consistently pursued although, if there was a conflict of interest, trade yielded to political security. Keeping the Netherlands neutral or out of enemy hands was a constant objective.

Dynastic and marriage alliances were consistently pursued by Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary, and less so by Edward VI and inconclusively by Elizabeth – although the latter used her unmarried status as a pawn in foreign diplomacy. There were inconsistencies however in the Tudors' attitude towards war. Henry VII avoided war if possible but engaged in continental alliances; Henry VIII devoted much time and money to waging war against Scotland and France; Somerset continued this policy towards Scotland but Northumberland totally changed this policy;

Mary was opposed to war but was drawn into it by Philip, and Elizabeth avoided conflict for as long as possible before engaging in war with Spain for the last 18 years of her rule. War was a last resort for most of the Tudors with the exception of Henry VIII and Somerset. Religious reforms also brought changes in allies and foreign commitments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England 1558-1689

The Development of Limited Monarchy in England 1558-1689

13 Assess the importance of religious issues in the development of a limited monarchy in England from 1558 to 1689. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of religious issues in influencing the monarchy's development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Religion was a constant theme in the development of the monarchy during this period. As Supreme Governor of the Church of England, monarchs were responsible for upholding the Act of Uniformity and overseeing the spiritual welfare of their subjects. For its part, the Church had an important impact on the development of the monarchy. It supported legislation against Roman Catholics and puritans in Elizabeth's and James's reigns, and strengthened the monarchy's authority. The growth of Arminianism and Charles I's attachment to it, however, rendered the possibility of an absolute administration and created political tension with a fiercely patriotic House of Commons. The political and religious power of bishops, the attempt by puritans to change the Church in the 1630s and 1640s and Charles I's endorsement of Laud's reforms in England, Scotland and Ireland, led to civil war, military defeat and abolition of the monarchy. Anglicanism was restored in 1660 and neither Charles II nor James II were able to widen the religious franchise. Attempts to establish greater toleration for minority groups only served to increase political tension and led to the Glorious Revolution and further restrictions on William III. Candidates should consider other issues (eg financial and political) in order to reach the higher bands.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

14 Assess the reasons why the role of parliament changed during the years from 1558 to 1689. [60]

Focus: Explanation for the changing role of parliament.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Parliament's role changed significantly in the course of this period. Elizabethan parliaments met occasionally when the crown was in need of finance or popular support. It had no rights but was keen to convert its privileges into something more permanent. By 1625 it was more outspoken about government policies, ministers and royal favourites and clashed with James in the 1621 Protestation. Monopolies were condemned, impeachment revived and subsidies made conditional.

Charles I regarded parliament as an inconvenience. It restricted his power to raise money, challenged his prerogative, criticised his ministers and policies. Part of the Commons' assertiveness can be attributed to the rise of puritanism, which developed further in the 1630s and 1640s as parliament learned the art of opposition and then government. After 1660 it was an integral part of administration even though it only had to be called every three years. Its role between 1660 and 1689 was to guard the people's rights and ensure Charles, James and William did not exceed their powers.

Some candidates are likely to explain the changes in terms of personalities, problems and policies, and if this thematic approach is sustained, they should score well. Some candidates may adopt a chronological format and perhaps pay less attention to the reigns of either Elizabeth or the later Stuarts.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

15 To what extent were the powers of Charles II more limited than those of other English monarchs from 1558 to 1689? [60]

Focus: Evaluative comparison of English monarchical powers during this period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Charles II's constitutional and political powers at the Restoration were restricted in financial, religious and political terms yet in the course of his reign he was able to evade many of these limitations by using his prerogative, appointing his own ministers, calling, proroguing and dissolving parliament, and pursuing secretive policies. In contrast, Elizabeth enjoyed near absolute power and was only reliant upon parliament for finances in wartime. James I had some constitutional limits and Charles I resisted attempts to shackle his power although his power was severely limited between 1640-42. James II also refused to be limited but lacked the political skill of his brother and fell as a result. Arguably William III's powers were most limited by the Bill of Rights, Toleration Act and Mutiny Act, but he still had the right to appoint and dismiss his ministers, call and dissolve parliament and make war and peace.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689

16 How far did the strength of Puritanism change in the course of the period from 1558 to 1689? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of changes in strength of Puritanism.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The strength of Puritanism changed a great deal during this period. It lacked unity of leadership and purpose and widespread support though it had the backing of some privy councillors, courtiers, bishops, nobles, gentry, MPs, clerics and academics. Mainstream puritans were moreover always loyal to the Queen if not her religious settlement and only radicals like the Separatists and Presbyterians were persecuted. Its strength in parliament grew in James's and

Charles's reigns when it became more aggressive and was prepared to challenge the emerging threat of Arminianism.

The 1640s and 1650s saw the zenith of Puritan aspirations but its disillusionment under Cromwell and fragmentation into a number of non-conformist sects weakened its challenge to Anglicanism. At the Restoration moderate puritans were absorbed into the Church of England and Quakers, Baptists and Presbyterians were again marginalised. Toleration was only granted to particular puritan sects in 1689.

Candidates are likely to chart the development of Puritanism, probably chronologically, but better responses should evaluate themes and compare periods in terms of strength.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

17 How do you explain the changing relationship between the governments and the Church of England in the period from 1558 to 1689? [60]

Focus: Explanation for changing relationships between the state and the Church.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may explain the mutual benefits of this relationship and why the Elizabethan government (crown, ministers and bishops) closely monitored attempts by reformers to change the Church Settlement. The Church cherished its political status, and the involvement of bishops in policy making and enforcement under James increased its sense of self-importance. Tension arose with the emergence of Arminianism and the crown's increasing patronage of High Church clerics. Charles I's support for Laud divided the Church as well as the state and the resulting defeat for the King also brought problems for the Anglican Church between 1649 and 1660. The Restoration recovered the union between Church and government, although Charles II was not particularly Anglican and clashed with parliament and the Church over issues such as toleration for Roman Catholics, Protestant non-conformists, his brother's succession, and his preference for a French alliance. James II found the Church to be one of his main critics who supported revolution in 1688. In 1689 William's government was conditioned by restrictions imposed by the Church.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

18 'Charles II was more tolerant of Roman Catholicism than any other ruler during the period from 1558 to 1689.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of Charles II's tolerance of Roman Catholicism compared with other rulers.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Charles II had Catholic sympathies, a Catholic wife, mistress and brother, enjoyed the company of Catholics at court and pursued a pro-Catholic foreign policy. His Declarations of Indulgence sought to exempt Catholics from the Clarendon Code and penal laws, and he never believed the existence of a Popish Plot while demonstrating his political skill at defeating the Exclusion Crisis. However, he was unable to repeal the Elizabethan and Jacobean penal laws and had to endure the Test Act after 1673.

Elizabeth was willing to tolerate Catholics until her Excommunication and the involvement of extremists in plots against her. James I sought to befriend them until the Gunpowder plot and wavered thereafter. Charles I married a Catholic and seemed to be more Catholic than Protestant in his foreign relations and support for Laud. Cromwell despised Catholics, as was evident in his treatment of Irish rebels and his refusal to permit English Catholics toleration.

Arguably James II, who was openly Catholic, was the most tolerant ruler – the papal *nuncio* entered England, religious orders returned to London, attempts were made to get Catholics appointed to Magdalene College and to commissions in the army, and he espoused friendship with Louis XIV. He also used his prerogative to challenge the Test Act though without success. Some candidates will therefore agree with the proposition; others will not.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1498-1610

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610

19 Assess the importance of Catholicism in the development of France as a nation state during the years 1498 to 1610. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the role of Catholicism in the development of France.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may seek to show the value of the Catholic Church to the monarchy, nobility and commoners, the role it played in the political and religious development of the nation before and after the Reformation, and its impact in areas of cultural and intellectual activity. Catholicism demonstrated that religion was both a unifying and dividing force in France for much of the period. It was a source of strength to the crown, many noble families and most of the people. Yet it could also be divisive, challenging royal policies, undermining liberal minded monarchs and governments, fomenting civil disobedience and, in its persecution of heretics, destabilising communities. Before the civil wars, the Catholic Church tried to suppress humanism, marginalize Protestantism and extirpate Calvinism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

20 ‘Supreme in theory, limited in practice.’ Assess this view of power of the French monarchy in the period 1498 to 1610. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the theoretical and practical power of the French monarchy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to agree with the premise though some may argue that Francis I demonstrated many elements of absolutism and both Budé and Knecht have put him in this category. Indeed the reign of Francis may be the focus of many answers. On the other hand, Seyssel and Russell Major stressed his limitations. In fact, all French kings claimed to be

absolute, most understood that their powers were hedged with limitations, but some were stronger and more skilful at getting their way.

Better candidates are likely to discuss the theory of French absolutism, and how Huguenots and Catholics during the civil wars revised traditional ideas in developing their own theories of resistance to a monarch. Less competent essays are likely to list and illustrate limitations eg the monarchy's handling of the States-General, *parlements*, nobility, Papacy and French Church, provinces, royal finances, and keeping the country internally peaceful.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

21 How far do you agree that France was unified but not united during the period from 1498 to 1610? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of France in terms of unity and unification.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Good candidates are likely to begin by defining 'unified' and 'united', and appreciating any differences. They may well look at some of the following issues: the geo-political conditions of France, the authority of the crown and its relations with the nobility, the development of a centralised administration, social and economic changes that gave rise to a stronger but not necessarily more uniform economy, and religious developments that created lasting social divisions. The role of language and legal reforms as unifying and divisive influences may figure in better essays. The best essays should address the issues thematically.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century

22 How far were the aims and achievements (to c.1600) of the Council of Trent influenced by the Protestant Reformation? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of the Protestant Reformation before 1545 on the work and legacy of the Council of Trent.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

When the General Council met in 1545, its aims were to remove clerical abuses and define the Catholic doctrine. In addition the Papacy was anxious to assert its supremacy over the Church. Protestant reformers had condemned corruption in the Church, challenged orthodox beliefs and denounced papal supremacy. Trent was therefore bound to be influenced by Protestantism, not least because the delegates were aware of its appeal and explicit threat to surviving Catholic churches in Europe.

Although Lutheran delegates attended the second session, the Catholic majority rejected any compromise with Protestants; thus many of the Tridentine decrees reflected traditional beliefs and practices. Moreover, the use of the consistory, the emphasis put on the sermon, and the importance attached to the role of education, and the social and spiritual welfare of the people, were all key features of Protestant practices.

Most candidates are likely to look at the main features of Protestantism before 1545 and see how and how far they affected the council's debates and decrees, and subsequent development of the Catholic Reformation. Better candidates will be aware of the extent of interplay between the two movements.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

23 Compare the strength of the Catholic Church at the beginning, the middle, and at the end of the sixteenth century. [60]

Focus: Comparative evaluation of the Catholic Church.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to suggest that the Church was much stronger in 1600 than in 1500 and 1550 but how they measure 'strength' and what evidence is used to evaluate the condition in 1550 may prove critical. The following themes may well appear.

- In 1500 the Church lacked effective and respected leadership. In 1550 this was still an issue although, in convening a general council, Paul III had shown some initiative. However, by 1600, the papacy was acknowledged as the undisputed leader and sole interpreter of the Catholic faith and doctrine.
- In 1500 the Church was riddled with corruption at all levels with few signs of improvement. In 1550 progress had been made but not uniformly. By 1600, although malpractices remained, the education and quality of clergy was much improved.
- In 1500 some religious and a few lay orders were reforming their practices to make them more relevant to society's needs; and this trend continued. By 1550 there many more orders and missionaries, whose use of catechisms strengthened spiritual understanding as the century advanced. Progress, however, was slow and patchy.
- In 1500 biblical humanists questioned some of the Church's beliefs and threatened to implement reforms independently of the papacy. By 1550 Protestants had split Christendom and the Church had still to respond effectively; but by 1600 this had been accomplished and the tide had turned in favour of the Catholic Church.
- In 1500 the Catholic Church in western Europe was united; by 1550 large areas of northern and western Europe were lost to Protestantism; by 1600 the Catholic faith had been restored or strengthened in much of southern and eastern Europe.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

24 'Sixtus V contributed very little to the success of the Catholic Reformation compared with other popes in the sixteenth century.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of Sixtus V's contribution to the success of the Catholic Reformation compared with other 16th century popes.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Sixtus V's main contributions to the Catholic Reformation were his reforms to the Curia, thereby reducing its size and nepotistic features; his establishing 15 'congregations' to administer papal

affairs which made the papacy more efficient and specialised; his rebuilding of St Peter's dome, a new Vatican library and continuing the development of Rome; his support for missionaries and Jesuits; and his encouragement to secular rulers to rid England, France and the Netherlands of Protestantism.

Some candidates may focus on the work of other popes, notably Paul III, who called the Council of Trent, authorised the Jesuits, founded the Roman inquisition and index, and encouraged bishops to reform their dioceses; Pius V, who led a life of austerity and asceticism, visited the poor and sick, oversaw reforms to the Breviary and Missal, and tried to enforce clerical residence on Italian bishops; Gregory XIII, who reformed the city of Rome and encouraged Jesuits to travel to Protestant countries. We should expect **Band 1 and II** candidates to review the contributions of a variety of popes from across the whole period. Candidates who ignore Sixtus should only reach **Band IV**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1598-1715

The Decline of Spain 1598-1700

25 Which country did more to hasten the decline of Spain in the seventeenth century: the United Provinces or France? Explain your reasons. [60]

Focus: Comparative evaluation of the United Provinces and France in furthering Spain's decline.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

How the United Provinces and France contributed to Spain's decline should be central to most answers. Wars against the United Provinces in 1598-1609 and 1621-48 weakened the Spanish treasury, diverted military and naval resources from other areas of Europe, brought defeat, and encouraged England and France to attack Spain, and Portugal to strive for (and get) its independence. The loss of the United Provinces at Munster was a blow to Spain's self-confidence and prestige as a world power.

However, peace with the Dutch enabled Spain to concentrate on fighting France and the 1650s saw several victories. France, on the other hand, played a key role in Spain's decline from 1628 onwards. It fomented rebellions in Catalonia and Portugal, encouraged England and the United Provinces in their wars against Spain, and exhausted and defeated Spain in 1628-31, 1635-59, 1667-8, 1672-9, 1689-97, seizing lands in Italy, the Netherlands and Alsace. As a result, Spain suffered financially, economically and politically. Candidates need to address both countries to access **Bands I and II** but the balance will be determined by their line of argument. Other factors that contributed to Spain's decline only become relevant if they are linked to the United Provinces and France.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

26 Assess the economic factors that contributed to the decline of Spain from 1598 to 1700. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of economic factors in causing Spain's decline.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to consider some of the following economic factors – inherited debts and *juros* payments, high taxation, declining population, weak industrial base, foreign competition, failure to capitalise on American trade, medieval farming techniques, social attitudes towards commerce and industry, decline in bullion, repeated debasement, constant warfare, failed attempts at reform, corrupt administration, the expulsion of the *moriscos*. Candidates should illustrate the significance of selected economic factors.

Most candidates will concentrate on finances but better responses should look at a range of economic factors and be aware of change and continuity eg economic improvements in the 1620s, 1660s and 1680s, and regional variations. Some candidates may assess other factors (eg political) but these only become relevant in the context of the relative importance of particular economic developments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

27 How far did the 1640s mark a turning-point in the development of Spain in the seventeenth century? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the 1640s in relation to the development of Spain.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The 1640s witnessed several key events that had a bearing on later developments eg revolts in Portugal, Catalonia, Naples, Sicily and Granada; the fall of Olivares; military defeats at Rocroi and Lens; loss of the United Provinces; bankruptcy and plague. Candidates should show good understanding of the significance of some of these events and set them in the context of developments since 1598 and after 1650. Some candidates may consider alternative turning-points (eg the fall of Lerma (1618) or death of Philip III (1621) or accession of Charles II (1665) or wars against France in Louis XIV's reign), but this is not required for any band.

The best responses are likely to look at developments thematically, with a strong emphasis on the 1640s as a turning-point, ie as an indicator of continuity and change.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715**28 Assess the view that Colbert did more than any other minister from 1610 to 1715 to develop the economy of France. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of Colbert's contribution to the French economy compared with other ministers.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Colbert had several distinctive qualities which set him apart from Richelieu, Mazarin, Tellier and other ministers. All were confronted with financial difficulties, and each tackled them in similar ways ie tried to cut expenditure, increased existing taxation, borrowed money, sold offices, introduced and then reversed reforms, so that revenue increased but the tax and administrative system remained largely unchanged.

However Colbert in the 1660s, unlike Richelieu and Mazarin, cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming, reclaimed royal lands, and increased the *taille* paid by landowners. Colbert also had a far wider view of the economy. He pursued mercantilist policies aimed at acquiring gold and silver bullion at the expense of the Dutch and English. He regulated industries, founded trading companies, established colonies in Canada and the West Indies, expanded the royal navy, maritime fleet and arsenals and naval stores. None of his predecessors since Sully had developed the economy so broadly.

As a result, he enabled Louis to wage wars in the 1670s and to become the most powerful man in Europe by 1683. Nevertheless, although Colbert strengthened the economy, there was a limit as to how long the economy could sustain Louis' wars.

Candidates should compare Colbert with one or more ministers, and they are most likely to refer to Richelieu and Mazarin.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

29 'France was a stronger international power in 1660 than at any other time from 1610 to 1715.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]

Focus: Assessment of France in 1660 compared with other periods in terms of its international power and status.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

An assessment of France's international position in 1660 may be the starting-point of most answers. The Peace of Pyrenees (1659) secured French dominance in western Europe over Spain, and enabled her to assail Dutch and English trade, seize Spanish territories and intervene in German politics in the course of the next 30 years. Prolonged war (1635-59) had left France with financial difficulties and in need of a respite but it gained further lands in 1668 and 1679, as well as an increase in debts.

Some candidates may compare its condition in 1660 and its aftermath with earlier and later periods, with reference to the development of other countries most notably Spain, England and the United Provinces. Some will challenge the premise, perhaps favouring c1700; other candidates will agree with it.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

30 Assess the reasons why Louis XIV was a more absolute king than Louis XIII. [60]

Focus: Explanation for Louis XIV's absolutism compared with Louis XIII.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

A definition of 'absolutism' would be helpful since neither Louis XIII nor Louis XIV was totally absolute but Louis XIV was 'more' absolute than Louis XIII. Candidates may compare the two rulers in terms of their fiscal wealth, economic strength, royal palaces, growth of administration, military and naval power, capacity to wage war, their control of the Church, relationship with nobles and *parlements*, and religious groups.

Some candidates may suggest that the French monarchy was bound to be 'more absolute' as the period progressed but better candidates will be aware that the power of the monarchy did not increase evenly and consistently (eg not until princes of the blood had been tamed, and not during royal minorities, the Frondes or before Versailles).

A comparison across the period is required; although the question can be answered chronologically, a thematic approach is likely to produce a better result.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1661 – 1796

From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661 - 1796

31 How far do you agree that the accession of Louis XV in 1715 was the most important turning point in French absolutism during the period from 1661 to 1789? [60]

Focus: Assessment of turning points in French absolutism.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might agree or disagree about the prior importance of 1715; they can argue the case for the greater importance of other developments. For example, the accession of Louis XVI in 1774 might be considered of prior importance. It will be valid to assess the importance of the declaration of his majority by Louis XIV in 1661; it can be argued that this shaped the nature of French absolutism to 1789.

The section on France in the Specification ends in 1789. Candidates are not expected to have more than a very general knowledge of developments after this date: enough to make sense of 1789. 'How far...**most** important' means that candidates must discuss more than one turning point, and the 100-years requirement applies to this question as to all others.

Examiners will look for two features. First, turning points should be seen as major / significant changes. Answers should explain why developments were turning points. Then these turning points should be related to French absolutism. The candidates who reject the prior importance of

1715 can devote more time to other turning points but **a mark in Band III will normally require at least a solid paragraph** assessing the significance of the accession of Louis XV. Otherwise the balance of the answer will reflect the argument that is presented.

Answers might be organised thematically or chronologically; the second approach should not automatically be dismissed as thoughtless narrative. 'Good' narrative might be seen as relevant accounts that are closely connected to an argument. Sound arguments might be constructed sequentially. Candidates should not focus exclusively on one turning point. The clear demands of this Unit include the requirement that answers deal with an extended period (about a hundred years). Assessing 'most important' involves comparison.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**32 Assess the view that the rulers of Austria and Russia were more repressive than enlightened during the period from 1696 to 1796.
(You should refer specifically to the reigns of Maria Theresa and Joseph II in Austria and Peter the Great and Catherine the Great in Russia.) [60]**

Focus: Assessment of the nature of rulers in Austria and Russia.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Answers in **Band I** and **Band II** can be expected to show a reasonable balance between Austria and Russia. A 60:40 balance between the two states might merit any mark. A 70:30 balance might be worth one band lower than would otherwise be awarded but, as always, examiners will give priority to the overall quality of the argument in making an assessment.

One might predict that most candidates will agree that Peter the Great was more repressive than enlightened. He used forceful, often violent methods. His westernisation might be seen as proof of his enlightened aims and policies but alternatively it might be claimed that western models were merely a means to an end. Some might claim that there was nothing truly enlightened about his rule.

Joseph II might be used to contradict the claim in the question. Especially from 1780, he carried out wide-ranging reforms in administration, religion, the economy and social policy. Whilst it is difficult to see the Emperor as repressive, he pursued his reforming policies impatiently, attempting to enforce adherence to his views.

There is likely to be more divergence in interpretations of Maria Theresa and Catherine the Great. The former embarked on moderate and pragmatic reforms but the claim that she was really enlightened is arguable. For example, she opposed an extension of religious toleration. Catherine the Great displayed enthusiasm for enlightened ideas and thinkers, and some of her policies were close to the enlightened views of western Europe, but she also strengthened the privileges of the nobility, worsened the condition of the peasantry and ruthlessly suppressed the Pugachev rising.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 33 'The most important principle of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment was religious toleration.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Focus: Assessment of a judgement about the Enlightenment.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Some might claim that other tenets were more important principles, such as the idea that rulers were the servants of the state or that unjustified privileges should end. The candidates who reject the prior importance of religious toleration can devote more time to other features but **a mark in Band III will normally require at least a solid paragraph** assessing the importance of toleration. Otherwise the balance of the answer will reflect the argument that is presented.

Support for religious toleration was based on a number of features including the increasing importance of science and Reason for enlightened thinkers. Religion should be a private matter, not an aspect of state control. There was a greater acceptance of human rights and the virtue of intellectual enquiry (but not political democracy). The domination of the Roman Catholic Church was seen to threaten progress. The Church was also viewed as the ally of reactionary political and social forces.

Good answers might be expected to support general claims by specific references to countries (Austria, France and Russia are mentioned in the Specification) and / or to *philosophes* (Diderot, Rousseau and Voltaire are mentioned in the Specification). Satisfactory answers can be expected to discuss several relevant features of the Enlightenment but answers in **Band I** will normally assess which was the most important. 'Most important' involves a measure of comparison.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Mark Scheme 2591
June 2007**

2591 THEMES IN HISTORY 1763-1996**Britain and Ireland 1798 – 1921**

- 1 'The Easter Rising of 1916 and its aftermath was the most important turning point in history of the Union with Ireland.' How far do you agree with this view in the period 1800 to 1921? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of the Easter Rising in the history of the Union with Ireland.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to compare the Rising and its aftermath in relation to other important events between 1800 and 1921, in particular with reference to the continued survival of the Union. Other possibilities might be: Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829 which conceded on the religious nature of the Union and led to office holding for a potential successor group to the Ascendancy, the Catholic Tenant Farmer; the Famine which focussed cultural and social resentment against the Union and created an influential group of Irish expatriates in the US (Fenians) who became the centre and financial source of terrorism aimed at the Union; the Home Rule Bills of 1886, 1893 and 1912 which indicated a major political party was committed to constitutional reform of the Union although it also reinforced the status quo by strengthening Conservatism and Unionism in Ulster; the Anglo-Irish War and the settlements that followed. Candidates could also focus on particular trends and their origin as possible alternatives to the Easter Rising.

When discussing the Rising itself candidates will need to put it into perspective – in a revolutionary tradition that periodically saw a rising as the way to achieve an independent Republican Ireland. Other 'turning points' tended, with the possible exception of the Famine, to encourage reform within the Union rather than its abolition. Most risings, (1803, 1848, 1867) including 1916, were marginalised and defeated, important only for demonstrating weakness.

Candidates are expected to pick up on the 'aftermath' as here lies the case for the importance of 1916 in the history of the Union. Although repression was not unusual the circumstances had and were about to change (democratic elections in 1918) in the mid term, an over-reaction, political and military, to what had been the rising of a minority within a minority, the proposal to introduce conscription to Ireland, the weakness of Redmond's Nationalists who by now lacked the militant roots of Butt or Parnell and who could only offer a call to join the British Army together with the growing impact of an Irish conscription ably exploited by Sinn Fein. Candidates could usefully focus on the British government's response in comparison to the 19th century when more careful concession had been adopted like Disestablishment and land reform 1869 – 1870. Like the Secret Ballot in 1872 which helped the electoral growth of the nationalists, the 1918 Reform Act underlined the importance of the events of 1916 – 18, especially the collapse of the Irish Nationalists. DeValera was the heir of Parnell, not Redmond. Although the ensuing events (coercion) were not inevitable two versions of Home Rule might have been possible.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2 To what extent did support in Ireland for the Union with Britain change during the period 1800 to 1921? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of support for the Union in Ireland 1800 to 1921?

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on support in Ireland. However, reference can be made to Britain where appropriate (links between the Protestant Ascendancy and Ulster Unionism with Westminster and mainland political parties). British governments certainly hoped to build Irish support for the Union. The Protestant Ascendancy was seen as the main instrument for ensuring the Union, at least in a 'control', patronage, traditional sense in the first half of the 19th century. It was the means of preserving political, economic, social and religious dominance. The Act of Union itself is worthy of mention here and many in the Ascendancy felt the loss of Grattan's Parliament acutely. 18th century Protestant nationalism was on the back step from the beginning but in other respects it was the active force in support of the Union. Emancipation challenged both its religious and political dominance in the longer term. In Ulster support was of a different nature, based on a different type of Irish nationalism – it was more confident, buoyed-up by economic expansion and the exclusion of Catholics. Like the Ascendancy, it worried about Whig deals with O'Connell and Peelite attempts to woo the Catholic Church, the mid century revival of which was to put Irish anglicanism on the defensive. This continued in the Gladstone and Salisbury eras. The reaction of some of the Ascendancy was to back Home Rule (Butt and later Parnell, himself from the Ascendancy class). Plunkett hoped to use devolved power to resolve grievances.

The 1880's proved a turning point in changing the base of support for the Union. The Ascendancy had dominated before but with Anglicanism losing out to Catholicism and especially the erosion of their economic base via Land Reform and the Agricultural Depression, they were replaced by pro nationalist Catholic Tenant farmers. The baton was passed to Ulster which took a hard line on resistance to Home Rule and defence of the Union as it stood. It developed links to the Conservatives from 1886 and organised along sectarian lines (Carson and Craig, the Solemn League and Covenant and the UVF), especially in the 1910's. Such support for the Union was of a very different type – strongly sectarian, radical in its organisation and willing to defend itself along military lines against both revolutionary nationalists and the British governments and, given its regional rather than national base, prepared ultimately to accept Partition and Unionist dominated Home Rule 1918 – 1921. There is therefore a considerable change in support within Ireland over the period and in the tactics adopted at any given time. This could range from opposition to change through to an acceptance of Home Rule in various forms.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3 'The Liberal governments during the period 1868 to 1895 were the most effective British administrations in dealing with Irish problems.' How far would you agree with this view in relation to the period 1798 – 1921? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the effectiveness of British governments in handling Irish problems 1798 – 1921.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to establish what Irish problems were from the government perspective and whether they changed during the period. All governments were committed to maintaining the Union after 1800 but would differ over means – coercion or reform within the Union, economically, religiously and politically. Candidates can assess relative effectiveness by examining such areas.

The question proposes Gladstone's liberal governments 1868 – 95 as the most effective. Certainly the problems were very evident at that point – Land and Tenant issues became violent, an effective Irish nationalist party emerged with the ability to focus Westminster on Irish issues, and the agrarian economy took a downturn in the 1880's. Credit might be given for Gladstone's Irish focus, for the successful Disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869, for the Land Acts of 1870 and 1882 and especially for handling Parnell and Davitt in the 1880's. Home Rule especially needs an assessment. However candidates could just as easily point to the lack of success, especially with the Land Acts (initially missing arrears, assuming impartial land courts, setting interest on land loans too high etc.) and Home Rule which severely split and damaged liberalism. Gladstone's handling of Parnell is very open to criticism. A case could be made that Peel, in different circumstances, was more effective, balancing concession (Emancipation and a political strategy aimed at defusing political opposition) with coercion (the Catholic and Repeal Associations were wound up and Freeholders removed from the electorate).

Another possibility for effectiveness would be Pitt's Tory government which tried to balance a new dispensation in Ireland with hopes on the economy and on reform, although little of the latter survived royal and parliamentary disapproval. Whig governments in the 1830's and Conservative ones after 1886 were very effective in granting political patronage to Catholics (Lichfield House compact in the 1830s and local government reforms in the later 1880's) and some very effective Land Purchase Acts culminating in Wyndham's Act. Liberal governments 1905 – 1915 had a more mixed record. There was much concession and expenditure from the Dublin administration but it can be argued that the 3rd Home Rule Bill was mishandled and the ground cut from under Redmond's nationalists. As for the Coalition governments 1915 – 21 it can be argued that a solution of sorts was reached on political problems (Partition and Home Rule) but much was face-saving on the part of government after a military stalemate.

This is a wide ranging question and candidates will be unable to dwell in detail on relative effectiveness, given the competing problems and nationalisms that governments had to deal with. It could even be argued that those governments who felt able to ignore Ireland were the most effective – Tory 1806 – 1828; Whig liberal 1846 – 1866; Disraeli 1874 – 1880.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

War and Society in Britain 1793 – 1918

4 How far would you agree that both the army and navy were under funded throughout the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the relative funding of the army and navy 1793 – 1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Some candidates may well argue that both were underfunded throughout the period, not least because the whole of the British State was minimalist and for much of the period Britain was in the grip of retrenchment and laissez-faire attitudes. Economy and costs were key considerations throughout. The navy was largely self-funding until the 1820s through the capture of booty and prizes, patronage and press gangs and bills of self finance. After this, small gunboats in

squadrons, operating outside home waters, kept costs down between 1830 and 1880 allowing politicians like Gladstone to achieve superpower status on a shoestring.

Britain was fortunate that the balance of power and trade favoured her. The revenues generated by the industrial revolution and trade helped to compensate for low taxation. Nonetheless the balance was a narrow one, hence the alarm when countries like France developed naval technology that could challenge the 'wooden walls'. The armed services had sunk under the weight of retrenchment into a sea of complacency between 1815 and 1854. Defence absorbed only 2-3% of GNP between 1815 – 65. Funding for the navy reached its lowest in 1835. Gladstone and Disraeli competed to reduce the navy estimates and the same applied to the army (the Indian Army was self financing). However, it could be argued that Britain remained 'covered' and despite keeping both on a short financial lead it could be argued the threat did not warrant more.

However candidates are likely to argue that from the 1860s funding came to the fore given a new European order, imperial rivalries, alliance systems and the impetus of technological change. Funding then became inadequate, particularly of the Army 1895 – 1914 when recruitment and size were both issues. Cardwell and Haldane's army reforms and Fisher's naval ones sought to hide this gap by making the services cost effective whilst politicians used diplomacy to acquire allies to fight on the continent and reduce the number of enemies faced (France, US). The Navy became fully funded by direct income tax in 1909. Both the Napoleonic and 1st World War periods could be seen as exceptions, when funding became more generous, especially in the army.

A possible conclusion is merely adequate funding for most of the period with periods of considerable strain (1807-15, 1858-63, 1905-1918) when a full continental commitment had to be considered.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

5 To what extent were British governments more concerned with the recruitment and organisation of armies than with their artillery and other weaponry in the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]

Focus: An assessment of government military priorities 1793 – 1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Governments were not military experts in the period and could only respond to either popular pressure (the shell shortage scandal in 1915, convoy losses in 1917 or uniform issues during the Boer War) or to expert opinion within the army as to weaponry and artillery. Given the conservatism of much of the latter demands during the Napoleonic Wars, peacetime or the colonial wars were not great. Governments, it could be argued, were much more sensitive to issues that impacted on popular opinion and civilian society, like recruitment and organisation. There were exceptions – weaponry could be limited by the obsession with cost, retrenchment and low defence estimates, especially as the army was viewed with distrust, an unconstitutional force which, in an industrialising society took men from factories and farming at the expense of higher taxes.

Governments would become involved with re-organisation because of the radical attack in the early and mid 19th century on the aristocracy's stranglehold on the army. In the Napoleonic War the hiring of mercenaries, the use of Bounties and even kidnapping and the use of children had been common. Post 1815 such methods came under attack. The Crimean War was a 'voluntary

war' but it was organisation and recruitment that came under radical attack and to which governments belatedly responded. Conscription was resisted up to 1916, but then voluntarism had apparently succeeded in 1914-15. Cardwell had tried to make recruitment more attractive in the 1870s, as had Howick's Enlistment Bill in 1847. Both were limited by cost. Governments could safely leave weaponry to the experts outside the major wars of the period (Napoleonic and 1st World War) but even here weaponry and artillery made few advances / demands in the Napoleonic period. The 1st World War gave much more scope for ambitious, weaponry and artillery, although even here Churchill hid tank development under the Naval estimates.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 'Britain's wars were always used to secure the balance of power.' How far would you agree with this view of the period 1793 to 1918? [60]

Focus: An assessment of the function of war for Britain in the period 1793 to 1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to assess Britain's wars in terms of their purposes – was it to secure the balance of power or was it more about securing and defending an overseas Empire or protecting and extending trade or simply defending the UK mainland? Much depends where one looks. The numerous colonial wars were more to do with trade and investment either directly (the 2nd Boer War where the mineral riches of the Boer States were at issue) or indirectly (protecting routes to Asia – the Sudan in the 1880s, or denying places of strategic value to enemies like Russia in Afghanistan in the 1870s and 1880s). These were not balance of power wars.

The Crimean War would be an interesting test case for candidates to choose as in part it reflected concern with a Russian threat to trade and naval power in the Mediterranean, in part a concern to preserve the balance of power in the Ottoman area. Before 1900 Britain had little interest in creating Empire there (except in Egypt and in terms of naval bases).

Large scale European Wars could be seen as pre-eminently balance of power wars given that Britain had no territorial ambitions in Europe itself. The balance of power was Britain's means of forestalling a threat to the UK's defence from a dominant power in the Low Countries and the economic threat of a 'Continental System' applied in a discriminatory manner to British European markets. The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars were fought to eject France from Belgium and Holland and to open up European markets to competition. They were triggered by French invasion of Belgium. The same was true of the First World War when Germany attacked Belgium and threatened France with defeat. A German dominated, economic bloc could not be tolerated. What was less thought through was how Germany was to be dealt with in 1918. At other points Britain threatened war if she felt the balance of power threatened local geographical interests (Russia in 1877 – 78; Mehmet Ali in 1839). Obtaining a balance of power in Europe enabled Britain to scale her army down to 'colonial size' for large parts of the period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Britain 1834-1996**Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**

- 7** 'Lack of finance was the greatest obstacle to attempts to tackle the problems created by the growth of towns and cities.' How far do you agree with this view of the period 1834-1948? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the factors that influenced attempts to tackle problems associated with urbanisation

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Financial cost was always the issue for local and central governments in their attempts to tackle the effects of rapid urbanisation. Chadwick's 1842 proposals for reform would have been costly to implement which partly explains the permissive nature of the 1848 Public Health Act. By the end of the nineteenth century housing legislation was of a more compulsory nature but slum clearance and improvements to sanitation, drainage and water supplies proved extremely difficult as ratepayers were still resistant to contributing more to solve social problems that they did not think directly affected them.

The 1919 Housing and Town planning Act was something of a landmark in that it did involve the spending of substantial amounts of government money on the provision of quality council housing for the first time. However, the Geddes Axe put paid to this and although there were further public health reforms in the interwar period, they were limited by the general depressed state of the economy.

Most candidates should be able to chart this pattern of continuity although weaker responses are likely to focus too much on describing public health problems, particularly for the early part of the period. Better answers are likely to discuss contributions made by non-government parties (charities, industrial magnates, wealthy individuals in general) although pointing out that these were limited in scope. For **Band III and above** other influences should be discussed such as political will (at local and national level), vested interests, scientific and technological developments and the attitudes of the general public.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 8** To what extent was the 1870 Education Act the most important turning point in the reforms of the education system during the period 1834-1948? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the significance of the 1870 Education Act

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Forster's Act was very significant in that it was the first time that a government intervened to provide state run schools. School Boards were given the power to make attendance compulsory and the Cowper-Temple Clause attempted to deal with the knotty problem of religious instruction. Better candidates are likely to point out that the Act still left many issues unresolved. Although gaps in the provision of elementary schools were filled there was still a patchwork system. Schooling was not free and not until 1880 was attendance fully compulsory.

The question demands that other turning points should be discussed and these might include 1861 (Newcastle Commission), 1894 (Bryce Commission), 1902 (Balfour's Education Act), Liberal social reforms (especially 1906 and 1907), 1918 (Fisher's Education Act), 1926 (the Hadow report), 1928 (the Spens report) and 1944 (Butler's Education Act).

More able candidates are likely to begin by discussing the significance of 1870 in a balanced fashion. They should then compare Forster's Act with developments before and after it. This is then likely to provide a more analytical rather than purely narrative based answer.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9 To what extent were the Liberal social reforms (1906-1914) the most significant development in creating a Welfare State during the period 1834-1948? [60]

Focus: Assessment for the reasons for the evolution of the Welfare state

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates should be able to make a case for Liberal social reforms laying a platform for the formation of the Welfare State. There is likely to be discussion of how it was the first time the state intervened to deal collectively with issues relating to child welfare, the elderly, health, unemployment and poverty in general. It marked a move away from nineteenth century *laissez-faire* individualism to state interventionism.

However, better answers are likely to offer a critique of the reforms pointing out their minimalist nature and deficiencies (such as the limited scope of National Insurance) and that there was still a long way to go before an integrated 'cradle to grave' welfare programme could be introduced.

The question demands that other significant events should be discussed. These might include reforms to the Poor Law (1834, 1847, 1939), the work of social investigators, foreign example, political pressures (especially the development of the labour movement) and the effects of wars. Successful responses will probably focus on a comparative analysis of relevant factors emphasising the long term evolution of the Welfare State rather than a narrow focus on events occurring from 1906 to 1948.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992

10 To what extent was victory at elections always dependent on the strength of party organisation during the period 1868 to 1992? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for victory at general elections

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should attempt to provide balanced responses by considering the importance of party organisation against a range of other factors. It was often the case that when parties were united, well organised and well managed they experienced success at general elections. This can be supported using a range of examples. In 1874, for example, Disraeli united his party in a

'negative' campaign to defeat the Liberals, claiming they had a 'strange mania for eating dirt.' In 1910 the Liberals secured victory by uniting to push the 'Peers against the People' argument. The Conservatives reorganised in 1923 under Baldwin to win the election by claiming to be the only bastion against socialism and there were hints of this approach again in the Conservative election campaign of 1951. The 1964 election revealed how a party could organise to promote a new image. Labour and Wilson based their manifesto on the concept of a 'New Britain' as opposed to a nation languishing in the past. This was similar to the way in which a new brand of Conservatism in the form of Thatcherism was introduced to defeat Labour in the elections of 1979 and the 1980s.

However, there were obviously times when elections were won simply because the losers were far more divided and disorganised than the winners. Examples might include the Liberal landslide victory of 1906, the labour success of the interwar years and the 1945 Welfare state election.

More able candidates are also likely to argue that circumstances and luck also played a large part in the outcome of elections such as the state of the economy, external events (for example Ireland, Russian Revolution, World Wars) and changing social structures. With the higher band responses there is likely to be some questioning of the term 'party organisation' and the relative significance of party leaders as opposed to the party as a whole.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

11 Assess the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Labour movement and party during the period 1868 to 1992. [60]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Labour movement and party

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should take a fairly broad view of the labour movement. They are likely to discuss the role of trades unions, other pressure groups and grassroots protest (for example, hunger marches). Reasons of an 'internal' nature might include the emergence of class consciousness, the role of leaders (for example, Tillet, Hardie, Macdonald, Attlee, Wilson and Foot), changing tactics and strategy (for example the use of strikes, the closed shop, collective bargaining, nationalisation), communications and the availability of finance.

Discussion of 'external' factors is likely to focus on the strengths of other political parties (especially the Liberals and Conservatives), political trends in general (for example, the extension to the franchise), economic performance (for example a strong economy often meant a strong union movement), social change (the swinging 60s and the Wilson regime) and foreign affairs (for example the Russian Revolution, the rise of Hitler and appeasement).

As the question demands that reasons be examined then candidates reaching higher **Bands I and II** should focus on assessing the relative importance of factors and making links between them where appropriate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

12 How far was the rise of mass media responsible for the growth of democracy during the period 1868 to 1992? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the importance of mass media in the development of democracy

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Some candidates are likely to adopt the rather basic argument that as the mass media emerged then Britain became more democratic. Early forms of broadsheet and then later the spread of the popular press (1896 onwards) gave a voice to the people and went hand in hand with the idea of free speech. This was added to by the introduction of the radio, the founding of the BBC, and the spread of television. Not only did the mass media provide a vehicle for expression but it also educated the public about current affairs such as wars, industrial action and foreign policy.

Better candidates should be able to offer a more critical analysis by pointing out that the mass media was often manipulated by those in power to influence and control public opinion. This was especially true during times of national crisis such as the two world wars, the 1926 General Strike, and the 'Troubles' in Northern Ireland. Those achieving **Band III and above** should also point out that in many ways the mass media was not very apparent in the early part of the period. This should lead to discussion of other factors that were equally or more important such as extensions to the franchise, reform of parliament, education reform and the growth of pressure groups.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996

13 Assess the consequences for society throughout the period from 1896 to 1996 of the growth and development of the mass media. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the consequences for society of the growth of the new mass media

The key to success here is recognising the significance of the instruction to assess: candidates will need to be able to argue the consequences through and weigh up their importance for society, and also discuss the relative importance of the consequences they identify. Weaker students are likely to be drawn into a list, unevaluated and undeveloped. Students who are able to categorise and link consequences (political, cultural; far-reaching or short-term; in order of importance etc) are likely to be more successful than those who are less analytical.

The consequences for society which students may wish to explore include: growth in political awareness and both political involvement and scepticism/ alienation; improved education/knowledge/understanding of issues; impact on values and morals; Americanisation; increased range of leisure activities/interests; impact on women and the family; high culture versus low culture debate; class awareness and conflict/envy; greater national unity and shared culture on the one hand, but greater awareness of differences and fragmentation on the other.

Band I and II answers will readily engage with all of this, finding and sustaining an appropriate thematic structure, and confidently using examples across the century to support the arguments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

14 How is the changing balance between the roles of the media to inform, educate and entertain best explained in the century from 1896? [60]

Focus: Explanation of the changing balance between the three main roles of the mass media

The roles traditionally attributed to the media have been to educate, inform and entertain. Here successful answers will need to weigh up the performance of one specified role against another, and the key is to recognise that this is a comparison question which requires direct, integrated comparison and therefore an appropriate structure. A largely separate discussion of evidence of entertainment and informing, however well done and informed, is unlikely to rise above Band IV.

Candidates will need to be familiar with many actual examples of the printed and broadcast media and analyse their content carefully, as well as considering the publicly declared or covert aims of broadcasters, newspaper editors and owners, and journalists. The perception of audiences and readers may be considered too. Candidates need to be aware of fluctuations, and the importance of circumstance (eg if there is a national crisis or a war in progress) in influencing the emphasis the media employs. Candidates may also make the point that an apparent 'entertainment' can be a vehicle for information (especially true of radio in World War II).

Answers in **Bands I and II** are likely therefore to adopt an effective analytical framework along the possible various lines indicated and sustain this throughout, weighing up the impact carefully in every section, and using specific examples drawn evenly from the whole period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

15 Assess the main reasons for the growth in popularity of the new mass media in Britain during the century from 1896. [60]

Focus: Explanation of the emergence and popularity of the new mass media

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Many possible explanations have been put forward for the growth in popularity of the new mass media. The skill needed for success in answering this particular question is the ability to identify the 'main' and adequately justify the selection of these as 'main', and of course to consider their relative importance. A candidate who simply produces a list of reasons, however interesting and well-illustrated, is unlikely to progress beyond Band IV. Having said that, the explanations which may be put forward are likely to include some of the following: the improvements in literacy and standards of living and aspiration; the extension of the franchise and political interest and involvement; increasing leisure; better pay in certain employment fields, and the growth of service industry white-collar jobs; natural enthusiasm for the new and different; improved distribution, keen pricing; governments' exploitation of the new media to rally support, especially in times of crisis. But the ability of students to compare and support arguments is paramount.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will show awareness of the explanation relevant to different periods and classes, be able to use a wide range of examples, and argue convincingly rather than assert or list.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1792-1919**The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1918**

- 16 To what extent was the leadership by individual generals the main factor in success in warfare in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]**

Focus: The impact of a single factor on successful war fighting in the period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to be able to address the key factors of generalship of individuals in the period. We might expect discussion of quality of leadership, control and application of strategy and tactics, an ability to respond positively to the changing demand of warfare in the period. Other factors may be included in the essay but the key prompt of the question must form the core response of the essay. Where other factors are linked directly and intelligently to the specific wording of the question then credit is due. Obvious examples of generals who made a critical impact on war would be Napoleon, Wellington, Lee, Grant, Sherman or Moltke the Elder. Candidates may use the incompetence of generals as an alternative perspective; Mack, McClellan, Benedek or Bazaine are examples. Some candidates may refer to generals who have been the subject of revision; an obvious example might be Haig.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 17 Assess the view that armies failed to apply developments in weapons technology to battlefield tactics in the period from 1792 to 1918. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of technology on war in the period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. It is perfectly possible – indeed perhaps the mark of the better candidate – that the successful application of new weapons technology will vary from date to date, even army to army.

The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars were fought with essentially the weapons technology of the 1700s; even advances in artillery predated the start of our period. However, candidates might argue that the combatant powers starting with the French applied this technology successfully and in new ways on the battlefield. From 1815 onwards the speed of development steps up with the introduction of percussion caps and breech loading rifles as the period goes on. Artillery also advances with the introduction of rifling, breech loading, various new types of munitions, and finally effective recoil systems. Machineguns appear in the later part of the period, with the tank and aeroplane entering the lists in WW1.

It is expected that these developments are analysed in the light of the development of battlefield tactics. Candidates might argue that armies embraced the new technologies well, for example the use of the breech loading carbine by the Prussians in the 1866 war or the French with the Chassepot rifle in 1870-71. Or, that armies are always one step behind. The 1866 conflict can be used to argue that the Austrian artillery had jumped ahead of that of the Prussians for example. Candidates might also argue that the response of armies to new technology varied according to period, for example that 1914 came as a total shock to the military thinking of the time. Candidates that simply list the development of weapons technology should not be awarded more than **Band IV**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

18 To what extent did public opinion influence military decisions in war in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the effect of public opinion on the conduct of war.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

It is expected that candidates will discuss the conduct of war in the light of the pressures of domestic public opinion. Definitions of public opinion vary and examiners need to be aware that political pressure on elites can come in many forms. Arguments that public opinion did influence military decisions might include the early part of the Revolutionary Wars where the French Republic was fighting perhaps an ideological war for its existence. Candidates might point to the concept of the 'nation in arms' or the execution of generals for political reasons. It might be argued that the *Ancien Regime* powers fought for the same reasons, ie to protect their own political establishment from potential opposition from below.

Napoleon might be used both ways, for example the need for military victory and its links to political stability. The Crimean War is a good example where military decisions are influenced by public opinion placing pressure on military decisions via the political demands on the French and British governments. The reaction of Russia to this conflict might also be discussed. With regard to the wars of unification, that public opinion might drag France into Italy in 1859 and the impact of rising nationalism in all of the wars of this period are obvious. Colonial conflicts in the latter part of the period, for example the Boer war, are candidates for discussion. WW1 has a lot of potential with regard the question. Obviously, candidates might argue that military decisions are made with no regard to public opinion in autocratic states.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815 – 1919

19 To what extent did factors influencing the development of German nationalism change in the period from 1815 to 1919? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the extent to which the factors influencing the development of German nationalism changed in the period

Candidates may answer this question in a variety of ways. Alternative approaches to the question are to be expected so no set conclusion can be presumed. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the dominant factors in the development of German nationalism during this period, from the reasons for the growing emergence of the nationalist movement after 1815 to the reasons for the development of more radical nationalism in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. The development and impact of ideas on the emergence and development of nationalism should be explored.

Candidates may demonstrate understanding of the debate about *Grossdeutschland* or *Kleindeutschland* in the period 1815 – 1871 and the reasons for the development of more radical nationalism in the remainder of the period. Candidates should explain the importance of

economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Military strength depended upon economic strength.

Bismarck's opportunistic and skilful leadership clearly had a significant impact on developments within German nationalism too. The impact of the foundation of the Second Reich from 1871 had a profound effect on the development of nationalism during the latter part of this period. Candidates may focus on the more radical nationalism of the Wilhelmine period and its ultimately disastrous impact on the German nation. The Great War left Germany broken and half-starved.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

20 'The 1848 - 49 Revolutions were the most important turning-point in the course of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the relative significance of the 1848 – 1849 Revolution as a turning point in the course of German nationalism in the period 1815 - 1919.

Candidates may answer this question in a variety of ways. Alternative approaches to the question are to be expected so no set conclusion can be presumed. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the phrase '**most** important turning point' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the 1848 – 49 Revolutions as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. In assessing the significance of the 1848 – 49 Revolutions candidates are likely to stress German liberalism's missed opportunity and the significance for Austria of the fall of Metternich. What follows is not an exclusive list of other potential turning-points, but obvious consideration could be given to 1815, 1862, 1866, 1871, 1888 (and / or 1890), 1914 and 1918 (and / or 1919). Clearly answers of the very highest quality can be written without considering all of these potential turning points, but the most able candidates will demonstrate a breadth of vision and a good understanding of the moments that shaped the destiny of German nationalism. Any answers that are limited to the importance of the 1848 – 1849 Revolutions, however full and accurate, are severely flawed and may not be awarded more than **Band III**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

21 'The creation and development of a united Germany in the period from 1815 to 1919 owed everything to Prussia and nothing to German nationalism.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the creation and development of the German Empire.

Candidates may answer this question in a variety of ways. Alternative approaches to the question are to be expected so no set conclusion can be presumed. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the dominant factors in the creation and development of the German Empire during this period, from the development of the nationalist movement after 1815

to the development of more radical nationalism in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. Candidates may argue that the emergence of romantic nationalism had an impact on the creation and development of the German Empire. Candidates may argue that the divisions within the nationalist movement weakened their impact. Certainly candidates must show that they understand that intellectual German nationalism was not the sole factor determining the creation and development of the German Empire in this period.

Candidates should be able to contrast the importance of nationalism with other factors: eg by explaining the importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Military strength depended upon economic strength: 'Coal & Iron' rather than 'Blood & Iron' could be usefully debated.

The leadership role played by Bismarck in determining the shape, extent and development of the German Empire may usefully be discussed. Candidates could argue that Bismarck's ideas owed little or nothing to nationalism and that therefore the contribution of nationalism to the creation of the Empire was minimal. The impact of Kaiser Wilhelm II from 1887 was arguably as significant on the further development and fortunes of the Empire.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1855 – 1956

Russian Dictatorship 1855 – 1956

22 'The communist rulers were effective autocrats; the Tsars were not'. How far do you agree with this view of Russian government in the period 1855 - 1956? [60]

Focus: Comparative assessment of the effectiveness of the Tsars and the communist autocratic rulers in the period 1855 - 1956.

Candidates may answer this question in a variety of ways. Alternative approaches to the question are to be expected so no set conclusion can be presumed. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the relative effectiveness of the communists and the Romanov Tsars as autocratic or dictatorial rulers of Russia. Candidates are likely to define their criteria for assessing the effectiveness of Russian rulers in this period and will then judge the rulers against them. The following list is not exclusive but obvious criteria might include the extent of the ruler's personal power and authority and how effectively they dealt with opposition, the extent to which they used their power and rule to improve the lives of their 'subjects', the extent to which they successfully implemented their policies or the extent to which they were able to develop the power and international standing of the Russian state.

Candidates are likely to argue that Lenin and Stalin were 'effective autocrats'. Lenin seized power in 1917 and successfully defended his revolution during the Civil War. Other parties were all banned, as were factions within the Communist Party. Candidates could argue that Stalin was even more effective, for example by arguing that his economic policies in the 1930s enabled the USSR to successfully survive Barbarossa and emerge victorious in the Great Fatherland War. Equally candidates could successfully argue that his 'success' was achieved at horrific expense and with needless brutality.

Candidates should, however, be able to differentiate between the relative effectiveness of the individual Tsars. Candidates may well see Alexander III as the most effective, rather than either Alexander II (who faced a growing tide of opposition and was ultimately assassinated) or Nicholas II (under whom the Romanov dynasty ended). However, candidates may see Alexander III in a different light, arguing that he achieved very little for Russia or his dynasty despite his apparent reassertion of autocratic control.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

23 'Alexander III was more successful at dealing with opposition than any other ruler of Russia in the period from 1855 to 1956.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the success with which the rulers of Russia dealt with opposition.

Candidates may answer this question in a variety of ways. Alternative approaches to the question are to be expected so no set conclusion can be presumed. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the success with which the rulers of Russia dealt with opposition during the period 1855 - 1956. Candidates may well see Alexander III as more successful at dealing with opposition than either Alexander II (who faced a growing tide of opposition and was ultimately assassinated) or Nicholas II (under whom the Romanov dynasty ended).

However, candidates who choose to differentiate between dealing with opponents and dealing with the reasons for opposition may see Alexander III in a different light. They may wish to argue that the granting of concessions was a more successful way of dealing with opposition than ruthless repression. It can be argued that his imposition of 'the reaction' from 1881 bequeathed Nicholas II a revolution.

A few candidates may consider Prince Lvov or Kerensky. Most candidates are likely to concentrate their arguments on Lenin and Stalin when considering whether Alexander III was the most successful ruler at dealing with opposition. Cases can be made for either. Lenin cut a swathe through the other parties that aspired to power in 1917 and successfully defended his revolution during the Civil War. Other parties were all banned, as were factions within the Communist Party. Stalin defeated all of his rivals during the power struggle with consummate skill and exterminated real and imagined opponents with bloodcurdling efficiency for the next 25 years.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

24 Assess the view that no Russian ruler in the period from 1855 to 1956 succeeded in improving the lives of the peasants. [60]

Focus: Assessment of the extent to which any of the rulers of Russia improved the lives of the peasants in the period from 1855 to 1956.

Candidates may answer this question in a variety of ways. Alternative approaches to the question are to be expected so no set conclusion can be presumed. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the effect of the rulers on the living and working conditions of the Russian peasantry and the treatment the peasants received. They should consider the way they

were treated by a range of Russian rulers in order to assess whether any of them did improve their lives.

It could be argued that the Russian peasantry made little progress in many ways during this period. The peasants faced harsh treatment both before and after 1917. They were 'squeezed dry' to finance industrialization. Famine hit, eg 1891, 1921 & 1932, regardless of regime. However, cases can be made for several rulers improving their lives. Alexander II, the Tsar Liberator, emancipated the peasants. Under Nicholas II, Stolypin encouraged the peasants to enrich themselves, as did Lenin during the NEP.

Obviously, cases against these rulers can also be made. For example, Lenin imposed War Communism and Nicholas II immersed the peasantry in the First World War. Few candidates are likely to argue in support of Alexander III, despite the Peasants' Land Bank, with his imposition of the Land Captains. Stalin will likewise win little support, though candidates may argue that his policies did much to eradicate illiteracy in the countryside.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

America 1763-1877

The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877

25 How far do you agree that the Constitution of 1787 was the main factor in creating the conditions for sectional conflict between North and South in the period from 1787 to 1877? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the role of US Constitution in causing sectional conflict in USA.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should assess the role of the Constitution and Bill of Rights as the cause of sectional conflict. The issue of slavery was not addressed directly in the Constitution; the Federal nature of the political system created the potential for conflict. The 10th amendment of the Constitution, in 1791, elaborated on this issue when it stated that powers not expressly given to the Federal government were reserved for the States. This created tensions, particularly in the 1830s about interposition and the role of States' Rights. In the defence of their position in 1861-5 the Confederate States claimed they were defending States' Rights as enunciated in the Constitution. The expansion of the USA westward strained the federal nature of the Constitution with the attempted balance between Free and Slave states as shown in the Missouri Compromise of 1820.

However, candidates could offer a counter-argument. They may state that slavery rather than the Constitution was the main cause of tension. They may link this with westward expansion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 26 'The presidency of Abraham Lincoln was the most important turning-point in the development of presidential power in the period from 1789 to 1877.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of presidency of Lincoln in development of presidential power.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates could argue that Lincoln was the most powerful president in the period. His actions in the Civil War greatly outweighed in importance those of other presidents. The suspension of Habeas Corpus, the expansion of the army and the Emancipation Proclamation are all examples of the growth of presidential power.

However, candidates should compare Lincoln's performance against other presidents:- Washington created the 'ground rules' for the role of president; Jefferson's role in the Louisiana Purchase, 1803, expanded the president's role; Andrew Jackson (1829-1837) helped create the condition of manhood suffrage, and was first to use the presidential veto, and ignored South Carolina and the Supreme Court on banking and Indian affairs respectively.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 27 'In the period from 1791 to 1877 amendments to the Constitution had little to do with social changes in United States.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the role of social change in bringing about constitutional amendment.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will be expected to explain the reasons for changes in the US Constitution. The first ten amendments (The Bill of Rights), 1791 can be interpreted either way. As they dealt with civil rights it could be argued that they did not have anything to do with social change. However, candidates may argue that the social impact of the American Revolutionary War and subsequent Articles of Confederation era necessitated the need to amend the Constitution in order for many states to ratify the Constitution of 1787.

Similarly the 11th and 12th amendments to the Constitution were associated with technical aspects of the working of the Constitution rather than the impact of social change.

However, candidates should argue that the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments (1865-1870) were associated with social change, ie the impact of slavery on US society. The abolition of slavery, the granting of equal protection of the law and full voting rights to African Americans was directly linked to social change.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980

- 28 To what extent were the 1960s the most important turning-point for the development of African American civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1980? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the 1960s compared to other factors resulting in change over time.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess the importance of the 1960s in the development of African American rights. They can mention the Civil Rights Act 1964, the Voting Rights Act 1965 and the Civil Rights Act 1968 as important milestones in the achievement of full political rights. They can also mention the Supreme Court cases associated with ‘bussing’ and the end of segregated schooling such as the Holmes case of 1969. They may also mention the development of affirmative action by the Federal government. In addition, the Great Society programmes greatly aided poor African Americans in inner cities. Candidates may also mention the Civil Rights Movement; the role of King, CORE and SNCC as important agents for change.

Candidates should compare the 1960s with other periods, for example:

Reconstruction (1865-1877) In this era African Americans received the right to vote; they participated in elections for the first time and several were elected to State legislatures and the US Congress. The Freedmans’ Bureau also aided ex-slaves to acquire education and land. The New Deal era (1933 to 1950s). Offers an alternative view where African American rights were enhanced.

The Second World War. In this period African Americans received jobs in war industries. Anti-discrimination employment regulations were introduced by the Federal government in war production plants, African Americans received military training and life experience outside segregated South. Many African Americans achieved higher status through officer training and gallantry in war

The 1950s. Brown Case of 1954 ending segregation in education. ,Montgomery Bus Boycott ending segregation on buses and the rise of Martin Luther King and Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Little Rock Central High in 1957 which tested the desegregation of high schools.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 29 ‘The most important obstacle to the development of trade union and labour rights was divisions within the trade union movement.’ How far do you agree for the period from 1865 to 1980? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of a factor causing trade union disunity against other factors.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may mention the splits between the Knights of Labor; the International Workers of the World and later the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organisations. These divisions occurred across the period from 1870s to 1950s. The creation of the AFL/CIO in 1955 brought a degree of unity to the trade union movement. However, individual trade unions, such as the Teamsters kept considerable autonomy.

Candidates may also mention ethnic divisions within the movement which resulted from the New Immigration (1870s to 1920s). Splits occurred between Old Immigrants (Germans,

Scandinavians and British/Irish) with New Immigrants (Italians, Eastern Europeans and Jews). These developments clearly impeded the development of trade unionism. However, from 1955 A F of L and CIO merged so divisions became much less significant. Candidates can compare this factor with others such as the power and strength of Big Business and the role of the Federal Government in impeding the development of trade union rights.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

30 Assess the view that the civil rights of Native Americans continually improved over the period from 1865 to 1980. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the development of Native American civil rights.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should address the issue of continual development of rights. In 1865 many Native Americans lived independently of US government control, in the West and Alaska. In the rest of the country Native Americans were regarded as members of sovereign nations and, therefore, were not US citizens. Many had been removed from the SE USA in early 1830s by US government in the ‘Trail of Tears’ forcible movement of the Five Civilised Tribes (Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw and Seminole) to new homes in Indian Territory (Indian Territory subsequently became the state of Oklahoma in 1907).

In 1865-1890 period the western tribes on the Plains suffered a series of military defeats by the US government and were forced off their tribal land into reservations. Most notable were the Lakota Sioux who lost their tribal homeland, guaranteed by the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 following the War of 1875-1876

However, by 1887 western tribes faced defeat and with the Dawes Act they gained some rights (for example, US citizenship for Plains Indians such as Sioux, Cheyenne and Crow). However these tribes lost their tribal independence. In addition, from 1887 onwards US federal policy was aimed at destroying tribal culture and integrating Native Americans into an American, Christian culture. By 1900 Federal government policy of assimilation had all but destroyed tribal life and customs. Therefore, candidates could argue that Native American civil rights improved in some areas but not others.

In 1924 all Native Americans received US citizenship but faced continual discrimination in social and economic matters. The New Deal legislation, in particular the Indian Reorganisation Act 1934 improved Native American rights. However, it wasn't until 1960s and 1970s that Native Americans received better rights as a result of Civil Rights Movement. In particular, considerable publicity was gained by the AIM (American Indian Movement) that occupied the Federal prison of Alcatraz in San Francisco Bay in 1969 and in 1971 occupied the Wounded Knee Battlefield in South Dakota. Marlon Brando refused the Best Actor Oscar for The Godfather, in 1972, in support of Native American rights. These incidents helped force Federal government to improve Native American social and economic position of reservations. Also in 1970s some Native American tribes won Supreme Court cases gaining more land and also gaining rights such as the ability to open casinos for gambling on their reservations, thus greatly improving their economic position. Examples are the Mohawks of upper New York state.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Generic Mark Scheme 2592/93
June 2007

UNITS 2592 & 2593: GENERIC MARK BANDS INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION**NB**

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best-fit', not a 'perfect fit' [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Examiners should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Candidates must either use and evaluate primary and/or secondary source material relevant to their question, and/or must explain and evaluate interpretations of the topic(s) studied. The importance of this is reflected in the weight given to AO2. Investigations which offer no interpretation or evaluation of sources and/or historical interpretations (ie. they fail completely to address AO2) may not be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The Investigation does not require high-level research or specialist resources (such cannot be expected at Advanced GCE).
- The quality of the English (grammar, punctuation and spelling) is never to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

NOTES (Unit 2592)

1. **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on an historical period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
2. **WORD LIMIT:** The target length is 2,500 words. **The maximum permitted is 3,000 words (excluding only the footnotes & bibliography). If that limit is exceeded, examiners must stop reading at 3,000 words and base their entire assessment on the first 3,000 words offered.** Watch for footnotes that evaluate sources &/or carry on the argument of the Investigation and, intentionally or not, thus circumvent the limit. **If any such footnote text takes the Investigation's total length beyond 3000 words then it must be included in the word-count after all and the excess material must be excluded from the assessment.** In such cases, please write an explanatory note on the front of the script [Do not check the actual length unless you are suspicious].
3. **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Candidates **must use footnotes and provide a bibliography.** No set form or location for either is prescribed; a list at the end is fine. The absence of either or both, or the inadequacy of either or both, must never be the sole criterion to pull an answer into a lower Band, but will be taken into account within the examiner's overall judgement.
4. **HANDWRITTEN INVESTIGATIONS** are valid.

NOTES (UNIT 2593 Open Book Exam)

- 1 Candidates have less time to write-up their Investigation than those who enter Unit 2592, so the following points of difference will be applied:
 - (a) Unit 2593 Investigations will be **shorter** and contain **less supporting detail/fewer examples. The range of evidence** marshalled to support arguments **will be narrower.** That said,
 - (b) **The qualities of evaluation and analysis required will be just the same.**
- 2 **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on a period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
- 3 **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY: Footnotes are optional. A bibliography is required.** This may be pre-prepared (typed or hand-written), taken into the exam and attached to the script with a tag.

Bands I-VII/90: Essay

I (72-90) The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve in A Level.

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.

The Investigation uses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic which is integrated into the overall approach. The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question** (eg causation, change over time, evaluation). The Investigation reflects a very high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach is consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative.** The argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material. **The answer is fully relevant.** The impression is that a good solid answer has been provided.

At the lower end of the Band, **there may be some weaker sections, but the overall quality still shows that the candidate is in control of the argument.**

The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

II (63–71) **The Investigation uses critically a reasonable range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically a range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic.** The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question but there is more unevenness than in Band I** answers. The Investigation generally reflects a high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. **The approach is mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer is fully relevant.** Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

III (54–62) **The Investigation uses a range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, but with some significant gaps and possibly with a limited critical sense.** The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument** and factual knowledge. The Investigation reflects a competent level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach contains analysis or explanation, but there may be some purely descriptive or narrative passages that are not linked directly to analysis or explanation. The answer achieves a genuine argument, but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge.** Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily, but some parts may lack full coherence. **The answer is mostly relevant.** The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate. *Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.*

- IV (45–53) The Investigation uses largely uncritically a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, and this may be 'bolted-on' to the other material.** The response indicates **an attempt to argue relevantly**. The Investigation reflects an adequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach depends more on descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions.** The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains some careless errors.
- V (36–44) The Investigation refers to a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. These may be poorly understood and used uncritically, and may be 'bolted-on' to the other material.** The responses offers **some elements of an appropriate answer, but there is little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question.** The Investigation reflects a very basic level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach lacks analysis and explanation and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, is not linked effectively to the argument.** The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is seriously unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
- VI (19–35) The Investigation refers only occasionally, and without any critical evaluation, to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations.** The response is **not properly focused on the requirements of the question.** The Investigation reflects an inadequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The argument will be of very limited relevance and there may well be confusion about the implications of the question.** There may be many unsupported assertions or a commentary which lacks sufficient factual support. **The answer may lack coherence as an extended essay, being largely fragmentary** and perhaps incoherent. The Investigation may rely heavily on a 'scissors and paste' approach. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-18) The answer demonstrates a completely unsatisfactory attempt to meet any of the demands of the Unit. There is no reference to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. There is no attempt to discuss any of the key issues in the question. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions.** The answer is **irrelevant** and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

2592/93 INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS**Marking Guidance for Board-set questions****1 THE ARTS AND HISTORY****How useful is the literature of a given historical period for assisting our understanding of the past?**

In this question, 'literature' can include for example novels, plays or poetry. Whilst responding critically to the chosen work, candidates need nevertheless to bear in mind that this is a historical investigation, not an exercise in literary criticism. In other words, the purpose should be to discuss the value of literature as evidence to the historian about the social, cultural, economic or political character of a past time or place: e.g. the usefulness of the novels of Dickens might be considered as evidence about aspects of Victorian England.

More successful candidates are likely to focus on the word 'useful' – considering the strengths and limitations of literature as a source of evidence, and comparing its value to that of other kinds of evidence about the past.

Less successful candidates may equate usefulness with detailed information and offer largely uncritical descriptions of a past society taken from one or more works of literature.

2 ECONOMIC HISTORY**Assess the impact of factors that have caused inflation in a given historical period.**

The word 'assess' signifies a requirement to both explain and evaluate. In this case, candidates will be seeking to identify and evaluate causal factors or conditions that have produced inflationary pressures on a given economy – for example, that of England over the 100 years between c.1520 and c.1620. Whilst candidates' overall explanation will be concerned with the causes rather than the consequences of inflation, they may also need to consider the effect of causal factors on peoples' lives, in order to determine how significant a particular factor might have been.

More successful candidates are likely to present a complex explanation, incorporating critical use of source material, which shows links between causal factors and/or demonstrates how certain factors had a greater impact than others.

Less successful candidates may offer simple explanations that are either largely descriptive, or limited in what they can explain.

3 THE INDIVIDUAL IN HISTORY**How far would you agree with Thomas Carlyle that history is no more than 'the biography of great men'?**

This question calls for a fairly straightforward argument based on the issue raised by the Carlyle quotation. Candidates should note that Carlyle is talking about history, not about the past – i.e. he is expressing a view about what history should concern itself with, and limit itself to. They are therefore invited to discuss whether history - the story of the past – should limit itself mainly to celebrating the achievements of the great and famous, or should be more inclusive, recognizing the importance of 'ordinary' people, or of 'collections' of people. Candidates need not be diverted by dictionary definitions of 'greatness' – 'famous' will serve as a more useful synonym. Since this

topic is potentially vast, candidates may validly limit the examples they use to support one or other side of the argument to a particular century, or period that they have studied.

More successful candidates will produce measured arguments, built upon critical use of evidence, showing how and why history should or should not confine itself to the story of 'famous men'. Some may go beyond this to examine ways in which various 'stories' can be intertwined, and so find a synthesis that can resolve the apparent conflict between two sides of the argument.

Less successful candidates may provide an uncritical narrative, outlining the achievements of a 'great man'. They may also fail, in doing so, to recognise the need to set this inside a discussion about the purpose of history.

4 LOCAL HISTORY

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

The term 'local museum' is intended to exclude the great national museums, such as the Imperial War Museum, or the National Railway Museum. Part of the purpose of the question is to encourage candidates to undertake a local historical investigation, using rigorously the facilities of a local museum. It is not the purpose of the question to invite uncritical accounts of museum visits. Candidates should take particular note of the phrase, "To what extent....?" This indicates a need to evaluate the museum-based part of the experience in some way. For example, a candidate might find that a museum presentation or reconstruction is in conflict with other interpretations or with a wider range of primary evidence. This would enable the candidate to compare critically, or adjudicate between, competing interpretations.

More successful candidates will understand the need to see the museum (or some part of its presentation) as an interpretation, which, like other interpretations, can be evaluated, or tested by reference to other kinds of evidence, critically used – in the context of a local historical investigation.

Less successful candidates may take a less critical line, for example by describing how they used the facilities of a local museum to provide evidence for their investigation.

5 MILITARY HISTORY

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

Candidates may choose to study a commander from any military context - on land, on sea or in the air. Clearly, the term 'military genius' narrows the field somewhat. Not all good commanders have been considered 'great'. Candidates would therefore be well advised to spend part of their time presenting the claim to genius itself and discussing criteria for making such a judgement. They should also note that the question is asking the candidate to evaluate the claim, not the person. Thus it would make sense, having presented and substantiated the claim, to test it against a wider range of primary and/or secondary evidence. This will provide the argument for the essay.

More successful candidates, making critical use of all of the available evidence, will provide balanced assessments of their chosen commander, perhaps confirming the original judgement; modifying it in some way, or rejecting it – all justified by reference to evidence.

Less successful candidates may provide largely uncritical, biographical accounts of the career and achievements of the chosen commander.

6 POLITICAL HISTORY

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

For the purposes of this question, candidates may consider any normally recognised form of government, e.g. a monarchy, a republic, a dictatorship, a parliamentary democracy etc. The purpose of the question is to enable candidates critically to explore the relationship between leadership and management (i.e. the systems of government and administration) in a political context. Candidates are free to examine either sides of the issue. For example, they might examine either a largely successful regime under what might be termed weak leadership (for example, that of Mary Tudor) – or a largely unsuccessful regime, under what might be termed strong leadership (for example, the latter part of Elizabeth's reign) – or a largely successful regime under strong government (e.g. that of Henry VII or Henry VIII). Candidates may use one or more examples (preferably from the same era) to support, undermine or modify the proposal in the question, explaining their view in each case by reference to evidence critically used, and reaching an overall judgement in respect of the original question.

More successful candidates who use one example, will make critical use of evidence to test whether a particular regime was (a) successful and (b) strongly led, forming a balanced view with which to agree or disagree with the proposition. Those using more than one example may take a broader view, looking for similarities and differences in the relationship between leadership and management in regimes that succeeded or failed and drawing a conclusion in respect of the original question.

Less successful candidates may relate the events of one regime, discussing either whether or not it failed or whether or not it had a strong leader, or both, but omitting to use the conclusion to answer the original question.

7 RELIGIOUS HISTORY

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

'Longer term' is essentially limitless, but we suggest that candidates confine themselves to a period of no more than 100 years. 'Religious change' need not necessarily indicate doctrinal revision – enabling candidates to choose the Henrician Reformation, which lends itself well to the requirements of the question. For the same reason, the consequences of the event or change in question need not necessarily be 'religious' – it may be, for example, social, economic or political. The purpose of the question is to encourage candidates to distinguish between short and longer views of history – between momentary ripples and underlying tides; in particular, to enable them to see what each perspective can reveal about the significance of the event or change in question. For example, candidates might focus on the religious radicalism of the English Revolution – the "World Turned Upside Down". They could show how the significance of sectarian 'enthusiasm' appears to diminish with the re-assertion of Anglican dominance under Charles II and his successors. However, significance is restored in the longer term with the Methodist revival of the mid 18th Century. The point that the candidate might wish to make here, supported by critical use of source material, is that the significance of religious change can be seen to differ according to the temporal perspective in which it is viewed.

More successful candidates will produce complex narratives of change, showing how short and longer-term consequences of an event or religious change are causally linked over time. They may also show an understanding of how/why variations in timescale can alter the amount of significance we may attach to the event itself (i.e. the extent of its 'impact').

Less successful candidates may produce chronological narratives offering descriptions of the religious event or change and its consequences. Some may go on to identify short and longer-term consequences and the difference between them but are unable to see how this might affect the importance we might attach to the event in question.

8 SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND HISTORY

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

This question uses the subject of Science and Technology to test candidates' understanding of causation. In particular, it invites them to demonstrate techniques for determining the relative importance of factors that have acted to advance and/or impede progress in respect of any scientific or technological endeavour.

Candidates need to identify a range of factors and then assess their relative importance (i.e. show why one factor was more or less important than others) in an explanation of the causes of progress (or lack of it) in the chosen scientific or technological field. Judgement about relative importance may be based on common sense reasoning (one factor was more important than the others because they all depended on the first factor – e.g. the availability of coal to the process of industrialisation), or counterfactual reasoning (of only one factor can it be said that the development in question could not have occurred without it).

More successful candidates will respond to the wording of the question not only to identify, but also to prioritise causal factors and use this analysis to produce an explanation of scientific or technological progress, making appropriately critical use of primary and/or secondary source material.

Less successful candidates may produce descriptions of the development they have chosen to study, or go on to list a range of causal factors (advancing or impeding, or both), but they will fail to assess or demonstrate their relative importance. Alternatively, they may simply assert that one factor is the most important.

9 SOCIAL HISTORY

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

'Factors' may be social, political, cultural or economic; long-term or short-term; internal or external. 'Social cohesion' refers to the degree of harmony that exists either within or between different groups in a given society. For any given period, candidates need to identify pressures or forces acting to increase social cohesion (e.g. the monarchy, the church, the family, popular culture/mass media, social reform, industrialisation, war) or forces acting against social cohesion (e.g. rebellion, bastard feudalism, religious or political radicalism, industrialisation, war) and go on to assess their effectiveness or impact on society. As suggested by the above examples, candidates might wish to discuss the extent to which the Industrial Revolution strengthened and weakened traditional social bonds.

More successful candidates might produce a balanced argument, based upon critical use of available evidence, showing how, for example, a development such as that of mass media has created a revolution in information but also helped to strengthen negative prejudices. Alternatively, they may try to explain how and why the emblems of national unity (the church, parliament, monarchy, imperialism) have endured despite periodic onslaughts by war, rebellion or popular protest.

Less successful candidates may describe examples of national unity or disunity but fail to assess or evaluate their impact.

10 WORLD HISTORY

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

This world history question recognises the value of studying history from a non-European perspective for its own sake. The question calls for a balanced historical judgement about the extent to which the chosen subject deserves to be described as 'great'. Clearly, candidates will need to establish criteria for defining greatness and make careful, critical use of primary and/or secondary sources when testing the 'claim to greatness'.

More successful candidates will test the claim or interpretation by reference to a wider range of relevant evidence. This process may well lead either to a modified claim, given that some evidence is likely to be generally less useful or reliable than other evidence, or to the development of a competing view of the individual in question, equally supported by the available evidence.

The best candidates will reach for a synthesis, for example by showing that the conflict between opposing views is more apparent than real and that a third view is possible—which needs to be justified in respect of the evidence.

Less successful candidates are likely to either assert greatness or to produce uncritical biographies of the individual in question.

Advanced Subsidiary & Advanced GCE History 3835/7835
June 2007 Assessment Series

Unit Threshold Marks

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

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3835	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7835	600	489	420	360	300	240	0

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

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

27077 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
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

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

© OCR 2007