

History

Advanced GCE A2 7835

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3835

Mark Schemes for the Units

January 2008

3835/7835/MS/R/08J

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 2008

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (7835)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3873)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
2580 Document Studies 871 – 1099	23
2581 Document Studies 1450 – 1693	29
2582 Document Studies 1774 – 1945	39
2583 English History 1042 – 1660	55
2584 English History 1780 – 1964	95
2585 European History 1046 – 1718	119
2586 European and World History 1789 – 1989	167
2587 Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	207
2588 Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	213
2589 Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	225
2590 Themes in History 1066 – 1796	246
2591 Themes in History 1763 – 1996	279
Grade Thresholds	309

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 or scripts from another Centre.

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 & 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).

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;

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.

**Units 2580-2582: GENERIC MARK BANDS AS DOCUMENT STUDIES
with Glosses & Revised Mark Allocations used Summer 2005 onwards**

- For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- for answers 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, in applying these Bands [see Marking Instructions #5].
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin all their answers directly **without an introduction**.
- The quality of the English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to put an answer in a lower Band.

- Glosses in [] have been added to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme” (*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 of 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 prerequisite 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 (i.e. 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.

Examiners are reminded that

- for answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark 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 Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5];
- 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 instead of William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award to the top of Band VI.

ESSAY

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 the 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 perspectives(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 will 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 of the Band, 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 tends to be descriptive or narrative in approach but the argument depends on some analysis. 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 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 perspective(s) in the question. The answer is descriptive or narrative in approach but there is some implicit analysis. 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 organisation is 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 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 an incompetent manner. 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.

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 [see General Marking Instructions #5];
- 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 markscheme.” (*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.

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.

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 an 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.

2580 Document Studies 871 – 1099

The Reign of Alfred the Great 871-899

1 (a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for Alfred's actions on behalf of the English Church. [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 **B** raise similar issues: the Church needs better religion, reform, help. In **B**, financial help to Wessex and beyond is a key feature, to encourage learning and aid the 'school for boys not of noble birth' as well as noble while in **A** there is a wider scope, pulling in Grimbold and answering Alfred's call for 'spiritual dogs' to aid revival. **B** favours a financial dimension while **A** looks more at personnel, education and learning needs. **B** emphasises monastic needs and role, envisaging a wide appeal (noble, non-noble), not least to recruit for the important school. **A** uses quite vivid language ('hunting dogs', 'spiritual dogs', 'guard his flock', 'keep away from impure spirits') and has a link to **B** in the appeal for the services of non-English ecclesiastics (here, Grimbold). In different ways, both Sources relate to clear spiritual needs, to be met from a variety of sources. Tone and language can be commented upon. **B** is from Alfred's biographer; he may be expected to play up the King's role but can be seen as reliable. **A** has value coming from a non-English source but reflecting similar views as to spiritual and educational needs.

1 (b) Study all the Source

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred saw the revival of the Church and education as the key to the future survival of Wessex. [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.

All four Sources mention religion and learning. **C and D** have references to the military arena (Viking attacks). Source **C** sets out the ruinous consequences of attacks and greed (the contradiction of an 'abundance of riches'). **A and B** link together via the responses to the problems, financial, personnel, better education. **D** presents a wider view, mentioning military needs and actions but also suggesting linkage to educational needs and religious revival ('intended cure'). Sources **A and B** focus upon needs for religious-ecclesiastical reform. Source **C** points up some spiritual needs. Sources **B and D** are explicit about education; **A and C** more implicit; Source **D** provides an overview, with a mix of military reforms and spiritual (elements of the 'Alfredian Renaissance', in essence); it mixes together education, religion and military arenas and it gives a sense of the reasons (eg 'decay', 'decline', 'blame') also found in Source **C** ('ravages of foreign enemies'). **D** points up the 'intended cure' in the 'programme for the revival of religion and learning'.

Own knowledge of Mercian, Welsh and Continental contributions as well as of Alfred's two monastic foundations and revivals can be supplied as well as the context of military needs, Viking attacks, political and military concerns across so much of the reign. Sources **A, B and C** can be tested against knowledge of the 'Alfredian Renaissance', its scholars and scholarship, the role of churchmen, the literature, even the artefacts; the revival of religious life by importing leading clergymen (eg Plegmund, Werferth, Werwulf, Grimbald, John the Saxon); the links of religious and educational activities to all-round Kingship; the submission of many of the English, the creation of support, leadership, instructional emphases (obedience, reverence, God's ruler on earth) – all could be used in support of the Sources. Candidates will need to have a strong focus upon 'the key to the future survival of Wessex' to argue and counter-argue around the proposition. Sources **A to D** all have linkages to reviving religion and education while Sources **C** and especially **D** do point to wider factors, above all military ('practical measures', 'military reforms' in **D**). Knowledge of the context of Viking attacks and of military responses can be tested against Sources **C and D**. Such knowledge will assist evaluation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Normans in England 1066-87**2 (a) Study Sources B and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems created by the actions of William I's sheriffs. [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 **B** and **C** are linked by their comments upon shrieval activities, malpractices, extortions, rights, seizures of lands, assets and finances. Source **B** is more explicit than **C** which has more implicit commentary upon these activities. In **B** there is a sense of immediacy and urgent action; **C** is more indirect, with a sense of neglect ('fourteen years'). Source **B** suggests the expectation of action while **C** is more about responses via judicial-legal processes. In **C** 'unjust exactions' and neglect are pointed up; William I is said to have placed restrictions, causing the capacity for shrieval extortions. In **B**, 'carelessness or fear or greed' are adduced as reasons. In **B** William issues a direct order via the writ while in **C** there is an objective record and report. In both cases the King is heavily involved. In both Sources the power and scope for misuses of that power wielded by the post-Conquest sheriffs are prominent. The tone of **B** is direct, incisive, ordering; that of **C** is more measured, befitting a record of factual events. Source **B** is a direct order from the King himself while **C** is a report of proceedings.

2 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that William I was more concerned with upholding property rights and customs than with changing the system of English government. [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, B and C** link to issues of property rights, lands, custumal rights while Source **D** especially refers to the Conquest's impact upon government. Sources **A and C** are linked via the focus upon shrieval activities and problems, linked to property and customs. Source **B** brings out issues of lands and rights and there is some link to the issues of Source **C**. Sources **A, B and C** reflect a sense of William's concern and desire for action. All three place some emphasis upon just government. Sources **C and D** link the uses of Old English customs, personnel and methods. Source **D** is very much about the uses of traditional forms of government but it does focus upon the lower levels of government. Here these Sources point towards an absence of changes in governmental methods again at a lower tier. **D** says there was continuity at lower levels but implies changes higher up.

Own knowledge can develop the point that 'time brought changes'. Certainly from the early 1070's there were significant changes in personnel (Earls, sheriffs, areas of the Chancery). All the Sources refer to officials at mid or lower levels, less so directly to those at the very top of the system. There were "new" developments in knight service and in curbing the powers of the Anglo-Saxon earldoms unless there were marcher lordships. Candidates could also usefully refer to Domesday. Evaluation of Sources can be achieved by reference, via own knowledge, to such areas and examples as the development of the Chancery, the use of the writ (as in **B**), fiscal machinery, courts, forms of central and local administration (hundred, shire, honour), record-keeping, the use of Latin, the use of commissions (as in **B and C** and, of course, the genesis of the Domesday Book). It is possible to argue that changes became manifest during the 1070s. Own knowledge (linked to **D**) can supply material to show that there were changes at a higher level (new foreign Earls, sheriffs, the use of Latin, developments at the centre in the Chancery and possibly Treasury), though such can also reinforce the importance of using existing traditions and methods (shire and hundred courts, for example). The use of the writ, shire institutions and older (Anglo-Saxon) methods can be linked in knowledge to Sources **A, C and D**. Candidates do not need to draw upon an exhaustive range of own knowledge; some choice evidence only is needed. **Examiners will note that, at AS level, even the best answers can be expected to include only some of this own knowledge.**

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The First Crusade 1073-99**3 (a) Study Sources B and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the influence of racial prejudice on the crusaders. [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 reflect aspects of racial prejudice, linked to religious fervour, and its effects on actions. Source **B** focuses upon religious fervour out of control, combined with ethnic dimensions, racial prejudice leading to attacks on Jewish communities. The language and tone reflect such ('slaughtering', 'the oppressor of all Jews'). Source **C**, in places, focuses upon the impact of religious fervour linked to miracle in the actual Crusade: the revival of spirits and so morale. But it also reflects racial dimensions, seeing the Muslims as 'enemies of our race and religion', 'ungodly' and linking fighting to killing in the name of (Christian) God. Whereas in Source **B** racial and religious zeal are unchecked, uncontrolled and not susceptible to traditional "pay-off" methods; in **C** they are more channelled and controlled. The dates, one before the actual Crusade, the other featuring a significant event on the Crusade, are important. There is plenty that can be said about tone and language here. Both have emotive dimensions. **B** may be said to reflect a racial-ethnic position in its comments on the attacks while **C** reflects much of the usual linkage of religion and ethnic attitudes. Both Sources may be regarded as opinionated and partial, **B** the more so but justifiably, but both are reliable and useful here.

3 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that religion was the most important factor in motivating those who took part in the First Crusade. [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, B, C** and some of **D** reflect the role of religion. Sources **B** and some of **D** reflect other factors. **B** and some of **C** reflect racial dimensions alongside religious, for example. In Source **A** the Pope offers indulgences and so makes the links of penance and remission of sins to vows, issuing an anathema on those who attack crusader families and lands (etc.) while husbands and others are away. But in Source **B** Jews are not immune from attack, released by (misplaced) religious zeal (and possibly other racial motives). Economic gain (treasure) is rejected in favour of religious massacre. It appears in **B** and in Source **C** that it is permissible to massacre in the name of religion. There is a link of Sources **B and D** via massacres and plundering, though the contexts are different. Source **C** offers the famous Holy Lance event while Source **D** offers factors that embrace the non-religious, economic, social and military.

Own knowledge will offer religious fervour and motivation but also other factors such as military skills and tactics, social and economic, leadership qualities, weaknesses amongst opponents. All these are seen in all four of the Sources: military is implicit in **B and C**; leadership is present in **A** (Papal) and **D** (nobility role); economic factors are in **D**. Source **D** provides a useful overview as to the motives of crusaders. Religious fervour could be expressed through the role and place of Pope Urban II and the Papal Legate Adhemar plus a host of clergy accompanying the Crusade. The People's Crusade would be another example. There is evidence of economic hardships, land hunger, a search for material rewards. The leadership of nobles and the role of their followings amongst knights as well as the export of unrest from areas of Europe are other factors. Many factors, of course, could be linked to the concept of the pilgrimage as religious-spiritual (penance, remission of sins), popular and populist, armed and militant. The links of such knowledge to the Sources will aid evaluation here.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2581 Document Studies 1450 – 1693

The Wars of the Roses 1450-85: Richard III

1 (a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for Richard's qualities as a ruler. [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 rate Richard highly. **Source A** mentions his 'blameless morals' and his previous record - presumably in reference to his role in the north under Edward IV. **Source B** characterises him as popular, a friend to the poor and refusing money offered to him. However, both Sources present problems 'as evidence'. Langton, recently promoted by Richard, has an obvious motive for praising him, though the more perceptive candidates may note that this is a private letter and therefore may well give his true opinion. The praise given to Richard in **Source A** is not Mancini's but Buckingham's, reported by Mancini. Buckingham was an ally of Richard engaged in trying to persuade the lords to offer him the crown. The last sentence, in which Mancini describes what then happened, hints at a rather different view. Both authors were writing early in Richard's reign; they might have written differently two years later.

1 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that by usurping the throne Richard, Duke of Gloucester, destroyed his own position and reputation. [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 last two sentences of **Source D** directly support the claim, but the narrative which leads up to this verdict leaves open the possibility that the greatest mistake was the murder of the princes rather than the usurpation. This is the view of the modern historian (**Source C**), who argues that the usurpation was generally accepted, not merely because Richard intimidated opponents but also because he offered the prospect of stable government. It is also the contemporary view of **Source A**, though it also advances the bogus argument that the princes were illegitimate, and more perceptive answers will draw attention to the critical note of the last sentence ('thinking of their own safety and warned by the example of the execution of Lord Hastings'). Moreover, Mancini is quoting Buckingham's obviously biased view, not stating his own opinion. **Source B** provides contemporary evidence that, whether or not the usurpation was legally justified, Richard made a very good impression as king. But of course Langton's recent appointment to a bishopric by Richard might lead one to suspect his motives for this eulogy. Neither **Source A** nor **Source D** shows obvious evidence of unreliability, but the modern historian offers the most balanced view. Candidates' own knowledge of the feud between Richard and the Woodvilles, however, could lead them to discuss whether the murder was the inevitable consequence of the usurpation, ie to challenge Myers's conclusion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The German Reformation 1517-30**2 (a) Study Sources B and D.**

Compare Sources B and D as evidence for the attitudes of the Emperor's officials to Luther at the Diet of Worms. [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 provide clear examples of contrast but also some minor similarity. Aleander, in **Source B**, emphasises the patience of the secular authorities. Charles V's spokesman, on behalf of the Emperor, is willing to give Luther time to respond to the charges against him. The description of Luther's manner is critical although Aleander concedes that many thought him pious. The overall balance of the impression is that Luther came off worse. **Source D** is describing a different and later stage and portrays an impatient and scornful spokesman who wants to put an end to Luther's evasions. Although the precise date of **Source D** is uncertain, it is close enough to **Source B** to provide a valid comparison. The introductions give a clear idea of the stance of the writers. They are evidence of very different attitudes to Luther. For example, **Source D** portrays him as humble. The extracts come from very similar periods. **Source B** was written at the time of the Diet – it is likely to be the better evidence as private report to the Pope; **Source D** was printed soon afterwards with the obvious intent of portraying Luther in a positive light. They are useful in showing the different reactions to the debate. The introduction to the newsletter describes it as an account that is sympathetic to Luther. The same events are described with a different slant.

Candidates whose focus is on other than the attitudes of Europeans officials are unlikely to achieve higher than band III.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2 (b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Luther was mainly responsible for the failure to reach a settlement with Charles V and his officials by 1521. [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 B and C clearly support the claim whilst **Source A** can be used to support or contradict it. **Source D** can also be interpreted both ways. On the one hand, it is a sympathetic view of Luther and an unsympathetic view of the spokesman of the Emperor. However, candidates might use their own knowledge to point out that that Luther was very slow at Worms to answer the charges against him directly. **Source B** describes Charles V, as the head of the secular authorities, being willing to give Luther more than enough time to answer the charges against him – although a desire not to alienate Frederick the Wise may be behind this. Luther is described as making a bad impression. This can be cross-referenced with **Source C**. Contarini sees Luther as having become too extreme, unwilling to moderate his views and backed by powerful interests. **Source A** includes parts of Luther's expression of grievances. Although the language is extreme, he was referring to issues that were widely held to be grievances, for example, the references to impositions on Germany. This feeling was widespread. **Source D** will probably be used by most candidates as a defence of Luther, contrasting his attitude with the impatience of the Imperial spokesman. However, high credit should be given to those who note that Luther had indeed been evasive before the Emperor.

Own knowledge to supplement the study of the Sources might include explanations of the position of the new Emperor, especially his role as the secular defender of Christendom. He and his officials would naturally back Papal authority. On the other hand, he lacked the practical power to deal with Luther. Some might claim that not all secular authorities opposed Luther; some princes supported him by 1521. Reference might be made to Frederick the Wise who protected Luther although he did not share Luther's religious opinions. However, candidates can reach the highest mark by focussing on Charles V.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58**3 (a) Study Sources A and B**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the way in which local and central government handled the rebellions of 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.

The Sources are contemporary (**B**) or near-contemporary (**A**), and broadly reliable; **A** is a general account, **B** specific to one moment in one county. **Source A** indicates that the rebels in Sussex, Hampshire and Kent were appeased by local negotiators, including 'gentlemen' or local governors as JPs, while the Norwich rebels were met with force sponsored by central government. In contrast, **Source B** indicates that the privy council had earlier tried to disperse the rebels by negotiation, and (in contrast to **Source A**) gives precise information about what this actually meant: although the letter begins by chiding the rebels for assembling 'in a very disordered fashion' and violating their duty of obedience, the Council acts in a conciliatory way, discloses that it had tried before now to redress their grievances over enclosure, has evidently received a petition from them and promises to fix rents and address other matters in the forthcoming Parliament. On these grounds, the rebels have no reason not to go home. Evidently this did not happen so the Council had to resort to force (**Source A**). Therefore both Sources together present a full picture of the response of central government, and **Source A** additionally reveals something about the reaction of local government. The modern historian is the only one that is in a position to compare 1549 and 1554. The contemporary sources are reliable and useful in the tone they adopt. Examiners are to be sympathetic to possible chronological confusion by candidates.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the most serious uprising of the period 1549-56 was Wyatt's rebellion. [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 options are the rebellions of 1549 (perhaps treating the most major of these, the Western and Kett's, separately), Wyatt's rebellions, and minor problems in 1550 and 1556 (**Source D**). Candidates may follow historians such as MacCulloch and Tittler and suggest that the overthrow of Lady Jane Grey was a rebellion, but the highest marks are possible without mentioning July 1553. 1550 and 1556 can be discounted. The case for 1549 as the 'most dangerous' is presented in **Sources A, B and D**: widespread disturbances across the country, with a strong dose of 'class hostility' (**Source D**), requiring central government to parley with the Norfolk rebels (**Source B**) before resorting to force, initially unsuccessfully (**Source A**), and candidates can draw parallels here with the difficulties and delays in suppressing the Western Rebellion. The rebellions were serious enough that, once they were all over, Somerset had to go (**Source A**). A case could also be made for Wyatt's rebellion (**Sources C and D**). Unlike 1549, the intention seems to have been to overthrow Mary, and the threat was such that Mary had to rally her supporters in the city of London (**Source C**) and fighting reached the capital. So there is much to debate here, for and against the proposition.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The English Civil War 1637-49

4 (a) Study Sources A and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for Charles I's willingness to negotiate with his enemies. [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 are reliable: **Source A** especially so, since it is Charles I's contemporaneous private correspondence, while **D**, though spoken in retrospect, is by an opponent involved in the decision to execute the King. The suggestion in **Source D** that Charles rejected all attempts to negotiate, and 'would not preserve religion and liberty' is partly but not wholly supported by **Source A**, which shows the King wishing to reject one of these 'seven or eight' sets of Propositions, but also keen to delay this 'flat denial' for as long as possible, and hoping to go to London to offer counter-propositions of his own, which presumably he did support. **Source D** implies that Charles I was simultaneously encouraging military conflict ('risings in all places'), and the 2nd Civil War would be the best example of this. Again, **Source A** gives some qualified support for this claim. Charles hopes to persuade the French and his 'other friends' to restore him to power, which is most likely through a renewal of war, although he may also be thinking about diplomatic initiatives. In short, **Source A** broadly supports without entirely endorsing all the claims in **Source D**.

4 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Second Civil War was the main cause of the execution of Charles I in 1649.

[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 Second Civil War might be seen as the cause of Charles I's execution in the sense that he caused it and his defeat gave his opponents both the justification and power to proceed to his trial and execution. Support for the proposition comes from **Source B**, which refers to the King 'who willed the nation back to war' and **Source C**, which states that God's favour in the Second Civil War should be taken by the New Model as an instruction to bring 'that man of blood' to book, and of course, having won the war, it was elements in the army which ended the Newport negotiations by purging Parliament and setting in train the trial and execution of the King. But other Sources point in slightly different directions. **Source A** indicates the problems of negotiating with Charles I in 1646-8, which could lead to the view in **Source D**, expressed by a regicide, that Charles I's rejection of terms and desire to renew war led to deepening frustration so 'it was impossible to allow him to live'. In this sense, the Second Civil War exemplified the problems of dealing with Charles as much as being the 'main cause' of his execution. **Source C** provides a chance to track changing attitudes to Charles I within the period 1646-9, and suggests that even before the Second Civil War Cromwell and others wished to remove Charles (as the vote of 'No Addresses' in January 1648 also intimates) although the means was not yet clear. It could be argued, therefore, that it was indeed the Second Civil War, or more accurately the New Model's reaction to it, which settled Charles I's fate. These various views need sorting and evaluating.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Louis XIV's France 1661-1693

5 (a) Study Sources A and D.

Compare Sources A and D as evidence for the effects on France of Louis XIV's absolute monarchy. [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 offer clear contrasts in their texts, introductions and attributions. **Source A** is written by one of Louis XIV's advisers who might be expected to support the King. However, although Courtin begins by stating Louis XIV's greatness, the extract expresses his doubts about the wisdom of the King's enthusiasm for war. The financial costs will have wider repercussions by encouraging violence and disorder. Courtin mentions the happy state of France in 1673 and the King's courage, but the criticism of warlike policy is clear, and there is a link between dangerous policy and royal absolutism. Overall, the writer supports absolute monarchy but sees danger in the adoption of some policies. **Source D** is a wholehearted condemnation of Louis' use of power. Absolutism has become tyranny. It is also contrary to God's will. The introduction to **Source D** underlines some of the probable reasons for the writer's attitudes. The dates of the extracts (1673 and 1690) might be commented on. **Source A** was written at a time of relative prosperity and when Louis XIV had enjoyed some success in war. However, Courtin appreciates problems and especially the link between financial exactions and popular discontent. Conditions had deteriorated by the time that Jurieu was writing. As for typicality, it might be argued that Courtin's views might be given particular weight because they come from within the governing circle, whilst Jurieu's views are those of a minority in France, but some candidates might point out that these were shared more widely outside France.

5 (b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the claim that Louis XIV's subjects mostly supported the King's absolute government from 1661 to 1693. [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.

Source A might as expected be seen to support absolute monarchy. The text and the provenance indicate this. The Source was written by one of Louis' advisers. On the other hand, whilst **Source A** admires Louis XIV ('the world's greatest prince'), it qualifies this praise by criticising the King's policies and suggests that Louis may lose his subjects' support. Support for Louis XIV from this adviser is not unfettered. Some candidates might see this Source as coming between **Sources B** and **C** and **Source D** in the extent to which it agrees with the claim in the question. There is a close correlation between **Sources B** and **C**. **Source B** is a strong justification of absolute monarchy and, by implication, of Louis' system of rule. The Church supports Louis although Jansenism may be mentioned as qualification. **Source C** supports absolutism wholeheartedly as might be expected from administrators and lawyers. **Source D** is a very strong condemnation of absolutism, seen as despotism.

Candidates can use a range of own knowledge to supplement their study of the Sources. They might enlarge on French views of Louis XIV's practice of absolute government. They are not expected to have detailed knowledge and understanding of his reign before 1661 but might make some general references to the Frondes and to the influence of strong ministers such as Mazarin and Richelieu, before him. However, this is not required by the terms of the Study Topic. **Source A** refers to war but examiners are reminded of the demand on candidates in the Specification, 'Candidates will not be tested on foreign policy, but a background understanding of its relationship with domestic affairs is useful'. It will be sufficient for answers to explain the costs of war although some might explain that war also glorified Louis at home. There was not significant criticism of the wars by 1693. Candidates should be able to supplement the brief reference to financial and fiscal problems. Versailles might be seen as the public face of absolute monarchy, impressive but expensive and remote. It was mostly popular with the nobility by 1683; criticism such as those of Saint-Simon tended to appear later. Taxation became unpopular and collection was difficult. Louis' rule did prevent large-scale rebellion and he controlled the most dangerous elements in France. The text of **Source D** does mention religion and the identification of Jurieu as a Huguenot exile gives candidates the opportunity to discuss religious policy and support. The justifications of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes included the need to have a unified state. Most of the population supported the Revocation but candidates can assess the extent of opposition. Overall, candidates might judge that Louis XIV's system of rule was in accordance with the wishes of most French people. Examiners will note that the Study Topic and the question end in 1693. Candidates are not expected to have knowledge and understanding of Louis's later popularity, or unpopularity. The most successful candidates might be expected to integrate their own knowledge in the study of the Sources but a separate treatment would not necessarily debar answers from gaining **Band I**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2582 Document Studies 1774 – 1945

The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-1792

1 (a) Study Sources A and C

Compare these sources as evidence for the achievements of the Revolution in 1789. [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 **differences** are: **A** sees change made with limited loss of life – an achievement; **C** also qualifies successes – not in terms of relative loss of life but in terms of some people rightly not benefiting (priests, financiers etc). **A** sees France now as free, the powers of the king reduced. **C** does not stress this freedom but sees achievement more in ending abuses. The ending of 'provincial privileges' (**C**) is not mentioned in **A**. Source **C** also sees the clergy's privileges ended and church property nationalised.

Similarity

Both agree on the reduction of the power of the nobles. Both are clearly in favour of the changes, though **A** is more concerned about aspects of brutality. Both see real achievements.

Provenance

A foreign observer in **A** must be compared to an active participant in the politics of his own country. What is striking is the degree of sympathy evident in Dorset's dispatch, reflecting the early hopes for the Revolution and the disapproval of the royal government even in conservative circles. **C** is written later, after the main events of 1789. It is doubtful if Dorset would have been as favourable after the events of the Great Fear and the October Days. However, the deputy in **C** had edited out the violence and praises the achievements. Candidates might know that the August declarations stressing the Rights of Man and the end of Feudalism had occurred between Dorset's dispatch and Duquesnoy's speech, and that the King's power had been reduced and France was awaiting a new constitution from the new Constituent Assembly. Unlike Dorset he is a committed revolutionary and is justifying the considerable upheavals of 1789. **C** is a public speech – which the Paris crowds would have listened to intently; **A** is a report to a limited audience.

1 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that popular unrest was the driving force behind the Revolution between July and December 1789. [40]

Focus: Judgment 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 how far change was driven by popular unrest and how much by the ideas and ideals of the liberal nobility and clergy and the educated middle classes who dominated the National and Constituent Assemblies. The two sources which link political change and popular unrest are **A and D**. In **Source B** candidates could comment on the popular impact of attacks such as these. They might even note that this particular noble has not enforced feudalism strictly and obviously accepts the authority of the Assembly, indicating that change has partly preceded unrest and partly been driven by it. **Source C** looks at change as having been wisely engineered by the Assembly. However, it is obviously from someone deeply involved in political change and is made in public with the Paris mobs watching closely.

A and D comment on events three months apart. The British ambassador makes a direct link between the events of 14 July and the revolutionary change. The troops have left, taking with them the last chance of the King to use force. The powers of the mob have led to change, limiting the monarchy, giving France freedom and bringing social equality. The Assembly certainly confirmed these changes in the Declaration of the Rights of Man, but according to **Source D** was considerably under the power of the mob when the events of October brought both Royal Family and National Assembly to the centre of Paris. No more the ally of the mob, the Assembly was its prisoner and thus popular unrest could be seen to be the major influence. However, there is little hint of this in **Source C** written early in the new year, 1790, which looks back on solid achievement by the Assembly. This might have been only possible through unrest, but this is not stated. The spread of the Great Fear of Summer 1789 recorded in evidence such as that of **B** could be seen as a major influence on the decision of the privileged classes to end their rights in August 1789, or this might be seen as the result of the growth of revolutionary language, enthusiasm and enlightenment ideas. Candidates could expand on the nature of rural and urban popular unrest – shortages of food, inflation, the Sans Culottes, the ending of traditional controls. Or there might be knowledge of other influences on 1789 – the development of ideas, the cumulative excitement, the mistakes of the King and these might be set against popular unrest. The content suggested above is only indicative of what candidates might bring to the question.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Condition of England 1832-53**2 (a) Study Sources B and D**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the methods used by Chartists and the authorities. [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 extracts are from moral force Chartists who clearly reveal little, or play down, any 'physical' force tactics (Plug Riots, Newport Rising etc.) Lovett is concerned to stress peaceful meetings, constitutionally correct and appropriate. Any violence is linked to the authorities. Although Cooper in **D** is describing a riot, he too is concerned to stress legitimate meetings as the key Chartist method. He pointedly refers, not necessarily accurately, to the non-involvement of Chartists in the workhouse riot (presumably the result of harsh circumstances or the Anti Poor Law League). Both sources also stress the key image of the Chartists – that government are the innovators, seeking to undermine the constitutional rights of the people (in **B** preventing newspapers being read aloud; in **D** robbing the poor of their sustenance via the New Poor Law). Lovett in **B** also mentions the tactic of an alternative Parliament, the convention, which had, in 1839, just moved to Birmingham. This could act as a force for protest and propaganda. As for the reaction of the authorities both refer to intimidating police action, often brought in by rail (**B**), and to the tactic of arresting key leaders (Lovett after the resolution in **A** and to 'ringleaders' in **D**). Both sources describe the midland towns (Birmingham and Leicester) and both are written from hindsight. This may have been more important in the case of **D** given the care given to refute any physical force. It might imply that **D** is the better evidence as, reading between the lines, it is clear that the Chartists were actively exploiting anti-Poor Law feeling ('we were often speakers'). Both are 'famous' Chartist sources, **B** from the leader of Moral Force Chartism (the events are not described as 'riots' but as an 'attack') and **D** from a Chartist who was to be implemented in the Plug Plot Riots (candidates are not expected to know this).

2 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that political and constitutional issues were the most important factors in explaining the development of Chartism in the period to 1848. [40]

Focus: Judgment 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 of the sources, except possibly **B**, can bear different interpretations. Candidates will need to make a clear distinction between political factors (such as universal suffrage, parliamentary reforms - aimed at gaining appropriate representation for working people in a system apparently stacked against them and, indeed, curtailing what constitutional freedom they had) and other factors such as economic and social ones (the reaction to industrialisation and urbanisation). The assertion is supported by the nature of the authorship of all four sources. These are Chartist leaders, whilst **C** is the Second Chartist Petition to parliament in support of an entirely political Charter. The six points could be introduced via own knowledge to demonstrate this. Two of these, Lovett in **B** and Cooper in **D**, were moral force sources whose stress was especially constitutional and political. Cooper in **D** is particularly good evidence and it both distances itself from the riot yet admits that he frequently spoke at anti-workhouse meetings, presumably to focus minds on political change at the centre as the only solution. The tone and stress of **B**, **C** and **D** all focus on political and constitutional factors; the right to assemble to hear newspapers read out and control over laws in **B**, the same right to meet freely and be dealt with justly in **C**, and in both the unconstitutional nature of the new police force. Nonetheless **B** and **D** are written from hindsight perhaps with the aim of stressing a peaceful political agenda. Source **A**, often interpreted as an economic, physical force, plea (a 'bread and cheese question') is in fact prefaced with political and constitutional right. Such 'knife and fork' questions, he is arguing, can only be addressed once the political system is reformed.

However, candidates could point to the evidence in all sources that suggests popular support was gained through tapping economic and social grievances. This is clearly the basis of Stephen's oratory and message in **A**. Candidates could make much of the post 1834 Anti Poor Law agitation, clearly referred to by Stephens in his comment on the security of wife and children (the new workhouse separated families). Although Lovett in **B** takes a political stance, one might presume that newspaper reading focused on social and economic grievance as the great Depression gripped after 1837. The title of Lovett's autobiography puts the 'pursuit of Bread' first. The context of the second petition in 1842 (**C**) and of Cooper in **D** is clearly the nadir of the Depression. Good candidates may note that the dates of the sources (1838-42) coincide with this. The stress is very much economic (low wages, unemployment, hours) and social (ill provision for all types of the poor and a determination to continue to apply the New Poor Law). Cooper especially makes clear that in Leicester the main issue is unemployment and the Poor Law. Given that the provenance of the sources tends to suggest a politically based Chartism their sub text is strongly economic and social. Own knowledge (O'Connor's Land Plan for example) could give further weight to this view. Better candidates could argue that it is a mistake to separate political from economic. A case could certainly be made that Chartist leaders were politically motivated whilst Chartist support may well have been promoted by economic and social grievance.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Italian Unification 1848-70

3 (a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the economic problems of Italy after 1861. [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 may place greater emphasis on the similarities or the differences, or both, depending on their interpretation of the content of the sources. Several points of agreement may be identified. In general, both paint a bleak picture of economic difficulties of some scale. **Source B** assesses the economy as 'static and out of date' which accords with the many negatives listed in **Source C**. Specifically, there were clear problems in agriculture with **Source B** referring to 'fields cultivated with old-fashioned methods' and **Source C** reporting the 'countryside is deserted'. Both sources concede that industry is weak, **Source C** suggesting that there is none and **Source B** that it is limited. Both indicate an absence of a middle class, **Source B** acknowledging that there were 'few entrepreneurs' and **Source C** that there was 'no bourgeoisie'. A lack of social cohesion is registered with **Source B** claiming there was 'little in our economic situation that shows unity' and **Source C** describing the gulf between proprietors and peasants. There is a difference of emphasis, however. **Source B** highlights the poor state of the nation's finances and predicts the loss of Naples and Sicily whereas **Source C** comments on the poverty of the peasantry especially in the old kingdom of Naples and the lawlessness that it spawned, but does not comment on the consequences beyond the present situation.

Comments on the provenance would be helpful. The authors are both academics presenting the facts in a largely objective way so perhaps explaining the convergence of their assessment. Candidates could verify some of the points made by the application of knowledge. The broader, more national, perspective of the author of **Source B** might be explained by his position as an advisor to government whereas the concerns of the author of **Source C** are more local, reflecting his origins. For this reason the former is more concerned with the particular details of the situation whereas the author of **Source C** appears to be concerned as much about the social consequences of economic arrangements. Further, and for similar reasons, **Source C** is, by implication, critical of government which is difficult to detect in **Source B** other than in foreign policy commitments.

3 (b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that a fully united state was created in Italy during the period from 1861 to 1870. [40]

Focus: Judgment 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, 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.

Arguably, none of the sources is unambiguously supportive of the notion that Italy was fully united by 1870. **Sources A** and **D** might be interpreted that way, but even they hint at unity to some degree being partial only. Certainly, both suggest that unity was developed over the years in question, that it was not evident in 1861 but had become more obvious by 1870. **Source A** is more explicit about the work to be done at the beginning of the decade highlighting the strength of local laws, customs and traditions and the belief that a degree of decentralisation would be necessary to accommodate such particularism. Candidates might apply their knowledge to explain the linguistic, political, legal and historical differences of the seven formerly independent states referred to in **Source A**. Yet, this source also stresses how such regionalism was less important than the imperative of unity. Again, candidates could mention the steps taken to create a unitary state, including the application of the Piedmontese Statuto to the country as a whole, and the uniformity of the law.

Source D reinforces the idea that unity was achieved gradually, if only by the emphasis placed on the acquisition of Rome without which, it is claimed, unity could never be complete. This is made clear in the second and last sentences. Candidates might confirm the symbolic and geographical importance of Rome by acknowledging the efforts made since 1848 by nationalists like Garibaldi and Mazzini to incorporate the city as the capital of Italy. The events of 1870 which led to the acquisition of Rome might also be considered. On the other hand the references to the Papacy and political parties might be interpreted as a measure of the limits of unity. The absolute independence of the Pope could be explained with regard to Cavour's policy of 'A free Church within a free State' leading to the Law of Papal Guarantees (introduced in 1871). Equally, the hostile attitude of Pius IX to unification could be explained and the confiscation of Church lands in the 1860s mentioned to indicate disunity between Church and State. The bitterness of political parties could also be examined with reference to the instability of the Premiership after Cavour's death, the struggle for power between parties (coalitions) and the degree of corruption. Implicit in the King's optimism that there will be more unity in the future is an admission that Italy was not fully united in 1870. Candidates might suggest that the authors of both sources had a reason to exaggerate the degree of unity, given their personal involvement in the history of the period.

Sources B and **C** are less equivocal although there is scope for debate in the interpretation of them. **Source B** suggests the very notion of Italy as a nation is odd with emphasis on the disunity of the economy of the country. The old fashioned nature of agriculture and industry might be set in the European context. The author's anticipation of the loss (secession) of Naples and Sicily might be explained by describing the difference between the relatively rich north and the impoverished south, the poverty of communications and the separatism of Sicilians.

On the other hand the author recognises unity in the commitment to secure Venetia and Rome, allowing the opportunity to refer to the wars of 1866 and 1870, and the political unity of the time.

Source C is more informative about existing social divisions, at least in the south, which could be elaborated by reference to the feudalism of the area, the frustration of the peasantry at the lack of agrarian reform and their suspicion of the political agenda. The brigandage mentioned in the source is interpreted as a social phenomenon but candidates could expand on this to show that disorder had a political dimension and was as much an expression of a reluctance to accept unification. The tenuous political integration of the south with the north is implicit in the comment that, socially, support was limited to the proprietors. Nonetheless, the author acknowledges a degree of centralisation with his reference to the prefects as agents of the government and their role could be explained further with the application of knowledge.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61**4 (a) Study Sources A and C.**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the reasons why the North opposed secession. [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 oppose secession but on different grounds. **Source A** focuses on the economic consequences for the North but offers no opinion about the constitutionality of secession. It appears to assume that secession will mean war and therefore the South would use trade and taxation to cripple Northern industry. **Source C** on the other hand claims that secession is illegal because 'the Union ... is perpetual'. Secession is thus an act of aggression or rebellion. Lincoln's purpose was political: to prevent civil war. Thus he tries to reassure Southern opinion that slavery in the South was not threatened while making it clear that secession would lead to civil war. The person and the occasion make **Source C** invaluable evidence about Northern opposition to secession, while **Source A**, as a newspaper editorial, may be seen as attempting to rouse opinion against secession and therefore evidence for only one point of view. Nevertheless, coming as it does from Boston, a major trading city, it is probably typical of a widely held viewpoint. Thus it helps to explain why the North had to oppose secession for economic as well as political reasons, and thus why Lincoln's stand against secession enjoyed overwhelming support in the North. Thus the two Sources are complementary.

4 (b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the outbreak of civil war is chiefly explained by the South's failure to compromise.

[40]

Focus: Judgment 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.

Some support for this proposition can be found in **Sources C and D**. **Source D** claims that moderates in the North had been anxious to reach a compromise which would satisfy the South. **Source C** shows Lincoln protesting his desire to avoid civil war. These are, however, both Northern sources; it is not surprising that they put the blame for the outbreak of war on the South. **Source B** puts the Southern view, claiming that the South had attempted conciliation but had failed to obtain 'respect for [its] rights'. But it also demonstrates that for Davis the bottom line is acceptance of secession by the North, while for Lincoln (**Source C**) secession is unacceptable. From own knowledge and with hindsight we can see that his attempt to reassure the South that the 'institution of slavery' is not under threat would not meet the South's minimum demands. In any case, **Source A** provides evidence that, regardless of the constitutional issue, the North could not afford to allow secession because of its economic consequences. It also gives the impression of an uncompromising South, but the provenance lays its opinion open to challenge. Similarly **Source D's** reference to compromise speaks of 'granting to the South her just rights under the Constitution'. From own knowledge candidates can argue that this means exactly what Lincoln had offered in his Inaugural Address (**Source C**), which was unacceptable to the South. **Source D** goes on to describe secession as 'armed revolution against the government'. But it also suggests that war was not inevitable until the attack on Fort Sumter by the South, over a month after Lincoln's inauguration, thus putting the blame on the South. But could the South have ignored the presence of a Union fort in Charleston Harbour? And if it had, would this have merely postponed the outbreak of war? Lincoln's stance against secession suggests so. From this evidence candidates can make a case either way.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-1893

5 (a) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for Parnell's character. [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 **differences** are:

C sees arrogance and a failure to engage sympathetically with supporters; **B** sees power and directness of personality.

B sees a mission, but **C** does not refer to this directly.

C sees a pride which brought him low in 1890; **B** sees conscious strength and resolute bearing and makes no reference to the O'Shea affair.

Similarities are the aloofness – referred to in both by stressing his Englishness and lack of Irish warmth (**B**). The implication of both is that he lacked revolutionary warmth. The picture that emerges from both is one of coldness, but the conclusion drawn from it is different.

In terms of **provenance**, one is from a political ally of Parnell in the days of the Land League who might be grateful for the alliance of the political Home Rulers with the more radical Land Leaguers, an alliance which gave the New Departure considerable influence. The other is from a journalist, who did see Parnell at first hand but would not have known him as well as Davitt and who might have been more influenced by the sensationalism of the O'Shea Case. Both are writing after Parnell's death, but one quite a considerable while afterwards. The vital point is the difference between a fellow participant in the Irish cause and a more detached observer.

5 (b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Parnell was an effective leader. [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 Parnell's ability to unite political and agrarian unrest, his popularisation of Home Rule, his parliamentary tactics and his negotiations with the British political leaders make him great; or whether his personal coldness, his lack of judgement over the O'Shea affair and his ambiguity about the extent of radical change he was prepared to support, make him a flawed figure.

B and D are generally favourable, but both are tinged with criticism; **B** has personal knowledge and direct experience of working with Parnell. It is open to some challenge – Parnell was not an outright radical like Davitt, but his support for the League and the speeches he made in America were seen at the time as having revolutionary implications. Both sources are looking back. **C** is more hostile, but may have been over influenced by the O'Shea affair which was not the only issue at stake by the time of Parnell's fall, though perhaps for a journalist this had the most impact. **A** has to be interpreted in that it was a public utterance, widely reported at a time when Home Rule was a distinct possibility, so Parnell may have been exaggerating his nationalist aims.

B is rather special pleading from a former ally. Parnell was powerful and direct and spoke clearly without exaggerated passion about Irish affairs. He had a mission, but was not a revolutionary. This could be supported by knowledge of the way that he changed the Home Rule Party into a much clearer and more focused group in parliament, by his realisation that he needed to link up with agrarian unrest and to get US-Irish support and then to make his position on Home Rule direct. Whether all this had revolutionary implications might be discussed.

D looks back – though Winston's father had been deeply involved in Irish affairs. Trying to show Parnell's ability to unite Irish factions, he is at the same time pointing out weaknesses and inconsistencies. Nevertheless there is a clear view that he was great by his inclusiveness. The less desirable aspects of Parnell's personality and actions are omitted.

C shows his coldness and dictatorial nature – and some might point out the splits in 1890-91 that brought him down as a sign of his failure to engender any warmth in his own party, however they admired his leadership skills. However, as **A** shows, this is not the whole picture. The passion that 'the uncrowned King' engendered by famous speeches must be set against the personal reserve (as indeed must his passionate emotional life). There are plenty of examples of emotional public utterances. The warm response (*cheers*) should be noted.

There are many directions which answers might take here, so it is important that the own knowledge is only indicative content.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England in a New Century 1900-1918

6 (a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for the effects of Free Trade on the working class.

[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.

Source A supports the effects of Free Trade on the working class by attacking the harm which will be done to the workers if Tariff Reform were to be adopted. Tariff Reform will raise the price of food, damage trade and increase unemployment.

Source B, however, takes the opposite view, and attacks Free Trade as being harmful to working class interests. To Chamberlain, the 'Big Loaf' of Free Trade allows the depression of wages. He claims also that Free Trade is hostile to the concept of collective bargaining. His final point mentions the use of import duties to provide support for welfare reform.

Each Source touches on similar ground in considering the price of food for the workers. The context here is the 'Big Loaf' (Free Trade) versus 'Little Loaf' debate.

Source A is more detailed on the related topics of trade and Empire than is **Source B**. Whereas Asquith raises a whole range of disadvantages associated with Tariff Reform, Chamberlain concentrates upon the workman's need for protection following decades of free trade. The major reason for this is that Chamberlain (in this particular Source, and because of his working-class audience) is focussed upon making a class point.

Basic differences would be expected because each author is prominent on either side of the Tariff Reform debate. Asquith is a leading Liberal in opposition to the Conservative Government. Chamberlain was the Conservative Colonial Secretary until 1903, when he left the Cabinet to conduct the campaign for Tariff Reform, which he believed would heal divisions within the Conservative party. Both of these Sources are speeches made in 1903 as the debate gathers pace, and thoughts turn to a future general election.

- 6 (b) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the main issue in the debate over Tariff Reform in the period from 1903 to 1906 was the competition Britain faced from foreign trade. [40]

Focus: Judgment 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 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 there were several important issues at stake during this debate, which begins with Chamberlain launching the Tariff Reform campaign in 1903, and ends with the defeat of the Conservatives in the Election of 1906. Useful own knowledge might refer to the rise of Britain's rivals (especially Germany and the USA), uncertainties regarding the British Empire, stemming especially from the events of the Boer War, and debates on poverty and welfare reform.

The threat of foreign competition as an issue in the debate is most clearly addressed in **Source C**, a pre-election poster (issued by the Tariff Reform League!) which clearly sees Tariff Reform as being the answer to growing foreign competition and the resulting unemployment. Both **Source A** (Asquith) and **Source B** (Chamberlain) raise the problem of foreign competition. Each (partly for reasons of party advantage) has views which are directly opposite. Asquith believes that Tariff Reform will make things worse (jealousies, tariff wars etc). But Chamberlain sees Protection as the answer to economic decline and unemployment.

However, **Source A and Source B** also indicate that there were many other important issues which played a part in the debate. On Empire, Asquith suggests that Tariff Reform will lead to jealousies and fear. But Chamberlain sees it (through 'imperial preference') as strengthening the links between Britain and her Empire. Again, **Sources A and B** would suggest that the price of food (Big Loaf etc) played a large part in the political debate. Both sides tried to appeal to the workers (only some of whom had the vote!). Thus unemployment, the provision of welfare, and workers' rights are all part of the argument. **Source D** (by a modern historian) is useful in showing how the various strands of the debate came together at the time.

Evaluation of the Sources. **Source A** gives the views of Asquith who is a leading politician in a Liberal party still wedded to the doctrines of Free Trade. These beliefs are vindicated by electoral triumph in 1906, and persist within the party until well after the First World War. The views expressed in **Source B** represent not only Chamberlain's efforts to win political support, reform finances and strengthen the Empire, but also (at least indirectly) his efforts to strengthen the Conservative party, efforts which clearly failed. **Source D** (the modern historian) is useful for putting the other three Sources into context. It is the view of Brendon that in 1906, the majority of the people had sufficient confidence in the economic and imperial strengths of Britain to reject Chamberlain's solutions, and support the Liberals. **Source D** also suggests that, in terms of trade, Tariff Reform would probably have done more harm than good.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Nazi Germany 1933-45**7 (a) Study Sources A and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for Hitler's style of 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 sources come from senior Nazis. However, Wiedemann in **C**, as Hitler's personal adjutant, would have had regular access to the Fuhrer and be able to observe at close hand Hitler's style of leadership. Willikens, as a Government official, was unlikely to have had much personal contact with Hitler or been in his entourage. The sources differ in nature, tone and purpose. There is almost an apologetic air about Willikens' speech, some acknowledgement of the confusion arising from lack of clear orders from above. The tone of Wiedemann's memoirs is somewhat pejorative. Published many years after Hitler's death, and safe from censure, he paints a picture of a leader lazy in his working habits. They also disagree on motive, **A** stressing overwhelming work, **C** laziness.

There are similarities in the content. The Fuhrer is not able to dictate everything from above (**source A**) which implies a lack of clear orders and written instructions and decision making which is strongly asserted in **C**. Both sources suggest a leader rather remote from the everyday machinery of government. Both indicate in their own ways a highly personal style of leadership in which the leader, not really interested in the minutiae of the exercise of power, delegates decisions and implementation of policy to others. This can clearly be inferred from **A** and is implicit in **C**.

7 (b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Hitler was ‘master of the Third Reich.’ [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, and 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 expression ‘master of the Third Reich’ should be familiar and should enable candidates to distinguish between the theory (**source B**) and propaganda image of an all powerful, decisive leader, and the actual practice of Hitler’s style of government once in power. Indeed, own knowledge of the workings of the Nazi political system can be tested against the assertions of **Source B**.

In terms of grouping, clearly **B** supports the assertion in the title, although it is long on rhetoric and short on practice, while the concept of ‘working towards the Fuhrer’ in **A** also implies masterful rule. The difference between theory, propaganda and practice is brought out strongly in **D**, while the impression in **C** is that Hitler clearly could not be the omniscient and well informed leader.

Good candidates should combine the content of the sources with own knowledge to aid evaluation and address fundamental questions on the working of the Nazi political system, Hitler’s style of leadership and methods of rule. The notion of an intensely personal style of leadership and form of rule, and its implications, can be assessed in the context of ‘strong’ or ‘weak’ dictator. Own knowledge of the workings of the political system can be tested against the assertion of untrammelled and unlimited power in **source B**. Lines of investigation can include the extent to which clear decisions were handed down from above, who actually implemented these decisions, the extraordinarily vague definition of Hitler’s power in ‘charismatic’ terms [**B**], the implications of Hitler’s remoteness from the actual organs of government and his lazy lifestyle and working habits, the lack of regular cabinet meetings, Hitler’s dislike of paperwork and his general lack of interest in the mundane routine of government. The tendency for powerful ‘empires’ to develop within the system stated in **D**, can be seen as a consequence of ‘working towards the Fuhrer’ in **A**.

The notion and implications for strong/weak leadership of Hitler’s tendency to delegate almost totally can be assessed in the light of the question. There is sufficient in the sources, combined with relevant own knowledge to enable candidates to come to a balanced judgement.

Most candidates are likely to focus on the years 1933-1939. Some might go into the war years to illustrate the point that the confusions, overlapping of responsibilities and development of ‘empires’ up to 1939 were amplified during wartime. However, candidates do not have to go beyond 1939 to get into Band 1.

Note: Awareness of historiography is not a requirement on this module and overemphasis on ‘intentionalists’ and ‘structuralists’ may mislead.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2583 English History 1042 – 1660

England 1042 - 1100

The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066

- 1 (a) How extensive were the powers of Edward the Confessor as monarch? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of the powers of the late Anglo-Saxon monarchy

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

By the reign of Edward the Confessor, England was ruled as a single and united kingdom. There was an effective administrative system with shires, hundreds and burghs. The fiscal and coinage systems worked efficiently and writs helped government to run smoothly. All of these helped to support the power of the king but were also dependent on the exertion of authority by a strong king. Candidates will judge how extensively Edward the Confessor exerted his powers but he was not a cipher. Candidates can also discuss the importance of a king's election to power. This choice was not free. Birth and tradition were important but it represented a limitation on the power of a monarch. The role of earls and the witan can be assessed because they are very relevant. In practice, the powers of a king varied in extent. As in all questions, examiners should be open to valid alternative explanations. However, some candidates might turn this into an assessment of Edward the Confessor's success in purely practical terms. As the guidance above indicates, this will be acceptable but probably not enough to merit **Band I**. This Band will normally need something on the nature of monarchy in the middle of the eleventh century.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 1 (b) **Assess the claim that Edward the Confessor gave too much influence to Normans.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a medieval king.

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

It might be thought that the importance that Edward the Confessor gave to Normans was the reason why he faced problems with Earl Godwin, who raised an army against him. This explanation might be discounted by others who see Godwin's personal ambition as more important, with the Normans being a particular rather than a major reason for his actions. Edward's affinity with Normans can be explained by his upbringing on the Continent. He did not handle the Anglo-Saxon earls easily. The King welcomed Normans to his court and as leaders of the Church in England. Reference might be made to Robert of Jumièges and Archbishop of Canterbury. Eustace of Boulogne was also influential. Harold, who succeeded Godwin to the earldom, persuaded the King to dismiss some Normans at the end of his reign but Normans were still influential. Candidates can discuss the succession issue and Edward's attitude to a successor. He might well have favoured William of Normandy. Did this help to promote the succession crisis? Harold's claim to the throne was more than an anti-Norman protest but candidates can also assess the possibility that Harold accepted William's claim when he crossed the Channel.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072

- 2 (a) **How far do you agree that Harold Godwinson lost the Battle of Hastings mainly because he had also faced a Scandinavian invasion of England?** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the fall of a king.

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

Candidates can offer contradictory explanations, for example that the major reason for Harold's defeat was the personal leadership of William of Normandy. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. Harold Hardrada represented a major challenge to Harold Godwinson. Scandinavia had long been the source of problems for Anglo-Saxon kings. The north of England was difficult for English kings to control. Harold acted decisively; it is easy to be persuaded by hindsight that William was to mount the more serious challenge but Harold had to exert his authority. Victory at Stamford Bridge justified Harold's march north in the short term but it weakened him because of the simultaneous landing of William. Candidates might assess Harold's actions after Stamford Bridge and before Hastings. For his part, William of Normandy realised the importance of detailed preparation. The Bayeux Tapestry might be seen as evidence of the naval and military preparations that William put in place for the invasion of England. He welded a diverse group of men into an effective army that faced Harold at Hastings. He was also an excellent battle commander. Examiners should not underestimate the value of answers that are organised chronologically. Excellent answers that appreciate the sequence of events and their significance should not be dismissed as low-level narrative. For example, the sequence of invasions, Harold's reactions and Hastings is very relevant. So are the events of Hastings that reveal the respective strengths and weaknesses of Harold, William and their armies.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 2 (b) **Assess the reasons for the opposition in England to William I after his victory at Hastings to 1072. Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the opposition to a king in a specific period.

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

Although the death of Harold deprived the Anglo-Saxons of their major leader, there was suspicion of William who, to the Anglo-Saxons, had seized power by force. The forced settlement of the country, seizure of land and the building of castles, justified to William and his followers, appeared to be oppressive to the native population. William could defend his policies because he was not completely safe on the throne. There were rebellions in England and challenges from the Danes. The frontiers with Scotland and Wales were not secure. In 1067-68 there were risings against Odo of Bayeux in Kent. Exeter rebelled. This was followed by trouble in the north where the Danes maintained their influence and ambitions. Edgar (Aetheling) had a claim to the throne and joined forces with the Danes. His claim to the throne was supported by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, some English earls and London. William's 'Harrying of the North' (1069-70) was successful in suppressing the rebels but did nothing to reconcile the English. Some English earls who were not reconciled to William had joined the rebellion (Gospatrik and Waltheof) and, although they were initially pardoned, they resumed their opposition to William, joined by Edwin and Morcar. The actions of Edgar and the earls might be seen as nationalistic, resistance to a foreign conqueror, but they also had personal motives.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Norman England 1066 - 1100

- 3 (a) **How far did the Norman Conquest change the military organisation of England by 1100? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the extent of change in military organisation.

No set answer is looked for - the assessments of the extent of change will vary - but candidates will need to address the question.

The Specification refers to 'barons and knights, the importance of castles, the survival of the fyrd.' The army was important to William I's control of England and he was determined to keep close control over military aspects, especially because many of his barons and knights were men of independent tendencies. Norman barons and knights - and those who came from elsewhere on the Continent - became more important military leaders under William and William II than Anglo-Saxon earls. Castles played a vital part in Norman control over England. They provided military strong points, as well as being important in wider administration. Candidates should be rewarded when they include some examples in their answers. However, the fyrd continued to be useful to William I. He recognised it to be an effective fighting force, especially when he was faced by rebellion and invasion. 'Feudalism' might be seen as an ingredient of military organisation because it involved knight service.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 (b) How far did the link with Normandy cause problems for kings of England from 1066 to 1100? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of the consequences of a link between England and a continental territory in a specific period.

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

It might be argued that Normandy was a strength for William I. It was the base from which he launched his invasion of England and provided him with a powerful army that gained the vital victory at Hastings and from whom would be drawn the nobility that would help him to govern England. He also introduced a number of governmental and religious practices from Normandy. However, his responsibilities in Normandy necessitated periodic absences from England that proved a danger to stability; William's presence was necessary to ensure good government. There were continuous wars on the continent defending his dukedom. He died at war in France. William I's dual role as Duke of Normandy and King of England was a major cause of the rivalry between William I's sons. Robert, his eldest son, was probably named as his heir in Normandy and William (Rufus) as heir to the English throne. However, Norman barons, including the powerful Odo of Bayeux, were unwilling to support this division of authority. The outcome was war between the sons, the defeat of Robert and his departure on crusade whilst William II established his authority over England and Normandy.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Society, Economy and Culture 1042 - 1100

- 4 (a) **Assess the condition of the economy in pre-Conquest England.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the condition of the economy in late Anglo-Saxon England.

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

Towns and markets were small but the economy seems to have been generally stable. Taxation was collected regularly and the coinage was efficient. Although there was national and international trade, the emphasis was on the local economy, giving rise to much variation. However, the agricultural picture was mostly encouraging. Most of the land was sufficiently fertile to support a comparatively small population. Minerals were available and could be traded over longer distances. It is very possible that economic conditions were a reason why William of Normandy was keen to assert his claim to the English throne.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 4 (b) **Assess the main effects of the Norman Conquest on towns and trade by 1100.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the effects of the Norman Conquest on towns and trade.

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

Some towns were affected significantly by the Conquest but the majority were probably little changed by 1100. London's importance was enhanced. Already the largest town, it became even more significant although it was not the sole centre of government. Norwich and Winchester were already the next largest towns. Some towns were changed by the building of castles; they gained military and administrative importance. However, it can be argued that, by 1100, many towns still retained a degree of independence as local markets and centres of small merchants and craftsmen. Before the Conquest, trade in England was mostly local but there was trade with the continent and even further. The opportunities for wider trade increased by 1100. The Normans provided more varied opportunities for trade and craftsmen.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England 1450 - 1509

The Threat to Order and Authority 1450 – 1470

- 5 (a) Assess the importance of the council in government in the mid-fifteenth century. [45]

Focus: assessment of the importance of an important governmental institution.

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

The importance of the (king's) council depended on the strength of the monarch. An important reason for its importance in the mid-fifteenth century was the relative weakness of a series of kings. Formally, its role was to provide advice. Its membership was not fixed but depended on the favour of the king. He could surround himself with men who were dependent on him for their position. In practice, it could put pressure on a weak king and some nobles could claim membership because of their personal power. The council became a forum in which rivalries were played out. The membership was not exclusively aristocratic. Some were on the council because of their particular talents. This helped the council to become a more permanent feature of government. Candidates might draw examples from the reigns of Henry VI and Edward IV. Richard III did not rule in the middle of the fifteenth century but references to his relations with the council should not automatically be regarded as irrelevant if they are part of a wider argument.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 (b) **Assess the reasons for Edward IV's problems with the nobility during his first reign, to 1470.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a king's problems with the nobility.

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

Candidates can discuss a number of reasons, for example Edward IV's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville which was controversial for several reasons. She was a commoner. She was a widow with two sons by a previous marriage. Her family, which had previously been associated with the Lancastrians rather than the Yorkists, was quickly promoted to positions of importance through advantageous marriages. One brother became bishop of Salisbury; another was appointed admiral of the fleet. Earl Rivers, her father, became Treasurer, supplanting Mountjoy, uncle of the powerful Earl of Warwick. Warwick became the centre of dissatisfaction. Edward had rewarded him when he became king but the Woodville marriage prevented a French marriage alliance that Warwick preferred. Another plan to marry Clarence, Edward's brother and heir-presumptive, and Warwick's daughter was opposed by the King although it did take place. Warwick became an important problem to Edward. He was popular, vigorous and ambitious. The King's split with Warwick, supported by Clarence, became a key reason for the end of Edward's first reign. However, Edward's problems went further than the link between his marriage and Warwick's dissatisfaction. In spite of Henry VI's incapacity, the Lancastrians could still mount a challenge and retained support among the nobility. Hostile nobles were supported by France. Edward IV's taxes were unpopular.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The End of the Yorkists 1471 – 1485

- 6 (a) **Assess the claim that Edward IV's only problem at the end of his second reign in 1483 was his relationship with the nobility.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the problems of a king in a specific period.

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, 'How effective was Edward IV's domestic government from 1471? Edward IV's management of government (royal finances, crown-noble relations), the claims on the throne in 1483'. Edward IV seemed secure during his second reign. He did not face serious rebellion. Clarence, his brother and an inveterate plotter, was out of the picture. He built up his supporters, especially relying on Richard of Gloucester. Although he spent lavishly on his court, officials and in gifts to the nobility, he generally managed his finances effectively. Responsibility was given to the Chamber from the Exchequer, allowing the King more personal control. The succession did not seem a problem until Edward's early death when his heir was only 13 years of age. This raised the problem of a regency and power after Edward IV's death. Some candidates might argue that there were other problems, particularly with the nobility, as mentioned in the question. Did Edward IV give too much leeway to potentially troublesome nobles such as Richard? Although he curbed the nobility, he did not destroy the power of nobles. The King's marriage had caused hostility. It might be claimed that the strength of the monarchy depended too much on his personality and that political stability could not survive his death. Examiners should note that the Specification asks candidates to examine only domestic affairs; foreign affairs will not be required although accurate discussions should be given credit.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 (b) **How far do you agree that there is more to admire than criticise in Richard III's kingship?** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a king's character.

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

It is possible that a very one-sided assessment might merit a high mark band; this might be an example of an alternative approach. However, most answers might be expected to consider some creditable and some uncreditable qualities in Richard's kingship and come to a conclusion based on the weight of evidence. Richard's character is likely to be discussed, a topic that might divide candidates. Some will see him mostly as untrustworthy, ambitious, even murderous. Others will prefer a view that he was mostly blameless, an able governor, more sinned against than sinning. It will be very relevant to discuss the 'murder' of the Princes in the Tower but an answer that focuses only on this might find it difficult to reach more than **Band III**. Candidates should deal with other salient aspects of his reign. Some candidates might use the question to assess contemporary or later sixteenth-century assessments (possibly Shakespeare's). This might produce some excellent answers but it is not necessary for any mark. Candidates should support their claims about his kingship by referring to specific developments; a tendency in weaker answers might be to be relevant but very vague, making unsubstantiated claims. Candidates might consider Richard's relations with the nobility, including the execution of Buckingham. They might examine his reputation as a law-giver and his methods of raising money. The significance of the few economic reforms that he introduced will be relevant. The possibility of a marriage to Elizabeth, Edward IV's daughter, can be discussed.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Reign of Henry VII 1485 – 1509

- 7 (a) **Assess the claim that Henry VII was more a medieval than a modern ruler.**

[45]

Focus: assessment of the nature of a king's government.

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

Examiners will not look for an even balance between change and continuity; the balance will depend on the argument. However, answers that consider exclusively either continuity or change will find it difficult to get more than **Band III**. 'Medieval' and 'modern' can be interpreted broadly in terms of continuity and change. In dealing with medieval / continuity, candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of previous monarchies because the Study Topic begins in 1485. Similarly, the discussion of modern does not require knowledge of monarchy after 1509. Henry VII himself emphasised continuity inasmuch as he claimed to be the lawful successor of previous kings. His reliance on 'divine right' was not new. Candidates might judge that his development of a professional bureaucracy marked a departure, that is modern/change. However, some might claim that this represented an intensification of previously used methods. Candidates might examine his personal control of government. His reign marked the end of the long-standing rivalry between Lancastrians and Yorkists. He also mastered the nobility to a great extent. Few peerages were created and the size of the nobility diminished. Reference might be made to his use of bonds and recognisances. The Council Learned in the Law can be discussed. Other councils (eg Star Chamber, Wales and the Marches, the North) were not innovations but were reorganised; candidates might possibly see the transformation as evidence of change. It might be claimed that his foreign policy was novel with its interest in trade. He aimed at making peace with France. These features marked a change from previous tendencies.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 7 (b) 'His handling of royal finances was the most important reason for Henry VII's success as king.' How far do you agree with this claim? [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the reasons for a king's success.

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

Candidates may offer a different explanation for Henry VII's success. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. The King realised the importance of sound finances to make him less dependent on loans and stronger than wealthy subjects. He increased royal revenues approximately three-fold and left a surplus. Although this was not large, it was in fact a considerable achievement. He took control by centralising different incomes in the Chamber. He enforced his rights rigorously. Alienated lands were recovered and the property of attainted Yorkists and their sympathisers were seized. Attention to trade meant that customs dues increased. Benevolences, forced loans, feudal dues and parliamentary taxes were all significant. Although he maintained an elaborate court, he was otherwise frugal. Among other factors that contributed to his success might be his achievement in overcoming Yorkist Pretenders and other enemies. Marriage to Elizabeth of York helped to stabilise his regime. Law and order were maintained through the effective use of the council where the members were a combination of old and new men; he did not wish to exclude the nobility but also wanted to use men of ability. The Council Learned in the Law helped to keep control over potentially disruptive nobles. The Courts of Star Chamber and Requests were strengthened. The Councils of the North and of Wales and the Marches were reorganised to give firmer control over distant provinces. He did not embark on expensive foreign engagements but followed a careful path in his foreign relations and managed some solid gains with little cost.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509

- 8 (a) **How far were the years from 1450 to 1509 a period of economic prosperity for most people? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the extent of economic prosperity in a specific period.

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

It might be argued that this period was one of prosperity for the merchant class. Trade, internal and especially external, did well. The Yorkists (Edward IV mostly because Richard III had little time to be effective) and even more Henry VII encouraged trade. Henry VII in particular restored the conditions of law and order necessary to a developing economy. Reference might be made to the Hanseatic League and Merchant Adventurers. Guilds enabled merchants to tighten their grip. The population increased, creating a greater demand. Some new towns, such as Halifax, Wakefield and Manchester in the north, benefited. However, London continued to be pre-eminent. On the other hand, some towns declined because they could not meet growing competition. The older aristocracy sometimes suffered. Political developments, first wars and then the forceful policies of Henry VII, had economic implications. They also were less involved in the new trades that brought greater profits. In spite of Henry VII's restrictions on retainers, the expenses of the nobles were still considerable. The fate of the peasantry varied. Some became more prosperous, especially because of the need for more labour. Free peasants tended to benefit more than those who held their tenancies by copyright or custom. The number of vagrants increased as peasants lost their lands and livings.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 8 (b) **Assess the condition of the Church during the period from 1450 to 1509.**

[45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for the importance of the Church in a specific period.

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

The wealth of the Church was very considerable. It was a major landowner and continued to receive many gifts in cash and kind. It enjoyed many privileges and immunities. Reference might be to Church courts. Holy Days and pilgrimages to English (and foreign) shrines were widely regarded and more than excuses for popular enjoyment. The number of churches was considerable and this was a period of church building and rebuilding. The veneration of the Virgin Mary was more pronounced. Some might link the Church with advances in education such as the founding of new colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. Churches were centres of social life. An alternative argument might refer to evidence of disenchantment albeit by a minority. Lollardy survived underground; its extent and popularity are difficult to assess. There was a gulf between higher and lower clergy who were often ill-educated. Church exactions were unpopular. On the other hand, the complaints were not apparently more numerous than in previous periods.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England 1509 - 1558**Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509 - 1529**

- 9 (a) **How far was Henry VIII successful in foreign affairs by 1529? Explain your answer.**

[45]

Focus: assessment of success in a king's foreign affairs in a specific period.

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

They might argue that he was more successful or less. Another alternative approach might be to argue that it was Wolsey, not Henry VIII, who was more or less successful. This approach can be valid as long as the answer demonstrates enough understanding of the King's role. Henry was successful in making England an active participant in European affairs but it might be judged that his achievements were limited. From 1511-14 he fought France and won the Battle of the Spurs in alliance with the Emperor Maximilian I. Thérouanne and Tournai were captured. The Battle of Flodden was an English victory, but not for Henry himself although he took the credit. A treaty was made with France that included the marriage of Mary with Louis XII. However, candidates might assess the ultimate gains of these early campaigns. England's diplomatic importance seemed evident in the Treaty of London (1518) and the meeting with Francis I at the Field of the Cloth of Gold (1520). On the other hand, candidates might judge them to have been temporary successes. The 1520s then saw Henry switching his alliances between France and Spain in the hope of maximising his influence. There were few military successes and limited diplomatic achievements. The victory of Charles I (V) at Pavia lessened Henry's ability to affect continental affairs. France and Spain made peace at Cambrai (1529) without reference to Henry. The Divorce issue was not unresolved merely because of Henry's foreign policy but it was an important element. England was isolated and lacking in influence by 1529.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 9 (b) **How successful was Wolsey in achieving his aims in domestic administration from 1515 to 1529? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about an important minister's domestic administration.

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

Candidates might argue that Wolsey was unsuccessful because his failure to solve the problem of Henry VIII's divorce outweighed any other success that he might have achieved. This will be a valid approach but it will not justify candidates considering only the Divorce. There might be alternative explanations but the question is clearly about domestic affairs; discussions of foreign policy will be irrelevant except in two respects. A brief comparison of domestic and foreign achievements could be creditable in an introduction or conclusion and, secondly, it will be relevant to assess the impact of foreign relations on Wolsey's domestic administration. However, the point will again need to be made briefly.

Credit will be given when candidates discuss Wolsey's aims explicitly. His priority was to serve the King and meet his wishes. He also wished to exert his own control over most aspects of domestic affairs, secular and ecclesiastical. Success might be seen in his legal reforms such as the emphasis on Chancery and the strengthening of the Court of Requests and Star Chamber. On the other hand, the greater power of these two courts did not succeed in winning Wolsey much support among influential people who were often the target of enquiry and prosecution. He was secure as long as he enjoyed the King's support but became isolated from the rest of the court. The Eltham Ordinance (1526) might be seen as Wolsey's attempt to limit the influence of other courtiers. Successful in the short-term, it did nothing to build a body of support. Wolsey was isolated when the Divorce crisis occurred.

He was generally successful in raising money but the Amicable Grant (1524) might be deemed a failure; on the other hand, it can be argued that the attempt to raise money in this way was in obedience to Henry VIII's wishes. He attempted to limit enclosures but mostly ineffectually. He succeeded in making himself dominant in the Church through his many offices and particularly as Papal Legate and attempted some minor reforms, for example of monasteries, but there was little positive change. His personal example probably helped to discredit the Church. The outcome for Wolsey of the Divorce issue can only be seen as a failure but candidates might consider how far he was responsible. The extent of his failure might be considered in the context of what was possible. His dual role as king's minister and pope's representative proved a weakness rather than a strength.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529 - 1558

- 10 (a) **Assess how far wars with France and Scotland weakened Tudor governments during the period from 1542 to 1558.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the domestic effects of foreign wars.

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

There is no need to provide much narrative description of the wars because the emphases in the specification and the question are on the domestic effects of the conflicts. Henry VIII's war with Scotland might have been justified because of the danger in the north of a pro-French and pro-Catholic government. The immediate effect was to bolster Henry's government. After a shaky start, the Battle of Solway Moss was a major victory. James V died, leaving a minority government. But the rest of the campaign was badly handled. The major effect was to weaken Henry's finances and to leave the English government with a more determined neighbour. His war against France did not have any significant gains. Boulogne was retained for a short period but the costs were very considerable. At a time of serious inflation, Henry was involved in another unnecessary expense. Parliamentary grants were obtained by the crown which also had had to sell off land, weakening it in the long term. Henry had to resort to expensive loans and the coinage was debased. There were other reasons for the financial problems but the external policies were a major factor.

On the other hand, although he had other problems, the wars did not substantially weaken Henry VIII's hold on government at the end of his reign. Somerset also invaded Scotland. A victory at Pinkie achieved little. There was more expense, Mary (Queen of Scots) went to France, strengthening the Auld Alliance, and Somerset's position in England was undermined. There were also setbacks in France that weakened him. War was therefore a significant factor. Northumberland ended the wars, accepting less compensation for the sake of peace. Mary I's alliance with Spain was the background to the resumed war with France that culminated in the loss of Calais. The damage to Mary's reputation was considerable. Many saw England as pursuing Spain's interests. Again, war was important in weakening Mary I. Overall, candidates might argue that the major reason why Tudor governments were weakened by these wars was that they engaged in unnecessary enterprises. They involved heavy financial burdens and they gained nothing.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 10 (b) **How different were the policies and methods of Somerset and Northumberland in governing England? (Do not discuss religion in your answer.)** [45]

Focus: assessment of differences in policies and methods of two important governors.

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

The exclusion of religion avoids overlap with Question 11 (b) and reflects the nature of the Study Topic. It might be argued that both Somerset and Northumberland aimed to dominate the government of Edward VI. Somerset overrode Henry VIII's will to gain personal power. He often ignored the Council to make personal decisions with his associates. His reputation for arrogance was well founded. Northumberland was also a man of personal ambition, taking advantage of Somerset's unpopularity to gain power and then taking full advantage of his position to gain honours and distribute favours to win supporters. However, he was more skilful in using the Council. On the other hand, Somerset gained a reputation for being liberal in his social views. He saw economic and social problems as a priority, especially enclosures. He supported the 'Commonwealth Men' who sought to curb the enclosers. This might have encouraged, rather than satisfied, those who had grievances and gave rise to Ket's Rebellion. Northumberland reversed this policy. However, he did promote some sensible economic reforms especially against debased coinage. Trade was encouraged.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Church and State 1529 - 1558

- 11 (a) **How 'Catholic' was England at 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.

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

Historiography is not a required element of AS Level assessment. Accurate historiographical references should be rewarded but they will not be expected for any mark. The balance of the argument will depend on candidates' views of the extent of Catholic sympathies; examiners will not look for an even balance. Candidates can discuss the religious developments from the early 1530s when the framework of the Henrician Reformation was established but the emphasis should be on the situation at the end of Henry VIII's reign. Candidates will have studied the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I. They can use future developments relevantly, for example the Western Rising there demonstrated the survival of strong Catholic tendencies in that region. However, this is not required for any mark. Answers might distinguish between the formal position of Church structures and doctrine, and popular opinion. From 1539-40, Henry VIII favoured more Catholic advisers after the fall of Cromwell, such as Norfolk (until Catherine Howard's demise) and Gardiner. Nevertheless, Cranmer continued to enjoy the King's favour. Henry did not pursue a clear line. Heretics were burned but the Six Articles were not enforced vigorously.

On the other hand, restrictions were announced to the reading of the Bible. The King's Book (1543) was orthodox. Prince Edward was educated by Protestant tutors. Seymour / Hertford / Somerset was favoured. Popular opinion is difficult to assess. Most people probably felt it their duty to follow the King's wishes. However, there were regional differences. The north and the far west were conservative. There was probably more support for more Protestant ideas in London and other large towns. Kent was more influenced by Protestant ideas. Anne Askew was burned for heresy. She was from Lincolnshire but did not necessarily reflect popular opinion there. However, she was linked to courtiers and even Queen Catherine (Parr) was suspected.

However, at the end of the reign Henry was Head of the Church and there were no monasteries.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 11 (b) **Assess the claim that both Somerset and Northumberland achieved little in their attempts to make England more Protestant.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the achievements in religion of two important governors.

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

Both Somerset and Northumberland sought to make England more Protestant. The former welcomed some who had gone into exile, such as Hooper. He also permitted the publication of books by continental reformers that had been banned by Henry VIII. Images were stripped from churches. Chantries were abolished and the mass was censured. Visitors were appointed to enforce anti-Catholic measures. Gardiner, and later Bonner, were imprisoned. Cranmer was authorised to introduce a Book of Common Prayer (1549). However, this was not radical in its interpretation of the Eucharist. It satisfied neither Catholics nor determined Protestants. Overall, whilst tending to Protestantism, Somerset might be seen as producing a fudge. He was faced by revolts some of which were clearly motivated by religion (the Western Rising) but in other rebellions religion was one of many grievances, especially social complaints.

Northumberland took a more pronounced Protestant stance. Radicals such as Hooper were promoted; John Knox was allowed to preach in England. Continental reformers, for example Bucer, were more influential. The second Book of Common Prayer (1552) was a further step towards change. Some Catholics went into exile either from fear or as a sign of protest. There was unrest in Lancashire but it might be argued that many other rural areas were untouched by the new teachings. Northumberland's Protestant stance was finally ruined by his association with Lady Jane Grey against Mary. Candidates will have studied the reign of Mary I. They can use future developments relevantly but this is not required for any mark.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Social and Economic Issues 1509 - 1558

- 12 (a) **How serious a problem were enclosures during the period from 1509 to 1558? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the extent to which enclosures gave rise to problems.

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

Candidates might argue that the extent of enclosures was limited in this period (perhaps 2-3% of total land) and that the problems should therefore not be exaggerated. This is a valid point and can form the basis of a very good answer but enclosures proved problematic in particular areas. They brought about depopulation and the decay of villages. People were dispossessed. Unemployment followed and often vagrancy. They divided society. Wealthy landowners who enclosed defended the practice on economic grounds but there were some influential people who perceived enclosures as dangerous. Wolsey believed them unfair and launched an enquiry, leading to some prosecutions. A group of 'Commonwealth Men' criticised enclosures as being unsocial. The failure of successive but intermittent official action, for example Hales Commission 1548, indicated the weakness of government. Enclosures could give rise to local rebellions in East Anglia, counties of mid-England and the north. Enclosures were not the only grievance but they were an important common factor.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 (b) How important was population growth as a cause of inflation from 1509 to 1558? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of a factor in causing inflation.

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

Candidates can offer alternative explanations of the important reasons for inflation. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. During the first half of the sixteenth century, prices rose by a half, with a sharper increase at the end of the period. Intermittent poor harvests could cause sharp rises in the cost of food. Some contemporaries looked to enclosure as a reason. Government policies, including debasement and expensive wars, can be cited as causes. The effects of greater imports of bullion, especially silver, can be assessed. The population increased during this period but the economy did not expand sufficiently to cope with larger numbers. There was pressure on employment. The availability of labour kept wages low. Greater demand on resources led to higher prices.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England 1547 – 1603

Church and State 1547 - 1603

- 13 (a) To what extent was there popular support for religious changes during the period from the accession of Mary I (1553) to the Elizabethan settlement (1559)? [45]

Focus: assessment of support for religious policies in a specific period.

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

Examiners will not look for a particular balance but there should be a reasonable coverage of the reign of Mary I and Elizabeth I's accession. 60:40 either way might be appropriate for any mark band and 70:30 could also merit **Band I** if the overall argument were sufficiently strong and effectively justified. The discussion of Mary's reign might be one-sided, with an emphasis on opposition and lack of support. Reference might be made to the burnings. There is other evidence in Wyatt's opposition to the Queen's Catholic marriage. 'Popular support' refers to the opinions of the general populace but it will not be irrelevant to note Mary's inability to restore monastic lands. On the other hand, high credit should be given to candidates who point out that most people conformed to Catholicism, sometimes enthusiastically from the evidence of the quick restoration of Catholic images and liturgy.

Whilst a Protestant settlement at the beginning of Elizabeth I's reign would be widely supported, there were significant problems. England's religious settlement also had international implications. A new Queen lacking in experience was not in a strong position. She realised the danger of extremes in any direction. Her preference was to introduce a moderate degree of change that would not risk controversy. There were Catholic bishops and nobles in the House of Lords. Parts of the country were very conservative. Protestant enthusiasts / Puritans were vocal and strong in London and in some other urban centres but a minority nationally. The bills to settle religion, enforcing royal supremacy and uniformity in worship, had problems in Parliament especially from the Lords. The outcome was that no bishop voted for the settlement and all except one were deprived of their offices. Changes had to be made but not because of the irresistible pressure of a 'Puritan choir'. Candidates can discuss the significance of her title as Supreme Governor rather than as Supreme Head of the Church. Most of the lesser clergy conformed but with differing degrees of enthusiasm. About 300 were deprived of their livings, a comparatively small proportion. Candidates might conclude that there was popular support for the moderation of Elizabeth's Protestant settlement.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 13 (b) **Assess the problems of English Catholics in maintaining their religion throughout the reign of Elizabeth I.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the problems of an important religious group over an extended period.

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

The question asks candidates to examine the Catholics 'throughout the reign of Elizabeth I.' This does not mean that a continuous survey is required, but examiners will look in particular for an awareness of Catholic problems at the beginning of the reign and their condition at the end. Examiners should not undervalue answers that are organised chronologically. The nature of the problems changed during the reign and a sequential answer might reach an excellent standard.

The Catholics had an early problem in dealing with Elizabeth I's religious settlement. Catholic-minded bishops and nobles in the House of Lords resisted the pressures of those who wished for a more pronounced Protestant settlement. Although the outcome was the replacement of a Catholic bench of bishops by Protestants and the exclusion of some priests, the moderation of the settlement and the Queen's attitude alleviated their problems. Catholics were faced with the problem of loyalty by the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots, in England and by the Northern Rising. The impact of Pius V's excommunication of Elizabeth (1570) also tested their loyalty. Plots and war with Spain from 1588 gave Catholics the reputation of being disloyal, although very few were involved in the plots and some offered to take arms against Spain (and were refused). Recusancy laws were tightened up but they were enforced only against the most determined non-attenders at Church services.

Candidates might judge that a major problem was the small number of priests, necessary to give the sacraments. The arrival of missionary priests and Jesuits was seen as a threat by the authorities but their small numbers and limited activities did not seriously diminish the problems of most Catholics in practising their faith. Very few priests survived to 1603. There were divisions among Catholics in the later reign that added to the problem of the survival of their faith.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Foreign Affairs 1547 - 1587

- 14 (a) **Assess the claim that keeping peace with Spain was Elizabeth I's most important aim from 1558 to 1585.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a ruler's aims in foreign affairs.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might disagree with the claim in the question and offer alternative explanations. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. Many of the issues were linked.

It can be argued that Elizabeth I's most important aim was to avoid being entangled in continental affairs. Mary I, her predecessor, had involved England in the war between Spain and France with considerable damage to her rule. Elizabeth's Protestant regime seemed threatened by more powerful Catholic countries in Europe. The succession issue was significant, involving the Queen's marriage. Relations with Spain were a common element of these aims. There were trade interests to consider. Spain was militarily and politically the most powerful state in Europe at the time of her accession. Philip II was willing to be friendly with England and pressed his case for marriage, which could not be refused abruptly. Friendship with Spain would also help English trade interests in the Netherlands but the Dutch Revolt tested Elizabeth's policy. There were contradictory pressures on her, some wanting to give more active assistance to the Protestant rebels whilst others were reluctant.

It might be argued that Elizabeth's increasingly obvious willingness to encourage illegal traders such as Hawkins and privateers such as Drake to break the Spanish monopoly in the Americas was a sign that she would risk breaking the peace. The Treaty of Nonsuch (1585) and the despatch of English soldiers to the Netherlands under Leicester was a clear sign that Elizabeth was willing to accept war with Spain. France was another problem especially with the outbreak of the civil wars. Should Elizabeth I help the Huguenots or, as her instincts preferred, should she remain as detached as possible? Again, marriage became an issue with negotiations opened with French princes, such as Alençon.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 14 (b) **Assess the reasons why Elizabeth I was concerned about Scotland during the period from 1559 to 1587.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for a ruler's concern about another country in a specific period.

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

At her accession, Elizabeth I was immediately faced with a problem in Scotland. Mary was Queen of Scots and Dauphiness, then quickly Queen of France and her mother was regent in Scotland. The 'Auld Alliance' was potentially dangerous for England, situated between the two Catholic countries. Mary had a claim to the English throne. The outbreak of a Protestant revolution in Scotland, led by the followers of John Knox, was a test of Elizabeth's diplomacy. There were pressures on the Queen to intervene on the side of the revolutionaries but her natural instinct was not to be involved. However, she was persuaded to send military support to Mary's enemies. The outcome was a success for England (Treaty of Edinburgh 1560) but it was not achieved without danger and showed uncertainty by the young Elizabeth I. Mary's flight to England (1568) continued the problem of Scotland, a test of English attitudes to the rebellion that expelled her. Morton's rule over Scotland brought some peace in relations. His execution by Lennox and the revived Catholic and French interest marked a downturn in relations. However, by 1586, threats from the north had been overcome. 1587 also marked the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots. Although the main danger from her was in England after her arrival in 1568, she still represented a danger from Scotland because of the succession issue. James VI had assumed power in Scotland. By 1587, he had abandoned attempts to save his mother and was more concerned to ensure his own position.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558 - 1603

- 15 (a) 'Elizabeth I had more successes than failures in domestic affairs from 1588 to 1603.' How far do you agree with this judgement? (Include the Irish Rebellion in your answer.) [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a ruler's domestic successes and failures in a specific period.

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

The Content in the specification mentions 'financial problems, the Irish Rebellion, Essex's Rebellion, the parliament of 1601 and the monopolies debate.' Examiners can expect candidates to consider a reasonable range, but not all, of these for **Band I**. The specification also includes 'the pressures of the war against Spain'. The question is about domestic affairs and foreign policy as such will be irrelevant but the financial costs of the war were considerable and will be relevant. This does not preclude the discussion of other issues such as the succession and her personal popularity when she became increasingly isolated as her contemporaries retired or died.

Religion is not mentioned in this part of the specification but candidates can assess the religious situation. It seemed as if the Queen had overcome the worst problems posed by Catholics and Puritans; candidates are not expected to have knowledge of developments after 1603. The Irish Rebellion was the heaviest expense of Elizabeth I's last years. Requests for parliamentary grants caused problems before the monopolies issue became acute. Essex's Rebellion was linked to Ireland and also to government and the court. The outcome ended Elizabeth's hopes of preserving a balance between factions and Robert Cecil's power was confirmed. Although Essex's rising was put down quite easily, he enjoyed significant support in different parts of the country. The monopolies debate was seen in Parliament as a matter of practical grievance; monopolies caused expense and prevented freer enterprise. For Elizabeth, it was also a matter of prerogative. Nevertheless, candidates might agree that the Queen had more successes than failures. Ireland was restored to order under Mountjoy. Her personal power was mostly unchallenged. Her finances suffered but the debt was not excessive. Complaints in Parliament about monopolies and the crown's requests for supplies did not weaken the Queen significantly. She could still handle MPs, for example through the Golden Speech. Although she remained aloof, the succession was managed without controversy.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 15 (b) **How successful was Elizabeth I in maintaining the power of the monarchy throughout her reign? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the extent of royal power in an important reign.

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

The most important discriminating factor will be candidates' success in differentiating between Elizabeth's general success as a ruler and her defence of royal power. On the other hand, examiners will not expect AS level candidates to be able to deal with political theory in a sophisticated way.

Among matters of prerogative was the power to make war and peace. The monarch appointed ministers and members of the Privy Council as well as other central and local officials. The monarch was the head of the law. Among areas that were disputed was authority over the Church. Elizabeth I was Supreme Governor but Parliament's role in enacting the settlement and authorising the Prayer Book meant that some disputed her sole power over religion. The Queen could levy some feudal dues and customs duties but Parliament's consent was needed to levy other taxes. Candidates might judge that Elizabeth I was mostly very successful. There were challenges to her policies but few doubted her ultimate right to make decisions in the matters mentioned above as areas of royal prerogative. Some concessions were made. For example, she was persuaded, probably against her will, to execute Mary, Queen of Scots. Her religious settlement was different from what she would have preferred. She agreed at the end of her reign to withdraw monopolies, previously a matter for the crown.

However, overall, there was little change. One reason was that there was no serious challenge to the idea of royal prerogative. There were complaints about particular policies but no real alternatives were proposed to the system, although some proclaimed Parliament to represent the people. Elizabeth herself used a combination of firmness and moderation to defend her powers. The court reflected and enhanced her personal pre-eminence and she transformed the weakness of her gender into a strength.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Social and Economic Issues 1547 - 1603

- 16 (a) **How far did inflation affect different groups in society during the period from 1547 to 1603? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the social effects of inflation.

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

Answers can be organised in separate sections because the question does not clearly demand a comparative element. However, one would normally expect some discussion of similarities or differences for a mark at the top of **Band I**. 'Different' requires at least two groups to be discussed. Answers that consider only one will probably be worth not more than **Band III**. (The Specification mentions landowners, tenants, labourers and townspeople but candidates might discuss other groups or categorise them differently.) On the other hand, marks will not depend on the number of groups considered by a candidate, and examiners will not expect as much detail in answers that discuss many groups as those that examine two.

Candidates should be given credit when they point out that some groups did not suffer significantly from inflation and might have benefited. These included food producers among the larger landowners and merchants in towns who gained from higher prices. Their larger incomes could cope with higher prices for food and other commodities. The fate of landowners generally depended on their ability to increase their incomes. Some were less efficient at implementing measures that produced more profits. Nobles and courtiers varied. Those who were more adaptable could increase their wealth. Some courtiers were awarded posts that, although unpaid or poorly paid, gave them access to gifts / bribes and various ways of making profits. Others relied more on traditional incomes and did less well when facing inflationary pressures.

Tenants often suffered. They could not easily increase their incomes and came under greater pressure to retain their tenancies. Even more, labourers were hit hard. Wages were low and inflation could push tenants and their families into severe poverty, even vagrancy. Townspeople might have been affected less directly by the worst effects of inflation but there were complaints about the impact of growing bands of beggars who needed support. Some small towns became less prosperous, but probably less because of the immediate effects of inflation than because of competition of new and growing towns, or because of trade cycles. The monarchs were not strictly a social group but it will not be irrelevant to discuss the effects of inflation on the crown as long as candidates also deal with other groups.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 16 (b) **How effective were the methods used to tackle the problems caused by poverty during the reign of Elizabeth I? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the methods used to deal with poverty.

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

Many of the causes of poverty were outside the control of the Elizabethans and it might be argued that measures to deal with it were necessarily bound to fail. There were poor harvests in the 1590s, causing extensive problems especially to the poor. Famine and rising prices could not be dealt with by sixteenth-century governments that lacked administrative and financial resources. On the other hand, nobility, gentry and merchants opposed financial exactions and controls that might have alleviated some causes of poverty. For example, vagrancy was widely perceived to be a problem - many made a link between vagrancy and crime - but attempts to deal with it had little success.

Elizabeth I's government legislated to tackle some aspects of poverty. Reference might be made to the Statute of Apprentices (1563) and the Poor Law Acts (1597 and 1601). Responsibility for enforcing these measures was given to the larger number of JPs and other local officials. Books of Orders were published instructing local officials in their duties. However, these officials were not enforcing laws objectively; they belonged to social groups who had to pay levies to maintain the poor. Although most co-operated, and others were persuaded to act by the Privy Council, a significant minority proved recalcitrant. In the absence of central institutions, the government had to rely on the parish and this, together with the use of local officials, meant that there was great variation in effectiveness. There were food riots in the later 1580s and 1590s and a more notable rising in Oxfordshire in 1596. But the discontented lacked leadership and their separate risings were put down but not without alarming the authorities. Candidates might note the importance of individuals whose generosity could make significant differences in the provision of water supplies, hospitals, schools and alms houses. However, the number of providers and beneficiaries was small, and it is possible that nationally the provision grew less in the later years of the reign when economic problems affected most members of the population.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

England 1603 -1660

Politics and Religion 1603-1629

- 17 (a) **Assess the reasons why some Members of Parliament opposed the Stuarts' use of royal prerogative during the period from 1603 to 1629.** [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for an important political problem.

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

An alternative approach to the argument might be that all MPs agreed with the royal prerogative as a basis of government and society, but that it was the Stuarts' interpretation of it that caused problems. This might lead to some very interesting discussions. Most candidates will accept the basis of the question. Candidates might discuss what is meant by Divine Right, although this can be brief. It put government within a religious framework. According to the Stuarts, kings were appointed to God and answerable only to Him. Their decisions and policies were unquestionable. Royal prerogative was held to apply to most aspects of government, including the making of foreign policy and the appointment of ministers. The Stuarts would include religion and most elements of domestic policy. Parliament was held to derive its powers from the crown. James I especially, but also Charles I, expressed these ideas forcefully. Some - but not all - MPs resisted this interpretation and relied on Parliament's traditional powers in taxation and their right to be consulted about policy, which developed into a claim to give consent. There was a claim that MPs represented popular opinion. Particular policies of James I and Charles I provided the context for the argument. For example, the Stuarts' handling of money was controversial. Their foreign policies aroused ill-will. The unpopularity of favourites and ministers raised questions about the kings' choices in government. Coke was to become an eminent critic of James I's use of prerogative and there was conflict over the role of judges. The Petition of Right (1628) protested against key elements of Charles I's policies, that he justified by prerogative, as against the consent of Parliament: billeting, martial law, taxation and arbitrary imprisonment. The Three Resolutions (1629) added religion, a central plank in the Stuarts' claims to royal prerogative, to the issue of taxation. Some candidates might point out either similarities or differences between the attitudes of the early Stuarts and Elizabeth I but this is not necessary for any mark because the Study Topic begins in 1603.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 17 (b) How far were James I and Charles I, to 1629, responsible for their financial problems? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of the responsibility of rulers for their financial problems.

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

Candidates might agree that the Stuarts were mainly responsible for their financial problems or they might argue that other factors were more important but 'How far..?' invites them to consider both possibilities. The balance will depend on the arguments but answers in **Band I** will require both alternatives to be considered unless a one-sided argument is otherwise excellent. James I inherited a large debt from Elizabeth I although it was much smaller than continental monarchs had to deal with. Inflation affected the crown; costs were increasing whilst it was difficult to increase the kings' income. James I tried to update taxes on trade (the Book of Rates), which Elizabeth I had largely neglected to do, but it was an unpopular measure and gave rise to Bate's Case. Although James I won, the decision did not persuade his critics. His court was more expensive than Elizabeth's and the expenses were believed to be unnecessarily large. There was criticism that favourites were rewarded unduly. Robert Cecil / Salisbury tried to agree the Great Contract with Parliament but nothing came of it. Monopolies, supposedly suppressed by Elizabeth I at the end of her reign, were revived and were challenged in Parliament. Charles I was immediately faced with financial problems because of the unwillingness of Parliament to vote supplies. The King's unpopular policies and the influence of Buckingham reinforced MPs' refusal to grant adequate taxes. Charles I resorted to forced loans, and arbitrary taxation became a key feature of parliamentary grievances, for example in the Petition of Rights and Three Resolutions.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Personal Rule and Civil War 1629 - 1649

- 18 (a) **How far do you agree that religion was the most important reason for the outbreak of the First Civil War in 1642? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the reasons for civil war.

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

Acceptable alternative explanations will include arguments that other reasons were more important than religion. However, marks in **Band I** will normally require a satisfactory paragraph on the stated issue. Other forms of alternative approaches will be either the narrow focus on 1640-42, from the meeting of the Long Parliament to the outbreak of civil war, or the longer term study that shows how factors leading to civil war gradually built up. Both can be acceptable. The problem with the second approach is that candidates might lose sight of the issue of civil war to concentrate on telling a story. Developments before 1640 can be relevant but civil war could not have been predicted in 1640.

In religion, Charles I's Arminianism / high Anglicanism, encouraged and enforced by Laud, was very different from the religious views of many people inside and outside Parliament. There were suspicions that Charles I was too tolerant of Roman Catholicism, even that he harboured sympathies with that religion. Laud was arrested and there was criticism of episcopacy. The Court of High Commission was abolished. Reference might be made to the Root and Branch Bill. There was suspicion of Henrietta Maria that was to alarm Charles I. Events in Ireland were strongly linked to religion.

Other reasons might include political divisions including Charles I's tendencies to absolutism. His prerogative powers were limited by the abolition of courts such as Star Chamber. Strafford's arrest and execution represented an important turning point. Within Parliament, the momentum gave more impetus to the war party; there were divisions between those who would be reconciled to the King and those who sought to weaken his position further. Control of the army became a crucial issue for both sides. Charles I was distrusted personally, a feeling that was confirmed by his attempted arrest of the Five Members. It is improbable that AS candidates will deal with the links between social, economic and cultural change and the onset of civil war. Answers that make no references to these should not be regarded as incomplete. On the other hand, candidates who show some awareness of these issues should be well rewarded.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 18 (b) **Assess the claim that the Second Civil War (1648) was the most important reason for the execution of Charles I in 1649.** [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the reasons for the execution of a king.

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

Candidates might prefer to argue the importance of factors other than the Second Civil War as primary causes of Charles I's execution and alternative explanations can merit any mark. However, marks in **Band I** will normally require a satisfactory paragraph on the stated issue. The Second Civil War proved to many in the army that the King was a man of blood. Although the royalists were defeated fairly easily, it seemed as if Charles I was not only unwilling to agree satisfactory terms for a settlement but was also willing to resume civil war. His defeat confirmed to Cromwell and others of a similar mind that God had judged the issue between the King and his enemies.

Among other factors that might be discussed are the failures of negotiations from the end of the First Civil War in 1646. Some candidates might begin before 1646. However, they need to choose and use their material carefully. Memories of the First Civil War were still strong in 1648-49 but the number and importance of regicides by 1646 were limited. All of the important people and groups at the end of the first war favoured a settlement. The problem was that their solutions were different and contradictory. Candidates can examine the aims and conduct of Charles I after the first war. He was still hoping to divide and defeat his enemies to hold on to his (divinely appointed) position and power. There were growing tensions in the army between officers / grandees and the rank and file, some of whom were attracted by Leveller ideas. Cromwell and his fellows proposed settlements that would retain a monarch with limited power whilst the rank and file became more radical, especially as their political views were encouraged by their religious views and financial grievances.

Members of Parliament played an important role. Parliamentary Presbyterians wished for a settlement that would preserve their political power alongside that of a king and bring the army under control. The Scots had a different agenda and ended by making an agreement to restore Charles I to power, sparking the second war. Candidates can consider the role of radical political and religious groups such as the Levellers. They first came to the conclusion that England needed a republic if power was to be held by the people. Credit should be given when candidates refer convincingly to particular attempts at a settlement such as the officers' Heads of the Proposals or to particular developments such as the Putney Debates and some of the Levellers' pamphlets.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Interregnum 1649-1660

- 19 (a) **Assess the reasons why Oliver Cromwell became Lord Protector in 1653.**

[45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the reasons for an important constitutional change.

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

The starting point is open to candidates although there is no need to consider developments before 1649; it is difficult to see how these can be made relevant unless examined briefly in introductions. Candidates should certainly not go beyond 1653 and the inception of the Protectorate. Cromwell's hopes of a permanent settlement after the execution of Charles I came to nothing. A growing gap appeared between Cromwell and the army officers on the one hand and the members of the Rump on the other. There were complaints about the Rump's policies in religion and its hostility to the United Provinces that led to war. Cromwell and the army were preoccupied with defeating Charles II's invasion from Scotland and the need to restore order to Ireland. The final quarrel came when these problems had been settled and focused on the issue of elections. There were accusations that the members of the Rump sought to perpetuate their position. Some historians have referred to the corruption of the Rump. Cromwell dissolved the Rump forcibly. The Parliament of the Saints (Barebones) was a brief and unsuccessful episode, showing the failure of an attempt to rule through godly people. The Protectorate seemed to provide a necessary balance between rule by one person (Cromwell), army (the Council) and Parliament, although elections would not be free. Candidates who explain the Instrument of Government should be rewarded. There are several alternative arguments that candidates can offer. It can be claimed that criticisms of the Rump were excessive and that the charge that members sought to perpetuate their position is unjustified. Some would maintain that Cromwell had no clear ideas about what he wanted. Others would judge that his personal ambition was most important. Very possibly, candidates might proceed directly from the dissolution of the Rump to the inception of the Protectorate, omitting Barebones. Unless the rest of the answer is excellent this would probably preclude answers from **Band I**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

19 (b) Assess the reasons why Charles II was restored in 1660. [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for the restoration of the monarchy in the mid-seventeenth century.

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

Candidates might give more attention to the positive reasons: the popularity of the monarchy. However, most are likely to focus on the negative factors: the unpopularity and failure of the Republic. Both approaches can merit **Band I** although one would normally expect some reference to both for a mark at the top of this Band.

Candidates might take a short-term or a long-term view. They might focus on the period from 1658, after the death of Oliver Cromwell, or they might argue that Oliver Cromwell himself did not establish a stable republic that could survive his death. The temptation in the second approach is that it might lead to meandering surveys. However, examiners should not prejudge answers that take this line. A good case can be made out for the argument that the foundations of a firm republic were never laid. However, such answers will still have to show a reasonable understanding of the position by 1660.

Those who focus on 1658 to 1660 might explain the divisions in the army between rank-and file and officers and between officers, such as Fleetwood and Lambert and the role of Monck. They might consider the vacuum at the head of the state after Richard Cromwell's failure and resignation. It will be very relevant to examine the role of politicians such as the members of the Rump. Answers can look at the active support for royalism. The welcome for Charles's return was probably genuine and certainly republicanism was not a very popular cause in 1660. Royalists had been weakened in the provinces but they still had considerable local influence. However, even in the last days of the Republic, royalist risings were suppressed fairly easily. The army, whatever its internal divisions, was able to defeat militarily the supporters of Charles II. The chronology of the period from 1658 to 1660 is not easy to grasp at AS Level and candidates who can trace a clear line that supports an argument should be well rewarded. Such narratives that illustrate the confusion and divisions in the republican regime should not be under-valued.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Society and the Economy 1603 - 1660**20 (a) Assess the reasons for the rise of the Levellers in the 1640s. [45]**

Focus: assessment of the reason for the rise of a controversial radical group.

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

Candidates might consider the effects of the First Civil War. Large numbers of men were gathered in close proximity, allowing the interchange of ideas. These ideas were an important part of the appeal of the Levellers. After the war, the army continued to be fertile ground for the expression of ambitions and grievances, such as the demand for back pay. The nature of the struggle meant that some saw it as the triumph of freedom over despotism. The parliamentary army itself provided some organisation for the Levellers. Institutions that had curbed free expression, for example the Court of High Commission, had been abolished and censorship ended effectively. Simple printing presses meant that publications could be produced and circulated easily. Religion was an important factor with the growth of diverse and unorthodox opinions. Ideas of republicanism, wider suffrage and religious toleration were attractive. The reaction of the army officers (grandees) was ambiguous at first. Radical ideas that were justified by religious beliefs had their attraction whilst it was important to retain the loyalty and discipline of the army. The Levellers had origins outside the army, especially in more urban areas, but the New Model Army's adoption of promotion by merit meant that men of a lower social status could achieve important military positions that proved problematic to Cromwell and his associates. Whilst comparatively few in numbers, other but linked groups such as the Diggers can be considered. High credit should be given when candidates can refer to some Leveller pamphlets as evidence of their beliefs and claims. The question asks about the rise of the Levellers. There is therefore no need to discuss their fall but an assessment of their strength and influence at their height will be appropriate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 20 (b) How far did the economy of England expand during the period from 1603 to 1660? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of the extent of economic development.

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

Candidates can emphasise either expansion or decline. The economy remained very largely agrarian. The economy of most regions remained essentially local. Wool and cloth continued to provide wealth for several regions. Among elements of change that affected some areas might be increasing enclosure and clearances in the Fens. The coal trade, especially from the north to London and surrounding areas, increased with the fashion for fires in larger houses. Some luxury trades benefited. International trade grew. Reference might be made to the East India Company (1600). Although the wool trade was widespread, competition from lighter cloths on the continent led to some depression. Candidates can examine the impact of the civil wars (especially the first) and the republic on the economy. War destabilised the economy in particular areas although most of England escaped the worst effects. 1640-60 was a period of heavy taxation. On the other hand, there was more economic freedom because central authorities such as the Privy Council were less able to control economic activity.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2584 English History 1780 – 1964

England 1780 - 1846

The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783 - 1830

- 1 (a) To what extent was royal support the most important factor in Pitt's domination of politics during the period from 1783 to 1793? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the reason for Pitt's political domination to 1793.

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

Candidates can be credited for placing the relative importance of royal support into the context of other factors – his reputation for cost-effective reforming policies, the weakness of the Whig opposition (especially over splits occasioned by the French Revolution), dislike of Lord North and Fox, especially over constitutional issues, a recovering economic and financial base and Pitt's ability to handle the French Revolution to 1793. Good candidates (Band I and II) will be aware of the importance of particular factors at particular times, not least the increasing role of Pitt's own abilities in restoring national finances and morale in the wake of American defeat (his stress on efficiency and the war on waste). That said the Hanoverian political system still gave great power to the King. Pitt was George III's choice and owed his power to him throughout this period. He did not dominate because he headed a political party, at least not initially. George III was looking for someone who transcended party, a King's Minister. A well respected King like George III could expect, via the patronage system, to wield much influence over elections to the House of Commons and, via his household officers, the House of Lords. George III created 119 new peers to help Pitt. In the 1784 election, which secured Pitt's government, royal support was vital. Pitt was always careful to respect royal wishes (over Parliamentary Reform in 1785)). His government was only threatened once during the period to 1783, in 1788, over the Regency Crisis. Nonetheless candidates could point to Pitt's growing political strength given that his reforms reduced the power of royal patronage.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 1 (b) 'The Queen Caroline affair was the most serious challenge facing the governments of Lord Liverpool during the period from 1812 to 1822.' How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: An assessment of the challenges facing Lord Liverpool's governments.

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

Candidates will need to assess, comparatively, the various challenges facing Lord Liverpool's governments. These would be **economic**, especially the depression following the Napoleon's wars which threatened the transition to peace, an **agricultural crisis** in the form of a collapse in farm prices which culminated in a divisive Corn Law in 1815 and political and constitutional in the form of a revised **radical challenge** that fed off the previous two and focussed on Parliamentary Reform. Also there was, to 1815, the final stage of the **Napoleonic Wars**. At various stages the government was faced with seditious meetings, urban discontent and various plots (Luddism, the March of the Blanketeers in 1817, Peterloo in 1819 and the Cato St. Conspiracy in 1820). Given that the governments were not seriously politically challenged candidates could argue that the most serious challenge of the period came from economic change and social discontent. This was made more acute by the relatively limited means at the disposal of government for ensuring law and order. It could be argued that the radical threat was handled repressively but sensibly, the economic one less so (the Corn Laws and then a punishing return to Cash Payments after 1819), although the economy was recovering post 1820. Much will depend on how serious candidates consider the challenges to be. Candidates need **not** know the details of the King's divorce. The case for the **Queen Caroline affair** was that it united Parliamentary opposition (the Whigs and others) with radical opposition on the government's weak point, George IV and royal scandal. It rallied the disaffected. The Whigs and Radicals successfully portrayed Caroline as the 'wronged woman' following her debarring from the Coronation in 1820 and the Divorce Bill that the King forced on a reluctant Lord Liverpool. Brougham, the Whig spokesman for the Queen, proved very effective in discrediting the monarchy right up to Caroline's death. Liverpool felt threatened politically (the general election of 1820 and perhaps more seriously the King's threat to dismiss him for his failure to obtain a divorce) but in practice her death in 1821 removed the problem and Liverpool was later able to reshuffle and emerge politically stronger by 1822. Caroline herself, given her promiscuity, was not an ideal role model for the radicals. The real loser was less Liverpool than George IV (and the monarchy). Liverpool's parliamentary majority was never in doubt.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

War and Peace 1793 – 1841

- 2 (a) **How successful were British foreign secretaries in ensuring a favourable balance of power during the period from 1814 to 1841?** [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the relative success of foreign secretaries in obtaining a favourable balance of power to 1841.

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

Candidates will need to understand why a Balance of Power was seen as a key British interest – that it was seen as stabilising Europe, thus encouraging trade, preventing the domination of any one power and the need for an expensive and difficult British intervention, as recently seen in the Napoleonic Wars. Castlereagh and Palmerston certainly accepted the need for it, although better candidates might argue that Canning was less certain, stressing his belief in enlightened self interest and the importance of pursuing these. The question refers to ‘success’ and candidates will need to decide when this occurred. A possible pattern would be to stress the success of Castlereagh in the period 1814 – 1817, when Britain was able to play a major role in the Vienna settlement, gaining both what she wanted (extra European supremacy) whilst appearing as an arbiter in Europe via the Congress System. This very much suited Britain’s interests. However by 1818 success seemed less assured as the Holy Alliance (based around an Austro-Russian rapprochement) threatened conservative ideological intervention in Italy and Central Europe. Castlereagh was forced to withdraw from the Congress system. Some might question Castlereagh’s success generally given that Britain was reluctant to intervene, Austria overburdened and Russia over-powerful. The Canning period could be a crucial test for success. It could be argued he backed a wider view of the balance of power, claiming to have brought in to play the New World (South America) to redress the balance of the Old. Was this rhetoric or did his policies of unilateral agreements with France and Russia over Greece and the Eastern Question successfully preserve the balance of power threatened by a resurgent Russia and a recovering France? However the period 1827 – 1841 is more open to question re success. Britain lost the initiative after Navarino and Russia was able to produce a balance favourable to herself by 1833 (The Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi). France too sought advantages in the Belgian Question and in Spain, Portugal and the Near East (Mehmet Ali). Palmerston took until 1841 to reverse Russia’s advantage at the Straits Convention, but was able to have an earlier success with the more compliant government of Louis Philippe in France. The Quadruple Alliance of Britain, France, Spain and Portugal in 1834 acted as a useful deterrent to the Holy Alliance, restoring a more favourable balance of power.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2 (b) How far did Canning's foreign policy differ from that of Castlereagh? [45]

Focus: A comparison of the foreign policies of Canning and Castlereagh

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

As a comparison question this is best handled by an examination of the issues that confronted both – their attitudes to the Congress System, to alliances in general and the Vienna settlement in particular, to France and Russia, to Latin America and the emerging Greek question. Better candidates will also be aware of changing circumstances between 1812 and 1827. This may well account for differences. Both men were personally very different (they fought a duel) and represented different strands of Toryism. Castlereagh was strong in Cabinet with royal support and was given great leeway in foreign policy. Canning was more insecure (hated by George IV) and had to rely more on Parliamentary and press support (does this explain the rhetorical differences?). Castlereagh had forged key contacts in Europe during the years of wartime coalition diplomacy (especially with Metternich) which Canning lacked. It enabled him to create the Vienna Settlement and the Congress System and to lay down key principles of foreign policy in the State Paper of 1820. Much will depend on whatever candidates see Canning as continuing this in differing circumstances or whether he created a new set of 'independent' principles which foreswore alliance diplomacy in favour of unilateral treaties of self interest (Treaty of London in 1827 over the Greek Question). Did Castlereagh already presage this by non attendance at the Congresses of Troppau and Laibach after 1818, in which case there is more continuity than difference in attitudes to the European powers and intervention? An undoubted area of difference is Latin America, where Castlereagh had been reluctant to recognise the rebellious Spanish colonies as independent whereas Canning did so, securing favoured nation status for British trade. However if Castlereagh had survived would he too have been forced to recognise them? The Greek Question could be seen as a new problem for Canning, one on which Castlereagh did not have time to formulate policies other than waiting upon events. Nonetheless it illustrates Canning's approach and methods, which were certainly different – recognising rebellion and working with enemies (Russia) to ensure British interests were not ignored.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Age of Peel 1829 – 1846

- 3 (a) **How far do you agree that Peel was a poor party leader during the period to 1846? Explain your answer.**

Focus: an evaluation of Peel as a party leader.

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

Candidates will need to be aware of the debate over party and patronage in the period. Arguably Peel still adhered to a combination of patronage and Pittite concepts of the King's government in which party groupings existed purely to rubber stamp executive government. He did not believe that a 'party' approach to politics and government was appropriate; hence he was not especially good at being a party leader, particularly when in government. Candidates could cite many examples of Peel overriding or ignoring his party after 1841 – his alienation of paternalists over the Poor Law and Factory Reform, his sidelining of the Agricultural interest over Corn Law reduction and repeal, the annoyance of vested interests over freer trade and the Sugar Duties and of Anglican interests over Maynooth. These had a cumulative effect so that by Maynooth and Corn Law Repeal he was reliant on Whig and Peelite support. His party was in opposition to him. However candidates could draw a different picture from the 1830's - his refusal to form a government during the Reform Act crisis, the use of the Tamworth Manifesto, rebuilding the party post 1832, the successful handling of the first premiership in 1834/35, the elections of 1837 and 1841 and his handling of the Bedchamber Crisis in 1839. Here he trod carefully to reconstruct a Tory party and broaden it into Conservatism by wooing all but the Ultras. The 1841 election reassured Tories in that it was fought over the defence of land. Better candidates could provide examples of effective party leadership in the 1840's – his continued mastery of the Commons, his popular approach to O'Connell's demands, his attempt to hand the 'poisoned chalice' to Russell during the Corn Law crisis etc. He largely managed to retain royal support in the period. Candidates will differ in their approach and attitude on this question. What matters is how they handle the evidence.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 (b) 'The Budgets of 1842 and 1845 were the most successful reforms of Peel's 1841-46 government'. How far do you agree?

Focus: an evaluation of the relative success of Peel's reforms 1841-46.

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

Candidates will need to establish criteria for success and could, with profit, use Peel's own – cost effective and carefully thought out reform schemes; economy and care with finance; stabilising measures in both finance and law and order; recognising and controlling industrialisation and its worse effects and feeding a growing urbanised population. They could also use those of contemporaries – his ability to push them through; his concern for working class budgets; popular respect; the acceptability of much of what he did. Most candidates are likely to argue that the **Budgets** were the most successful, citing the clever linking of carrot (lower duties and a cheapening of the manufacturing base) with stick (the need, following Whig bankruptcy, for an Income Tax). Thus sound government finance, a boost to manufacturing and a broadening of consumption were all combined. Politically this was astute as it could and was portrayed as temporary. When the economy picked up in 1845 such experiments could be seen as vindicated and further free trade could occur on a less controversial basis. In terms of a wider economic impact the Budgets could be questioned (recovery occurring through a combination of factors, not least the impact of railways). This could lead candidates to consider whether other reforms had more success, the obvious candidates being the **Corn Laws**, a much more controversial action than the Budgets and possibly with more impact (cheap food) on ordinary people and on social stability. It was certainly more politicised thanks to the Anti Corn Law League. Another area would be **Factory Reform**. Peel certainly regarded it as vital in preserving a free labour market, although candidates could point to the failure of its educational aspects and to the role of others. **Irish reform** would be useful to point to some failure – on land (the Devon Commission and Land Bill) and the Catholic Church (Charities and Maynooth). **Bank and Company Reform** is a useful area – a stabilised gold standard in the Bank Charter Act was the key to sterling's 19th century supremacy and to fiscal orthodoxy well into the 20th century, whilst the Company Act and Railways demonstrated both the need for, and the difficulties of, regulating early industrial capitalism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Economy and Industrialisation 1780 – 1846

- 4 (a) **How important were railways compared with other forms of transport in the period to 1846? Explain your answer**

Focus: an assessment of the relative importance of railways within the transport sector by 1846.

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

Candidates will need to focus on the relative importance of railways in the later period, from 1825 to 1846 vis à vis roads and canals. Most are likely to argue that, following the two bursts of major rail investment, in 1837-40 and 1846/47, railways had come to dominate both passenger and goods transport. The sums flowing into rail investment dwarfed earlier investments in turnpikes and canal mania (1790's). Trade opened up by this outstripped canals by the 1840's. Most key cities were linked by rail by 1846. Travel by canal or poor quality road took much longer and was frequently less direct. However, better candidates will stress that on short haul routes canals often still dominated the carrying trade. Railway freight rates remained high in the second quarter of the 19th century, especially so given the mergers and larger companies of the 1840's. Canals, to compete, undercut rail and remained significant, both for cheap passenger travel and bulk transport, especially of agricultural produce. The fact that rail companies resorted to buying up canals, either to close them or raise their prices, indicates their continued importance. Similarly the coastal shipping trade remained relatively unaffected, especially coal from the North East (rail had originally developed here as a means of facilitating coastal transport eg the Stockton-Darlington railway). Road transport reacted by becoming more located around the railway. Nonetheless in terms of the numbers employed and the infrastructure required, railways were clearly dominant in the public mind of the early Victorians by 1846. Although freight and fare costs only began to drop in 1846, or after, the foundation for rail dominance had been laid. There was also a considerable 'knock-on' effect on other industries, notably iron and coal, which canals and roads did not have.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 4 (b) How far do you agree that enclosure was the most serious problem affecting the rural economy during the period from 1780 to 1846?

Focus: an assessment of rural problems in the period 1780 – 1846

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

Candidates will need to examine rural problems to establish the relative importance of **enclosures**. They had been perceived as a problem for centuries, especially in the late 18th and early 19th century (1770's and 1790's) when high agricultural prices acted as a stimulant (General Enclosure Acts). They were attacked as symbolic of large landowner greed, depriving the very poor of habitation rights (squatters), reducing small landowners to the status of labourers and of displacing the cottagers who had no legal proof of ownership. The object was seen to be higher rents, achieved by landlord class in Parliament. However this view could be challenged. Britain's regions varied enormously. Enclosure was more a problem in the South, particularly the Midlands, East Anglia and Lincolnshire. It had much less impact on the North and West. The North especially had alternative employment opportunities, was already pastoralised and had higher rural wages. Similarly it could be argued that in those areas affected by enclosure the size of farms remained the same. Each village differed in its typography and circumstances. There was also the plus side of increased production and efficiency and responsiveness to markets. Anti enclosure riots were rare and the Swing Riots of 1830 occurred in counties relatively unaffected by enclosure. Candidates could well argue that a more serious problem was **population increase**, uniform across the country. This led to structural imbalance whereby job opportunities lagged behind population in some rural areas, especially the South and East. As a result wages were depressed and underemployment increased, made worse by the usual rural rhythm of seasonal unemployment. Farm servants were replaced by temporary labourers. This may have been more responsible for poverty amongst rural labourers not able to migrate easily to industrial towns. A further problem was the **collapse of artisan industry** in the South West and East Anglia in the face of northern industrial competition, thus reducing the opportunities for alternative employment in these areas. Candidates might also cite the **Speenhamland System** as evidence of the prevalence of this problem (and possibly link this to the Swing Riots rather than enclosure). It was much criticised at the time for institutionalising such problems (keeping insufficient pools of labour subsidised out of the rates). Thus **low wages** and **casual labour** were arguably a more serious problem than enclosure, especially after 1815. Another major problem post 1815 was the **fall in food prices following the war**. This led to depression in agriculture and more unemployment than between 1780 and 1815. This was certainly not linked to enclosure.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

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

- 5 (a) **Assess the reasons for Palmerston's political dominance during the period from 1855 to 1865.**

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for Palmerton's political dominance

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

Candidates will be expected to establish the relative importance of the various factors for his dominance. A good case could be established for the prime importance of his **foreign policy** stances. He came to power in 1855 on the issue of an effective prosecution of the Crimean War and appeared to have won it by the Treaty of Paris. In the 1857 election his victory was largely due to the pursuit of an aggressive policy in China. He carefully maintained his reputation for defending British interests, championing popular issues like Italian Unification, carefully handling the American Civil War and even avoiding damage over the Danish Duchies. These contributed to his final electoral victory in 1865. However foreign policy wasn't always a vote winner. The Orsini affair led to defeat and resignation in 1858. Candidates could also point to many **domestic** factors in his favour, not least a divided Conservative Party, economic stability and his political astuteness in finally binding the non Tory elements together in Parliament to forge a new alliance / party (the Liberals) in 1859. Once the Whigs, Peelites and Radicals came together under his leadership there was little but death that could shift him. He also cultivated the press, (much helped by the Abolition of the Paper Duties), played down earlier disputes with Russell and above all established a working relationship with the rising financial star of Gladstone, his Chancellor from 1859. This ensured a dose of extensive Peelite free trade, low taxation and administrative reform that gave added lustre to the mid Victorian love affair with a stable and maturing industrial economy. After the hiccup of 1858 some candidates might see this carefully handled and difficult relationship of Prime Minister and Chancellor as the key to his dominance after 1859. It brought in the upper working class and the urban middle class, especially its activist non conformist element. Palmerston was the perfect balance between Gladstone, Cobden and Bright on the one hand and Russell and the aristocratic Whigs on the other. He also avoided the possible pitfalls of Ireland and Parliamentary Reform. All of this was immensely popular to a stable, propertied and limited electorate for whom Palmerton had come to personify Britain at its complacent zenith.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 (b) **How popular was Gladstonian Liberalism during the period to 1874? Explain your answer.**

Focus: an assessment of the popularity of Gladstonian Liberalism.

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

Two approaches are possible here, one that looks at various sectors of society and their attitudes to Gladstonian Liberalism and another that looks at the relative popularity of various liberal issues (peace, retrenchment, moderate reform, merit, free trade and an internationalist foreign policy). Candidates will need to establish the extent of popularity. For example, foreign policy might be popular amongst radicals and nonconformists but was much less so to the Whigs, ordinary Liberal MPs and much of the electorate, as the Crimea and Alabama incident showed. Irish policy could also divide depending on which aspect was under consideration. Disestablishment was popular amongst most Whigs, Liberal, Radicals, Nonconformists and the Celtic Fringe but University proposals and Irish land proved very divisive, alienating land, Whigs, the radical Irish and the working class. The propertied and the Non conformists were attracted by Gladstonian Liberalism's belief in individualism, toleration and moral energy but this could be lost by liberal legislation on education (Forster) and licensing. In general the Upper Classes were divided over it. As the period wore on more came to distrust it, even amongst the Whigs. The Urban middle classes and professionals found in it a suitable set of political ideas. Activist individuals with a cause especially found it an appropriate vehicle for their various radicalisms. Nonetheless the growth of stability and suburbia in the 1870's, especially in London, would increasingly find it a less popular set of ideas. The skilled Upper Working class also found it attractive in fitting their self help ambitions via the New Model Unions. Nonconformist rural areas were interested, but most of the countryside and the unskilled working class found Gladstonian Liberalism too demanding and harsh. Whether it rather than other issues won elections in the period is a moot point.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Conservatives 1846 – 1880

- 6 (a) 'The loss of Peel and his followers was the most important reason why the Conservatives were out of office for much of the period from 1846 to 1874'. How far do you agree?

Focus: an evaluation of the reason for Conservative weakness from 1846 – 1874

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

A good case could be made for the **loss of the Peelites** as the key factor in keeping the Conservatives out of office. Their departure in 1846 led to disputes and problems over the leadership for the rest of the 1840's (triumvirates were suggested) followed by an uneasy relationship between Derby and Disraeli until the former's retirement in 1867/8. Derby was no match for Aberdeen and then Gladstone. Most expected the return of the Peelites to conservatism up to 1859 but their aloofness and talents were largely given to Whig-Liberal coalitions. With so much leadership 'lost', plus the fifty plus MPs (dwindling by the 1850s) the Conservatives were at a political disadvantage when it came to staffing minority governments (the 'Who, Who?' Ministry of 1852). The loss of the Peelites also meant the loss of a moderate conservative ideology that was financially and administratively 'expert'. Gladstone was able to monopolise this, despite Disraeli's best efforts. However by the 1860's some candidates could argue that the conservatives were recovering and other factors may have been more important, not least **Derby's continuing timidity** and **mistrust of Disraeli**, himself a major obstacle to the return of the Peelites. However some candidates could point to slow recovery and the maintenance of a large number of MPs. The minority governments did seek to tackle major issues – budgeting reform, foreign policy issues, the reorganisation of India and very successful parliamentary reform in 1867. A key issue that kept them out of office was **protectionism**. Although Disraeli slowly sought to bury this in the 1850s suspicions remained in an electorate that was dominated by increasingly urban values. It took time to break out of this. Also of crucial importance was the Whig / Liberal (ultimately **Liberal Party**) who combined the Whig aristocracy with Radical and Peelite elements. This, with **Palmerston's** stout defence of Britain's interests abroad, made it very difficult to establish a distinct conservatism that was not minority based until the Gladstone first ministry.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 (b) 'A belief in stability at home was more important than promoting the British Empire in the development of Disraelian Conservatism to 1880'. How far do you agree?

Focus: A comparison of the relative importance of two factors in Disraelian Conservatism to 1880.

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

Chronologically candidates are likely to agree with the assertion that domestic stability was the more important. In the 1850s and 1860s this was the tenor of Disraeli's approach. In 1874 he promised the electorate 'respite' from Gladstone's 'harassing legislation'. His vision, developed from his novels, was of an England that respected class adhered to a 'one-nation' view of affairs and accepted the leadership of monarchy, Church and aristocracy. He accepted the Peelite inheritance (free trade and moderate reform) and adopted a practical approach to imperial problems that arguably regarded them as unnecessary diversions (as Chancellor in 1852 he regarded colonies as 'millstones around our necks' given their financial implications, whilst in 1858 India was reorganised without any particular appeal to the electorate on grounds of the Conservatives being the party of Empire). During his 2nd Ministry he was much preoccupied with Church matters (the Ritual Act) which was concerned to stabilise Anglicanism and defend it from high Church pretensions. Similarly there was a concern with landed interests (an Education Act prevented the incursion of rate aided Board Schools into landed counties). There was no attempt to deal actively with Ireland or the Agricultural Depression. Candidates could also point to his industrial and social reform as stemming from accepted liberal approaches. Nonetheless it is possible to argue that imperial promotion developed in the 1870s as a key strategy to promote conservatism. The death of Palmerston in 1865 and Gladstone's dislike of imperial gestures led Disraeli to devote much of his Manchester and Crystal Palace speeches to the view that there was a liberal conspiracy to 'dish' the Empire. Was this the most important aspect of both the 1874 and 1880 elections, both fought in part over imperial issues? Disraeli certainly used the purchase of the Suez Canal shares and the Royal Titles Act to pose as the saviour of India, although it is doubtful that his imperial vision was as thought through as the new imperialism of the next generation. Was intervention in Southern Africa and Afghanistan part of this? Certainly Empire became important to Conservatism in the 1870s but possibly, like stability, this was more an electoral reaction to Gladstonian Liberalism. Disraeli did not develop his imperial views in novels, or elsewhere (as he had done his social ones), suggesting that stability was, for him, the more important aspect of Disraelian Conservatism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846 – 1902

- 7 (a) **To what extent did an expanding empire become the main aim of British foreign policy during the second half of the 19th century?**

Focus: an evaluation of the aims and priorities of British foreign policy, 1846 – 1902

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

Candidates may agree with the question, citing an ‘imperial’ age when, as the largest European empire, in a period when larger, more populous, continental states were industrialising and threatening her supremacy, Britain came to see that preserving and extending that empire and market were her priorities. This involved maintaining naval supremacy, securing trade routes (Suez Canal), buttressing southern Africa and India by expansion and absorption of the Transvaal and forthright action in Afghanistan and Tibet. It involved setting strategic limits to French influence in N.E. Africa (the Fashoda Incident), to Russian influence in the Far East via alliance with Japan and to German involvement in both Africa and China. Until 1904 it also meant splendid isolation, dealing with internal problems in southern Africa and the Sudan (Khartoum to Omdurman). However candidates can challenge this. For the first 30 years of the period the Empire expanded little and impinged only through rebellion (the Indian Mutiny). For Gladstone and Disraeli the problems were financial and peripheral, the colonial ‘Millstones’ around our necks. From the 1870s Britain reacted more than she initiated in the Scramble for Africa. Imperial problems like the Boer War, whilst creating a European dimension, remained a British / Boer affair. Joe Chamberlain failed to make the Empire the centre of British foreign policy concerns. It could be argued that either traditional issues, like fear of Russian or French power, were far more central to Palmerston, Russell, Granville, Derby, Disraeli and Lord Salisbury, than the Empire. The traditional balance of power, determined first by the Eastern Question, then by the Unification of Germany, was their main concern. Its preservation was vital for British trade, for stability in Europe. The Empire was subservient to this. At the end of the period rapprochement with imperial enemies (like France) occurred when Germany threatened the balance through her alliance with Austria, a new navy and large scale military expansion. Better candidates will see the connection between European and imperial issues, especially in the second half of the period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 7 (b) **How far did the Boer War (1899 – 1902) affect the popularity and prestige of the British Empire during the period to 1902?**

Focus: an evaluation of the impact of the Boer Wars on the Empire to 1902.

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

Candidates should provide a balanced answer as the impact varied. It is expected that there will be a focus on the 2nd Boer War but to gain access to Bands I – III there should be some references to the 1st Boer War. The latter had a mixed impact on the history of the Empire. The annexation of the Transvaal in 1878 proved popular in many circles (but not all). However the resulting Zulu Wars were damaging to prestige, especially the Zulu victory at Isandhlwana and certainly damaged Disraeli's political reputation. Gladstone similarly was damaged by the Boer uprising in 1880 and the ensuing war. Defeat at Majuba Hill was as humiliating as Isandhlwana, if not more so, whilst Gladstone was much criticised for confirming a sort of Home Rule for the Transvaal in the Convention of Pretoria. However candidates could argue that Britain won the Zulu Wars (Nkambule) and that a loose federation in southern Africa had been the intention all along. Gladstone was sensibly stabilising an area at minimum cost by conceding internal independence. Imperial prestige and popularity were secured. By the time of the Zulu War much more was at stake – Britain and its colonial government in the Cape had been humiliated by the inept Jameson Raid and were determined not to be dictated to by trading companies whilst the Boers had the sympathy of Europe (not least the Kaiser in the Kruger telegram). Key economic interests were at stake – diamonds and gold. The British Army in South Africa had suffered a series of humiliations at the hands of Boer farmers and a difficult guerrilla war had ensued. Failure in this might set an unfortunate precedent, to be taken to heart by Indian and other colonial peoples. It followed the imperial panoply of the Jubilees and bitterly split Britons into pro and anti Boers. Candidates could point to its popularity – the press stressed its righteous glory, there was a rush to volunteer, noisy celebrations on the relief of Mafeking in 1900 and electoral victory for the Conservatives in the 'khaki election' of 1900. However, enthusiasm soon waned for the war when it dragged on in guerrilla fashion involving brutal methods under Kitchener that laid waste Boer land. 30,000 died in 'concentration' camps and there was much comment that Britain was only fighting to aid City financiers exploit the gold reserves (Hobson's point). More British troops died than in the Crimean War (many from disease). Britain's imperial and moral prestige was dented and the Empire was no longer seen always to play positively at home (methods of Barbarism, Chinese Slavery, the unfitness of many recruits etc).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Trade Unions and Labour 1867 – 1906

- 8 (a) **How far did government from 1867 to 1906 enable trade unions to expand their influence?**

Focus: an assessment of the role of governments in the expansion of trade union influence

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

Candidates will need to assess the extent to which trade unions could progress only in so far as governments allowed them or whether, through their own efforts, they could persuade governments to condone or even encourage their activities. Did governments lead or follow the trade unions? Candidates could argue that governments were the crucial factor in controlling trade union influence. Such influence was varied - on membership, organisation, the effect on industrial and economic policy, the effect on employers and industry in general, help for workers (conditions, hours, pay, and self help) and on class solidarity. Much of this was dependent on their legal position, including their potential 'friendly society' status. This was controlled by governments who, throughout the period, were determined to resist anything perceived to be 'in restraint of trade'. A free labour market was deemed essential so closed shops were prevented. This ensured that although unions were legal any attempt to pursue associated rights were legally dubious. The unions were isolated following the Hornby v. Close case in the 1860s, showing they couldn't even protect their funds. The Sheffield Outrages (closed shop) were roundly condemned. Similarly, in the 1880s, the Unions and their 'strikes' were resisted. In the 1890s the law was again rigorously interpreted to ensure union liability for losses, culminating in the Taff Vale Judgement (1901) and the Blackburn Weavers Case (1903). A maturing industrial economy required a 'reasonable' trade union movement. Good industrial relationships were important, as was a self help approach to welfare that some trade unions were keen to indulge. Thus governments were prepared to legalise such activities provided the balance was kept between this and the flexing of too much industrial muscle. Reform Acts were passed by Conservative and Liberal governments and, in the 1870s, Trade Union legalisation gave great power to the Unions but limited their ability to picket, confirmed in Lyons v. Wilkins in 1896 and reconfirmed by the Court of Appeal in 1897. In 1906 the Trades Dispute Act indemnified Unions against financial liability for strikes. However, after 1884, governments did not move further on 'democracy' and stood more aloof from the Unions. Candidates could also argue that Union influence was determined much more by economic developments, by ideological issues ('socialism' in the 1880s), class issues and by employer reactions than by government which, by its reluctance to interfere in education, economic and welfare issues, restricted its impact on union development.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 8 (b) 'Keir Hardie was by far the most important leader of the labour movement and party to 1906.' How far do you agree?

Focus: an evaluation of the relative importance of Keir Hardie as a labour leader to 1906

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

Candidates will need to compare Hardie's leadership with other 'labour' leaders up to 1906. These could include Ramsay MacDonald, the SDF leader H.M. Hyndman, the Fabians Sydney and Beatrice Webb, trade unionists like Ben Tillet, Tom Mann and Annie Besant or individuals like the ILPer Philip Snowden. Candidates need not deploy extensive detail about all such leaders provided the context is clear – that labour was suspicious of leadership and that the movement consisted of many class and ideological strands that would make unity difficult (divisions over 'independence', over detail or a general commitment to socialism, over collective ownership, over tactics and the relative importance of the trade unions, over finances, to name but a few). Better candidates will avoid separate accounts of leaders which fail to compare relative strength and weakness. It is likely candidates will consider Hardie to be the most important, at least in the period to 1901, both in and out of parliament. MacDonald might be seen as the more important between 1901 and 1906, although he did not become an MP until as late as 1906. Similarly, over a long period of time the Webbs were crucial in policy formation (evolutionary Fabian socialism of a 'gas and municipal' nature) and in seeking to influence opinion making in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain. As regards an active championing of the working class Tillet, Mann and Besant were very prominent in the 1880s. Yet Hardie was crucial, both as one of the first 3 MPs elected in 1892 and as foresighted enough to work for labour independence (from the liberals to which he had first belonged). It was he who brought the Trade Unions into association with a labour political party, thus providing funds, membership and organisation transcending a largely middle class socialist leadership. Whilst MacDonald shared this he lacked the position, image (cloth cap and dignity of labour) that Hardie provided. Hardie founded the Scottish Labour Party in 1888, the first party to champion independent labour representation, and then the socialist ILP in 1893. Hardie organised the mining Unions, even though they remained liberal throughout this period. Hardie's main claim to be the most important was his role in creating the L.R.C in 1900, becoming its leader in 1906. He was able to ensure that a general rather than specific commitment to socialism was made to allow liberal trade unionists to join. After 1900 a case could be made for the Webbs or for MacDonald, the latter being 1st Secretary and negotiating the Electoral Part of 1903 with the liberals that enabled labour's first breakthrough in the 1906 election. The labour movement and party bore the often contradictory stamp of many influences and leaders and better candidates will be aware of this.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

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

- 9 (a) **How far do you agree that poor leadership was the main problem for the Conservatives during the period from 1899 to 1905?**

Focus: an evaluation of the role of leadership in the problems of the Conservatives 1899 – 1905

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Conservative leadership during this period could be viewed as either poor or an asset. Much depends on how candidates wish to view the 'Hotel Cecil,' as it was nicknamed (Lord Salisbury to 1903 and then his nephew, Arthur Balfour, to his resignation in 1905). Up to 1900 there seemed few problems. Liberal dominance had been broken and the Conservatives seemed to be establishing the sort of roots that would lead to continued predominance. However it could be argued that leadership was weak. Lord Salisbury was deeply pessimistic, opposed to change, especially anything constructive on social or parliamentary reform. From 1900 he was ill and gave little time to domestic affairs. His nephew Balfour had a reputation as an intellectual but, like Salisbury, failed to inspire electorally or personally. His education act in 1902 was politically ill advised, reinforcing Nonconformist support for liberalism and reflecting an elitist approach to educational developments. He also failed to manage Chamberlain and the dangerous split occasioned by Tariff Reform. It is this which candidates are more likely to see as one of the key problems, although it reflects Balfour's failure to control a divisive policy. Chamberlain resigned to campaign for imperial preference, the free traders opposed it. The party was split and the liberals were galvanised by the defence of Free Trade. Revenue from Tariffs was also the Tory solution to finance social reform and prevented them from proceeding along the more electorally popular route of taxation on the rich and self help contributory schemes. This helped to lose working men, previously attracted by Empire and economic stability. Another key problem proved to be the Empire and the Boer War. Balfour's government took the blame for the prolongation of the war, its 'barbarous methods,' and for policies like 'Chinese Slavery' which further alienated the working class, already annoyed by Conservative failure to reverse Taff Vale and by conservative association with the plutocratic wealthy. The Boer War set an agenda of social reform and concern which, with the exception of the Unemployed Workman's Act, the Conservatives failed to rise to, except through unpopular Tariff Reform. Candidates could see such problems as 'stand alone' or due to mismanagement by the leadership.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 9 (b) How important an issue was the female franchise for the Liberal party during the period from 1906 – 1918'. Explain your answer.

Focus: an evaluation of the issues affecting the fortunes of the liberal party 1900 – 1918

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. This is wide ranging and detail is not expected. Candidates should consider a range of factors affecting the Liberal party, one of which is clearly the issue of **female suffrage**. This did not affect liberal fortunes up to 1906 but it can be argued that the impact of the WSPU (formed 1903) contributed to a crisis for liberalism before 1914 and to a largely pro conservative but limited female electorate in 1918. The WSPU disrupted liberal meetings as early as 1905. As the government after 1906 the liberals, although containing some support for limited female suffrage, bore the brunt of the middle class suffragettes. It faced growing militancy after 1910, failing to solve it in the 1st Conciliation Bill of 1911 with its limited proposals on suffrage for the single and propertied. The liberal party's methods in dealing with Hunger Strikes were counter productive. However it could be argued that, after Davison's 'martyrdom', the tide turned against the WSPU and the War let the liberals off the hook until 1918. The **wider problem of the franchise** was serious. Women could not be put on an equal footing with men as many working class men lacked the vote. If the working class in general had the vote, its female side might favour the conservatives, its men the labour party. New liberalism could be seen as a tactic to secure liberal fortunes in a more democratic era but much depends on how the franchise factor worked. The elections of 1910 suggest it did not work as a tactic as some of the policies were unpopular. The **Labour party** also threatened liberalism and could be seen as the decisive factor, their influence growing after 1910 and through the Pacts negotiated to prevent three-way contests. Liberalism also had to deal with the old divisive issue of **Irish Home Rule**, another major factor in its fortunes from 1912 to the collapse of the pro liberal Irish nationalists in 1918. However many candidates might argue that the **War** was the major determinant of liberal fortunes, destroying its liberal precepts and dividing its leaders in the Asquith – Lloyd George split of 1916. The war also rescued a divided conservative party. Candidates will need to balance the female suffrage against these other factors in the fortunes of the Liberals to 1918.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Inter – War Domestic Problems 1918 – 1939

- 10 (a) **To what extent was trade union unrest the main cause of the General Strike in 1926?**

Focus: An evaluation of the causes of the General Strike 1926

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to analyse the Trade Unions, especially the N.U.M, and set them alongside a consideration of other factors – the attitudes of the coal owners, their response to adverse terms in world trade which saw British coal as increasingly uncompetitive and government policy towards the industry. The role of the press and its owners, especially the Daily Mail, could also be considered as a strike trigger. The case for Union unrest as the main cause is the growing power and influence of the Unions up to the 1st World War and their reaction to changed economic conditions after it. Here a useful distinction is to be made between the Miners (led by Smith and Cook) and the leadership of the Union movement in general who were reluctant to act and certainly unprepared to stage a General Strike. The latter were prepared to accept Samuel's recommendation as a basis of settlement (wage cuts but a cap on hours and the promise of reorganisation). The Miners were less prepared to compromise. Previously the aristocrats of the labour market and long unionised they were especially hit by economic contraction, new fuels, poor geological conditions and under investment in mining technology. Employers argued that a competitive price could only be achieved at the expense of the miners. Having scored victories in the Sankey Commission and on 'Red' Friday (government wage subsidy) they were keen to make a stand on behalf of other well organised but struggling industries. They failed to see Red Friday as simply a government tactic to buy time to stockpile and prepare for a strike. The government made much of the constitutional point, that the Union threatened the will of an elected government, but there is little evidence of this. The Unions were moderate, embarked on the Strike reluctantly and were defensive in their propaganda. Even the Miners considered that they were defending an industrial community from attack rather than making a syndicalist point. It is possible to point to press and government intransigence, combined with an economic policy that was in part mistaken (returning to an overvalued currency backed by gold in 1925) as the main cause. The government was certainly determined to stand by private ownership and lower labour costs. It was the government that precipitated a strike on 3 May 1926 by calling off negotiations, not the Unions.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

10 (b) **How far did the National governments adopt new policies towards unemployment during the period from 1931 to 1939?**

Focus: an assessment of the unemployment policies of the National governments 1931 – 39

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to appreciate the differences between traditional economic policies (retrenchment and cuts in government spending, balancing the budget, deflationary policies, avoiding high taxes, maintaining free Trade and free competition etc.) and new departures (selective protection, pump priming, assistance to specified areas and industries, intervention re re-organisation, cheap money, floating exchange rates etc.). On balance some candidates might argue that the National governments made considerable headway with new policies, moving towards cautious protectionism via the Ottawa agreements, abandoning the Gold Standard in 1931, (which allowed lower interest rates and a cheaper pound that boosted exports) and intervening via the Special Area Act in 1934. Candidates could, with profit, examine the work of Neville Chamberlain. Agricultural subsidies were a not so subtle way of supporting prices, whilst there were some moves towards nationalisation (London transport in 1931, Coal Royalties 1938 and air transport in 1939). However candidates could point to much that was traditional about government economic policy. National governments were dominated by conservatives. Those who were National Labour, MacDonald and Snowden in particular, were Victorian in their approach. Both had split with labour to preserve a balanced budget by cuts that fell disproportionately on workers and the poor. Those associated with more radical approaches (Lloyd George and Mosley) were sidelined. The National Government had been determined to save the Pound. The abandonment of Gold came because of crisis and necessity, not through a belief that it might be beneficial. Chamberlain's actions were cautious. The Special Areas Act was small in scale, governments interfered only to tinker and create free market or equal trading terms, as they did with Housing. As an export based economy Britain could not resort to full scale Protectionism, except in steel. More radical thinking (Keynes and the General Theory 1936) was slow to evolve and little appreciated outside liberal and intellectual circles. Later boosts to heavy industry came very late through rearmament, reluctantly undertaken because of the demonstrable threat from Germany. The issue of public investment and how it was viewed would help candidates establish a case for either tradition or novelty.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Foreign Policy 1939 – 1963

- 11 (a) **How far would you agree that Britain followed the policy of decolonisation mainly for economic and financial reasons during the period from 1945 to 1960?**

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for decolonisation 1945 – 60

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

It is likely that candidates will agree with the assertion. Britain faced huge **economic difficulties** after 1945. Military and defence costs were crippling but the issue was complicated by the British perception that the Empire was less the problem than part of the solution to her economic difficulties (a closed imperial economy with guaranteed markets, cheap food and raw materials). This was especially so in Africa and Malaysia where, from 1945 – 1959, Britain pursued a series of economic schemes. It was also evident in the creation of the Sterling Area (a form of protection against the US and a means of earning Dollars). From this, some candidates could argue that economic and financial reasons prevented rather than encouraged decolonisation. They could cite the Colonial Development Corporation (1948) the Groundnut Scheme and a Middle Eastern presence (oil) as examples of this. A better economic case could be made for the 1950s when trade was less with the Empire than with developed economics (Europe). Few were willing to invest in underdeveloped areas, the sterling area looked less desirable and there was growing colonial resentment at the distortion of their economies for Britain's benefit. This lay behind Britain's decision to abandon the African Empire after 1959. However candidates could argue that other factors were more important in decolonisation, especially **US hostility** (partly economic) to colonialism. Much US pressure was put on Britain to make Sterling freely convertible in 1947, to abandon India in 1947 and Palestine in 1948 and, in 1956 especially, to abandon Suez and Egypt. Unless Britain played the Cold War card, as she did in Malaysia, such pressure was difficult to resist. Britain was also under **pressure from colonial national movements**, such as the Gold Coast Riots in 1950, the Quit India Movement and the Mau Mau in Kenya. This too impacted on costs, a good example of how factors could be linked. Although there were many attempts to foster local elites and economies the strategy usually involved an **acceptance of independence as a goal** that tended to come sooner rather than later. This could be seen as the main reason for decolonisation by the 1950s. Similarly some may make much of **political changes in Britain** itself, especially the attitudes of the political parties, originally united in resisting decolonisation. Talk centred on 'managing decolonisation' as part of retaining influence' (Macmillan after 1957). Racism at home also encouraged decolonisation. Better answers will be aware of changes over time and of particular factors affecting particular parts of the Empire.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 11 (b) To what extent was fear of Russian expansionism the main reason for Britain's involvement in the Cold War during the period from 1945 to 1953?

Focus: an evaluation of the reason for British Cold War involvement 1945 – 1953

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

A variety of reasons need to be comparatively assessed alongside **Russian expansionism**. Candidates could stress fear of such expansion as a traditional nightmare for the British, made worse by the growth of Soviet power in Europe during the 2nd World War and after. This was confirmed by Soviet behaviour in her occupied zone post Yalta. It was clear that the USSR was Britain's major enemy on a variety of fronts (in Persia, Italy, Greece and Turkey between 1946 and 1947) whilst Communism in general had to be resisted (Korea). Britain saw herself as the **major European power**, her German involvement was non negotiable. Crises there and her 'occupying presence' involved her in confrontation with the USSR. British policy makers saw Russia's aims as geo-political, not modestly defensive, particularly when the USSR moved against traditional British interests in the Mediterranean and the Middle East. Candidates can equally point to the importance of other factors – the need to maintain **Great Power** status, the need to **influence and obtain US aid** (financial and military) to make Russian containment work. This involved playing the Cold War card, both to alert the US to Soviet intentions and to then suggest joint action and a US commitment to European spheres. Britain's **global position** inevitably involved Britain in most aspects of the Cold War. Neutrality or isolationism was simply not an option for British policy makers and they fought to involve the US in areas traditionally seen as British preserves. Britain also involved herself militarily by attempting to maintain sizable forces overseas and by pursuing an independent nuclear option to defend her from the Russia threat. Most candidates will appreciate the need for Britain to operate both an Atlantic and a European strategy against the USSR. Better candidates will see the various factors as part of the same set of issues.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Post War Britain 1945 – 1964

- 12 (a) How far would you agree that the main reason why Labour lost the 1951 General Election was the re-organisation of the Conservative Party?

Focus: an assessment of the reason why labour lost the 1951 General Election

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

Candidates could point to much recovery and reorganisation of the Conservatives since their damaging 1945 defeat when they had been associated with a failure to deliver on social reform and unimaginative policies, foreign and economic, in the Depression years. The scale of their defeat ensured **structural reorganisation**. This had been run down during the war years. Key constituency staff were put in place; there were membership and money raising initiatives by Lord Woolton which made the Conservative Party one of the largest organisations in the UK. Image problems were tackled with a Young Conservative movement reviving grass roots support. The party's structure was democratised following the Maxwell – Fyfe Report in 1949 allowing more open selection of candidates. In policy terms the Conservatives accepted the Welfare State consensus established by labour thanks to 'Rab' Butler, Macleod, Maudling and Powell (a property owning democracy). An Industrial Charter was produced in 1947 acknowledging co-operation, the role of the Trade Unions and a role for the State in maintaining full employment. All this led to a report in 1949 'The Right Road for Britain', which became the party's manifesto. Pledges were made on more house building, a perceived labour failure and an attractive vote winner. However candidates could argue that the main reason was the **economy and continued 'austerity'**, the state of which was blamed on Labour. Devaluation benefits had yet to work through, restrictions remained irritating, rationing was particularly disliked (the 'Housewives' League). Certainly these provided two key electoral issues in 1951. There was also the **Cold War** where the Conservatives could play on patriotism and defence again. It is also perfectly possible to argue that labour lost in 1951 rather than the Conservatives winning it through active policies and reorganisation. **Internal labour divisions** had worsened between left and right (Bevan v. Morrison), brought to a head by Gaitskell's proposals for rearmament to deal with Korea and Britain's cold war commitments, which meant prescription charges being imposed on Bevan's Health Service, 'free at the point of care'. Bevan, Wilson and Freeman resigned from the labour government in April 1951. Nationalisation of Iron and Steel in 1951 also proved electorally damaging. However it is difficult to prove their precise electoral impact. The 1951 election was very close, Labour scoring its highest poll to date with a larger share of the vote. It could simply be a **pendular** swing with little to do with either Conservative revival or labour difficulties.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 (b) How successful was Macmillan as Prime Minister (1957 – 63)? Explain your answer.

Focus: an evaluation of the relative success of Macmillan as PM

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

It is likely that candidates will see Macmillan as a success, identifying himself as 'Supermac' with an age of affluence. Better candidates will establish appropriate criteria for assessing Macmillan's relation success, possibly his leadership of the party, his handling of the economy and social policy, foreign and imperial policy, his handling of specific crises like the Profumo Scandal and events in Europe in 1963 and the image that he projected for the Conservatives. As regards the **party** Macmillan was the beneficiary of Eden's Suez collapse but he showed great skill in distancing himself from the events of 1956 and focussing on an 'affluence' agenda that was electorally popular. He weathered the resignation of his Treasury team in 1958, although by election defeats demonstrated the damage done by such public disagreement. Macmillan mastered television and ensured rising personal approval ratings. His choice of Lord Hailsham as party Chairman saw a more modern approach to electioneering (new commercially aided campaigns) that paid dividends in Macmillan's only election in 1959. He went on ruthlessly to purge his party in the 'Night of the Long Knives' in 1962. However candidates could stress that, after only 3 years, Macmillan was tired and appeared too 'establishment' (half the Cabinet were, like Macmillan, old Etonians). Hailsham went and Butler seemed overstretched. The 'Night of the Long Knives' could be seen as a serious mistake as Macmillan offended many, lowering party morale ('laying down his friends for his life'). Certainly Macmillan's handling of his resignation and the succession was poor. **Economics and social policy** could be seen as a key success. Economic recovery had occurred in the first half of the 1950s but was less assured in Macmillan's period. He proved skilled in hiding this (the Treasury resignation over the failure to reduce the budget) but proved lucky in 1958-9 when the economy recovered. He was less successful in doing this in the 1960s (the Orpington by election defeat), as the New Approach demonstrated (the 'Dash for Growth' budget of 1963). Candidates are **not** expected to know of **foreign and imperial policy** but might usefully refer to Macmillan's successful handling of Africa and decolonisation ('Winds of Change'), his successful development of the Special Relationship with Eisenhower and Kennedy which contrasts to the disastrous and serious handling of De Gaulle and EEC membership in 1963. As to specific issues candidates could point to success in dealing with the aftermath of Suez but the **Profumo** scandal damaged his reputation (backing Profumo appeared unwise). On immigration the government was forced into action. Better candidates will produce a balanced assessment of Macmillan's only government. Did he deserve the luck he had?

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2585 European History 1046 – 1718

Europe 1046-1250

The Reform of the Church 1046-1122

- 1 (a) **Assess the reasons why the Investiture Contest ended in 1122.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation within a major religious event

Candidates need to convey a good sense of 'Assess ...' and to set out a range of factors, preferably prioritising these. Some brief reference to the contents of the Concordat of Worms would be acceptable, though the emphasis of the answer needs to be upon reasons for eventual compromise within the context of the Investiture Contest. The needs of the Pope and the Emperor, the need to compromise, changed personalities and mutual needs, can be assessed. Henry V and Calixtus II achieved a compromise where (eg) Paschal II failed.

Points that could be mentioned are: the Emperor was prepared to give up the use of the staff and ring in investiture; he received homage within Germany from bishops for their temporalities before they were consecrated; elsewhere the Emperor received homage after consecration; for the church, there was at least symbolic and spiritual control; secular rulers retained extensive practical powers over appointments; a reduction in ideological political tensions of Church-State for a while ahead. There was a need for compromise between the two most powerful spiritual and secular leaders; convenience and practicality required such; the Investiture Contest had been, in part, an aberration; its length dictated some settlement as a growing necessity; Emperor-induced schisms had failed and domestic political considerations required some agreement; Calixtus proved an able statesman.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 1 (b) **Assess the reasons for the development of different forms of monasticism in the period from 1046-1122.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of causes in major religious changes

Candidates need to convey a good sense of 'Assess ...' and to set out a range of factors, preferably prioritising these. They will need to have a range of coverage across the period and will need to convey an understanding of change as well as try to move beyond the obvious example area of the Cistercians. The use of other Orders as examples of the new wave of monasticism would be good. Context will be important as will an understanding of problems with the 'old' monasticism, specifically the Cluniacs, though this is not a question about the decline of the Cluniacs and answers so focused will need to set their responses in a wider context to go beyond **Band IV** at best. Similarly, answers which simply focus upon the rise of the Cistercians *per se* will not move much beyond high **Band III** or lower **Band II** unless they have a good sense of contextualisation and breadth in the monastic changes of the period. They might cite the Carthusians as one example of a developing new Order.

Candidates are likely to consider such factors as: dissatisfaction with contemporary monasticism and the feeling that it was too 'comfortable' in its ways; links to lay desires for better spirituality and routes to salvation; more freedoms for monasteries from episcopal and lay controls; the better performance of the *Opus Dei* and the practice of truer, purer Benedictinism; the search for truer austerity and remoteness from the world (hermetical, ascetic geographical, etc); membership of an exclusive elite; testing life to the full according to the highest of ideals; some importation of Eastern traditions; sanctity and other worldliness. Examples of other orders could be the Carthusians (above) and Premonstratensians.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

France and the Empire 1152-1250

- 2 (a) **Assess the reasons why Frederick Barbarossa often intervened in Italy.**

[45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for major policy activity

Candidates need to convey a good sense of 'Assess ...' and to set out a range of factors, preferably prioritising these. 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 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 might be adduced too, if briefly.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 2 (b) **How strong was the French monarchy at the death of Philip Augustus (1223)? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of change and power

Candidates will need a good focus upon 'How strong ...' and will need to evaluate strengths in context to achieve reward in the higher Bands. Focus is likely to be upon such areas as increased territorial extent, heightened royal-feudal power, greater legal claims, more control over towns and nobles (including in ex-Angevin lands), greater financial resources. Answers might compare and contrast the situations in 1180 and 1223 and note that there was a progressive strengthening, based in part around the benefits of the accretion of Angevin lands and resources. Philip was helped by the inheritance from Louis VI and VII and he was a strong personality, quick to exploit his position as feudal suzerain as his ties with the Church and with many towns. He possessed a formidable range of skills, political, diplomatic and administrative, and he was a decent commander. He was aided by the problems of his opponents, above all the Angevins, especially King John. He manipulated a favourable context and used his suzerainty and growing resources-base to the full. A developing administrative system at local and central levels, good use of royal lands, alliances with towns, skilled use of the law, the mobilisation of wealth (there was a big increase in income as taxable capacity rose), all aided Philip. The sense of ambition and purpose as well as the development of a strong provincial network in administration, a strong Royal Court, the mixture of sacral and seigneurial powers, the enhanced position of the Crown, were all further factors.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Crusading and the Crusader States 1095-1192

- 3 (a) To what extent was religious enthusiasm the most important reason for the success of the First Crusade? [45]

Focus: Assessment of factors leading to success in a major event

Candidates will need to have a good focus upon 'To what extent ...' and to deliver a good sense of prioritisation of factors, setting religious enthusiasm against several other factors. Such will lead to reward in the higher Bands. Candidates are likely to see religious zeal as important, perhaps crucial, and answers that focus upon this, if suitably developed, will secure commensurate reward. Then again, they may cite other factors. As ever, it is the quality of argument that matters. Religious zeal can be seen in and expressed by reference to such features as: popular preaching, the concept of pilgrimage, the strengths of penance and remission of sins, the roles of Urban II and Peter the Hermit, events of the Crusade (the Holy Lance, the procession around Jerusalem, for example). They can also consider such factors as crusader leadership; military skills allied to strategy and tactics; determination, the capture of towns on the way to Jerusalem; Muslim disunity and underestimation of the Crusaders' spirit, skills and zeal.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

3 (b) Assess the reasons why the Second Crusade failed.**[45]**

Focus: Assessment of factors involved in a major historical event

Candidates will need to have a good focus upon 'Assess ...' and prioritise several reasons, to achieve the higher Bands. Analysis will be persistent. No set conclusion is expected. Factors that can be assessed here are, for example: a lack of clear and unified command structure; internal divisions; the tensions between Louis VII and Emperor Conrad III; differences between newcomers and established settlers; a lack of money and resources; poor choice of routes and weak appreciation of geography, terrain, climate; tactical errors, not least the decision to attack Damascus; the role of Byzantine Emperor Manuel I and a lack of help from Byzantium; the strength and unity of opponents, the fierceness of their attacks; possible weak crusading zeal; exaggerated expectations.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century

- 4 (a) To what extent was the development of the knightly class the most important social change of the twelfth century? [45]

Focus: Assessment of changing role of important social group in historical context

Answers need to be evaluative, with a strong sense of tackling the requirement to consider 'To what extent ...'. They will need to place the role of the knight in a wider context, assessing against other social groups in contemporary society, military and social roles, the role of chivalry, the feudal context, the idea of the knight as both leader and guardian, social status, membership of noble retinues, fighting skills, local leadership can all be assessed and some linkage to contemporary knightly representations in art and literature would be useful. A sense of historical change as the position and role or roles of the knight shifted across the century will be important: arguably, the military role became less prominent as against, for example, social significance, an enhanced role in leadership at local level. The role of the knight will need to be set against that of (for example) the noble, the merchant, the scholar in a period of social changes.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 4 (b) **Assess the reasons for the development of the schools in the twelfth Century.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of cultural-educational change in context

This is an evaluative question calling for an ordering and prioritisation of key reasons. The question does focus upon the 'Assess the reasons ...' and the best answers will seek to address that, not least by placing the schools in their educational, political and social context. A range of factors can be used here, such as: their place as learning centres; the role of the great masters or teachers in attracting the brightest and the best; the rise of lay literacy and education; the importance of theology, classics and the law (including the growing interest in canon law); the greater requirements of both ecclesiastical and lay administrations; the twelfth-century Renaissance. Specific examples of academic centres, notably Bologna in the South and Paris in the North, will add to the argument. The schools created a powerful base for the subsequent rise of the universities and they were strong centres of interest and attention in this period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1450 – 1530**The Italian Renaissance 1450 – 1530**

- 5 (a) **Assess the importance of Rome and the Papacy to the development of the Renaissance from 1450 to 1530.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of factors involved in a major cultural development

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.

Issues: Classical remains of Rome as inspiration and education eg Brunelleschi – study of dome of Pantheon, mantle of leadership passing from Florence during High Renaissance, work of people such as Michelangelo, Raphael, Botticelli.
Contributions of specific Popes eg Nicholas V – restoration of the authority of the Pope and Rome as the centre of religious and cultural life, patronage and building of Sistine chapel by Sixtus IV, tomb and St. Peter's by Julius II.

Candidates could assess Rome's importance within its own terms or compare it with Florence and/or Venice. Either way, there must be a significant emphasis on Rome and the Papacy and evaluation of factors.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 (b) **To what extent did Renaissance art and architecture imitate classical models?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of an important cultural development

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 likely to conclude that although many artists and architects studied classical works widely, their finished products often had new features as well as having adapted old ones; thus architects such as Brunelleschi, Bramante and Palladio were well-versed in Vitruvius' book on architecture, went to Rome to study classical models and produced works based on their principles eg Brunelleschi's church of San Lorenzo in Florence and Bramante's San Pietro in Rome. Their basic plan moved away from the medieval cruciform back to the circular plan of the Roman Temple. Brunelleschi's dome however went further than classical styles in size and method of construction. For artists there is likely be some reference to use of classical subject matter such as Botticelli's Calumny, based on the work of the painter Appelles as described by Lucian. However there should also be some indication of the new in reference to such matters as perspective, development of oils and colour and the change in subject matter in an attempt to reconcile antiquity with Christianity. Answers should be more or less balanced with consideration given to 'extent'.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Spain 1469 – 1520

- 6 (a) To what extent did Ferdinand and Isabella unify Spain? [45]

Focus: Assessment of an important political development

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 likely to reach the conclusion that Spain was still very much a collection of separate states by 1516, by looking at the differences between Castile and Aragon in terms of constitutions, language barriers and monetary systems. They could also point out the restrictions on Ferdinand in the marriage treaty and the situation in 1504 at Isabella's death. Other issues could include different policies in different states *vis a vis* Hermandad, *corregidores* and Moors and in terms of foreign policy. However some balance is required, and candidates should examine issues of unity such as single currency (the *excelente*), the common institution of Inquisition and joint action over issues such as the Granada war, before reaching a conclusion on 'extent'.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 (b) To what extent did Charles I inherit a secure and prosperous kingdom? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a key political issue

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.

In terms of security, issues should focus on internal problems such as Comuneros and Germania – though they may reach the conclusion that the former particularly is more to do with Charles himself than his inheritance. In terms of prosperity candidates might compare the apparent situation with a more realistic one, setting the beginnings of overseas empire and the reasonable situation left by Ferdinand and Isabella against the structural weaknesses of the financial system. Some conclusion should be reached in terms of the question.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Ottoman Empire 1451 – 1529

- 7 (a) **How important was religion in developing the Ottoman Empire from 1451 to 1529? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of key factors in an important political development

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.

Religious issues include the integral nature of conquest and Islam ie actions of the Sultan as a Ghazi warrior, changes from a ghazi state to a caliphate and the importance of jihad, devshirme and its importance in producing Janissaries and local government system, increased importance of religion with capture of holy places and need for protection of pilgrims. Candidates may point out that religion is a cohesive factor but that other factors should also be considered such as the military nature of the state based on both the Janissaries and Sipahi cavalry – considered by many to be the most effective fighting force of the time. Economic factors might also be considered with the development of an economic system based in Constantinople and entirely geared up for war. Political considerations might examine the meritocratic system owing absolute obedience to the Sultan as an aid to unity of purpose in pursuing development of the Empire. Candidates should weigh up other factors against religion to reach a balanced conclusion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 7 (b) **Assess the importance of the fall of Constantinople (1453) for the Ottomans and Western Europe.** [45]

Assessment of the significance of a major event

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 might explore the following issues:-

For the Ottomans; psychological effects of inheriting leadership of great empires; strategic factors – in control of Black Sea and jumping off point for further expansion, particularly into Europe (opportunities for links here); as well as economic effects of trade and as basis for growth of naval power.

For Western Europe; the threat of encroachment from Muslim power – exacerbation of conflicts within Europe in support from French against Charles V, loss of territory in Balkans, conflict with Venice over trade and dominance of Mediterranean.

Strong answers will include evaluation of the issues, providing both ranking and linkage to reach the highest Bands.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Exploration and Discovery 1450-1530

- 8 (a) **How important was royal patronage in encouraging voyages of exploration from Spain and Portugal from 1450 to 1530? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of factors leading to a major development

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 the Portuguese candidates may refer to Henry the Navigator, his financing of voyages and collection of information on navigation, though this is mostly outside the period. John II is more central in his support of voyages round the tip of Africa (Diaz) and to Asian spice sources. However, individual merchants were also responsible for financing expeditions.

Similarly Ferdinand and Isabella provided patronage for Columbus, though much later in the day due to the more unsettled political situation in Spain; an element of competition might be considered. Later voyages of the conquistadors tended to be privately financed but had royal support. There were also other 'push' factors in terms of geography, maritime experience and economy and new technology. 'Pull' factors might include gold, spices, land and religion.

Candidates may come to the conclusion that other factors were more important, but there must be a substantial consideration of royal patronage.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 8 (b) 'Columbus was the most important individual in overseas exploration and empire-building from 1450 to 1530.' How far do you agree with this statement? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the contribution of individuals to a world-wide development

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 question seeks to set the achievements of Columbus against that of other individuals such as da Gama and Cortes. There should be an explanation of why their achievements are important eg for Columbus, that he is dealing with entirely new territory. It could equally well be argued that Cortes' achievements were more important in the long-term for empire-building, with the settlement and conversion to Christianity of Mexico and the wealth and trade it brought. A distinction might be made between exploration and empire-building with some individuals being considered more important in one area. Candidates might argue that earlier pioneering voyages provided important information and experience on which later individuals could build. Consideration of individuals providing patronage, such as Isabella of Spain, might also be made. Answers should contain significant reference to Columbus and other individuals, even if candidates reject the thesis.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 9 (a) **Assess the view that Charles V's power within the Holy Roman Empire was weaker in 1556 than in 1519.** [45]

Focus: 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 is taken from the first Key issue on Charles' relations with his German subjects. This is an AS paper and candidate should not be expected to show the same skills as demanded A2. There is debate about this issue and some candidates may argue that Ferdinand was able to advance Imperial authority, others may suggest that Charles' power stayed the same, some may suggest that there were fluctuations within the period, whilst others agree with the proposition. Any approach is acceptable, what matters is the level of analysis. There is a great deal that could be considered and it is not expected that candidates will cover all possible areas. Candidates may refer to some of the following developments: the autonomy granted to, or taken by, territorial princes, the lack of a central imperial government, treasury or army, the federal constitution, the Capitulation, the divisions created by the Reformation, the powers that Charles did possess and this may lead to reference of events at the Diet of Worms where the arrangements for the regency were made, the Compact of Brussels, administrative reforms, the Diet of Speyer, the development of the Schmalkaldic League and the Peace of Augsburg.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 9 (b) **Assess the view that Charles V's foreign policy towards both France and the Ottoman Empire failed.** [45]

Focus: A key feature of the reign of Charles V

The question may be agreed with or rejected – 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 criteria against which the candidate judges failure. Many are likely to focus on Charles' aims, others may consider his policy in the short or long term, others may judge it against a variety of factors, but the important issue is the level of analysis. Weaker answers are likely to describe Charles' foreign policy rather than analyse it. It should also be noted that this question concerns Charles as Emperor, not as King of Spain, although most are unlikely to be able to distinguish. Candidates are not expected to divide their answer 50:50 between France and Turkey, but answers at the higher levels should demonstrate a reasonable balance. When considering relations with France candidates may consider events such as the capture of Francis I, events in Milan and Naples, war over the Burgundian lands, the Treaty of Cambrai, marriage alliances and treaties such as Cateau Cambresis, although not Charles may be used to evaluate his rule. When considering relations with the Turks candidates may refer to the Battle of Mohacs, the sieges of Vienna and Guns, the payment of tribute to the sultan and the occupation of Eastern Hungary. It is very unlikely that candidates will cover all the above.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Spain 1504-1556

- 10 (a) **How strong was the Spanish economy by 1556? Explain your answer.**

[45]

Focus: Evaluation of a key issue in the development of Spain.

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

There is a great deal of material available to candidates as this question reflects the whole of Key Issue 2. Although candidates should cover a range of issues it is the quality of analysis that is important and do not expect candidates to discuss every issue in depth in 45 minutes. Candidates may consider the condition of Spanish finances, particularly the issue of taxation and conclude that their collapse in the 1550s suggests they were not strong. However, finances are not strictly the economy and it is hoped that candidates will focus on the condition of domestic trade, industry and agriculture as well as the significance of the Americas in the development of the economy; all of these issues are mentioned in the specification. Candidates may examine the failure to adapt agricultural activity to meet needs, particularly with regards to grain, the dominance of the Mesta and its impact on the economy. With regards to industrial activity they may consider the weakness of the silk industry, the success of the industries of the north, but this might be balanced against the overall view that Spanish industrial activity did not flourish as it might. The impact of inflation on the economy might also be addressed. Trade might also receive consideration, the disruption in the Mediterranean could be balanced against the success of the Atlantic trade. A consideration of the impact of this trade might also be a feature.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 10 (b) **How successful was Charles I as King of Spain in achieving his aims in foreign policy? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Key issue in the development of Spain.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – 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 criteria against which the candidate judges success. Many are likely to focus on Charles' aims, others may consider his policy in the short or long term, or the different regions over which he ruled as King of Spain, others may judge it against a variety of factors, but the important issue is the level of analysis. The question focuses on Charles as King of Spain and examiners should be careful that the answer does not drift to Charles' foreign policy as Emperor. Candidates should consider a range of issues, but it is not expected that there will be a balance between the various areas over which he ruled. Charles' policy in the Mediterranean may consider events such as the loss of Algiers, Tunis (although recaptured later) and Tripoli and its impact on Spain's position in the Mediterranean. Meanwhile, when considering Spain's position in Italy it is likely that answers will focus on Milan and the Battles of Pavia and Landriano. Candidates may also consider the dynastic position that Charles was able to establish.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

France 1498-1559

- 11 (a) **Assess the reasons for the persecution of Humanists and Lutherans in France to 1547.** [45]

Focus: Key development within the period

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. This question is taken from Key issue three on the religious issues and problems facing the French church. Although the specification specifically refers to humanism and Lutheranism it may not be the approach that candidates are expecting as previous questions have been asked on the spread of these ideas. The question requires candidates to assess reasons and better answers should offer a weighing up of reasons for the persecution, rather than just a list of reasons. There are many reasons that could be considered and candidates are not expected to cover them all, what is important is the quality of analysis. Candidates might consider some of the following: humanism's attraction of powerful enemies, the humanists' questioning of the value of monastic life, the role and importance of the Sorbonne, the supposed links between the Meaux circle and Lutheranism, political opportunism following Francis' capture at Pavia, the endorsement of Luther's excommunication, the role of the Paris parlement and its battles with Francis, the limits to Francis' tolerance, the threat to public order, the Affair of the Placards, links between Protestantism and criminal activity and the Edict of Fontainebleau.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 11 (b) 'The main aim of French foreign policy in the period from 1516 to 1559 was the avoidance of encirclement'. How far do you agree with this view? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus:

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to focus on the aims of French foreign policy and not simply describe events, although candidates may use events to illustrate and support their arguments about the aims of foreign policy. It is likely that many will argue that the most important aim for France was to defeat their Spanish and Imperial neighbours and explain why this was important, pointing in particular to dynastic concerns which had to be preserved, this may lead to an explanation for French involvement in Milan and Naples. However, the focus of the question is encirclement and candidates must consider this reason, even if they disagree. Other issues linked to this that may be discussed include the feeling of being threatened, honour and glory. Linked to the dynastic battle candidates may also consider the personal rivalry between Charles and Francis. Some answers may also consider the development of alliances with the Turks and the German Protestants to enable these aims to be achieved. The question does require candidates to consider the reign of Henry II, and this should certainly be seen in the higher levels, but most are likely to focus on Francis I. Those who do consider Henry's aims might mention revenge, following his imprisonment, but they might also suggest that his aims were more cautious, realistic and pragmatic.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Warfare 1499-1560

- 12 (a) **To what extent did warfare become more defensive in the period from 1499 to 1560?**

Focus: Change in a key feature.

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 drawn from a range of key issues, but particularly focuses on issues one and two, encouraging candidates to use precise examples from the Habsburg-Valois wars to support their more general ideas. Although no set answer is expected it is likely that many will agree with the proposition. Many candidates will simply describe the changes rather than linking their knowledge to the actual question and assessing how far. Candidates may look at the developments in defensive fortifications, which were more generally used in the second half of the period, as an explanation for the change to more static warfare. These developments helped to nullify the changes in artillery, which had made attack more successful in the first part of the period. There may be lengthy descriptions of the development of *trace italienne* which did play a key role. In examining the earlier developments there may be reference to siege canons and artillery and field artillery. Candidates may also be drawn in to discussions of the changes in infantry warfare, considering the increased use of pikemen and the development of handguns, but it should be noted that these developments only aided success when they were new or possessed by just one side. It should also be noted that the power of the gun made the risk of defeat a sufficient reason to avoid battle, whilst the emergence of powerful infantry also encouraged commanders to abandon offensive strategies. All of these general developments could be supported by specific examples from the Habsburg-Valois wars.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 (b) **How successfully did rulers deal with the problems of controlling and financing large armies in the period from 1499 to 1560?**

Focus: A key issue in the changing nature of warfare.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates are required to assess the impact and better answers should go beyond a simple list of the changes that the rising costs brought about and reach a judgement as to the ruler's relative success. There are many issues that candidates might consider, but what is important is the quality of the analysis. Weaker answers will describe the rising costs or write in very general terms, rather than examine the impact on rulers and princes using specific examples to support their conclusions. Many answers will focus on increased pressures placed on the problem of revenue raising, particularly as wars became more drawn out and may point to examples such as France or Florence. Candidates may look at the devices government used to increase their revenues, such as devaluation, the selling of offices and loans. Some answers may suggest that the rising costs also impacted on the way rulers conducted their campaigns. It is likely that many answers will focus on bankruptcy, which was a major feature of many states, Siena lost its independence as a result. Some answers might suggest that the rising cost ensured that it was only kings who could afford the large armies needed and therefore the power of feudal magnates and nobles was undermined. As a result many noble became soldiers in armies and it resulted in the adaptation of the chivalric code. However, king's still depended on the loyalty of their nobility, often to raise forces and this often became more important as costs rose.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1545-1610**The Counter Reformation 1545-c.1600**

- 13 (a) **How successfully did the Catholic Church deal with the challenge of Protestantism from 1545 to c.1600? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of a response to a major religious development

Candidates might refer to the following issues:

Con: Church initially slow to react – Luther's 95 theses 1517 so battle already lost to some extent by 1545; too tied up with political situation in Germany ie extension of Princes' power at expense of Emperor; limited implementation of Tridentine decrees. Failure to stem growth of Calvinism in Netherlands.

Pro: Attempt to put own house in order in a variety of ways – reformed papacy, new orders – Jesuits particularly successful in winning back some lands and in hardening resolve viz. work of Peter Canisius in Germany, missionary work and colleges, own example of rigorous approach. Re-definition of issues raised by Luther – Tridentine decrees on papal authority, transubstantiation, good works, purgatory. Answers will need to maintain some balance and reach a conclusion about the question asked.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 13 (b) **How important was the role of the papacy in the Counter Reformation? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of factors contributing to a major religious development

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 might refer to the following issues:

Need to change emphasis from worldly potentate to spiritual leader. Importance of leadership from the 'top'. Impact of reforming Popes eg Paul III in calling general council of church, appointing reformers to Curia such as Caraffa, suggesting reforms eg residency of Bishops. Set against other issues such as exemplary lives of Jesuits and their missionary and educational work. Effectiveness of Tridentine decrees where implemented. Re-definition of doctrine post Luther. Candidates will need to reach a conclusion on the relative importance of this factor compared with others. Although they may consider it of less importance than other factors, they must nevertheless give the role of the papacy considerable discussion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Reign of Henry IV 1589-1610

- 14 (a) **How successfully did Henry IV deal with opposition from 1589 to 1610? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of a response to a political problem

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 might deal with the following issues to argue success/lack of success. Pro – Marginalised Princes of the blood, bought off greater nobles, reduced their powers by use of *elus* and *noblesse d'epée*. Used mixture of severity (execution of Biron) and clemency (Bouillon allowed to keep lands) to deal with plots. Undermined Catholic league by adoption of Catholicism and declaring war on Spain, settled Huguenot problem by Edict of Nantes. Made concessions to Parlements and rebels eg Croquants

Con – Still opposition (Bouillon conspiracy) as late as 1604. Problems with Edict of Nantes linked to opposition from Parlements – Rouen not ratifying until 1609. Many attempts on Henry's life, finally successful in 1610. Candidates must give a more or less balanced answer and reach a conclusion in line with the question.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 14 (b) To what extent did French finances and the economy improve from 1598 to 1610? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of development of a key issue

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 might consider the following issues:

Pro – Ending of war a key factor and general limitation of expenditure, work of Sully as *surintendant des finances* decreasing *taille* but increasing indirect taxation eg *gabelle*, introduction of *paulette* – overall surplus. Work of Laffemas and de Srres in agriculture and industry. Communications improvements by Sully as *grand voyer* (but limited)

Con – Early failure with *pancarte* of Henry, no real structural reforms, *paulette* future problems, industrial development of luxury industries unsuccessful, improvements mainly due to political stability and peace.

Candidates should give a more or less balanced answer and reach a conclusion in lines with the demands of the question.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Dutch Revolt 1563-1609

- 15 (a) **How important was religion in the outbreak and development of the Dutch Revolt to the 1580's? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of factors involved in a major political event

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 might consider the following:

Outbreak:- Reaction of tolerant state with increasing Calvinism to anti-heresy laws, Inquisition, imposition of Tridentine decrees and projected reform of bishoprics. Real religious issues but also links with separatist/regionalist views. 'Hedge preachers' and iconoclasm showing religious inclinations but also linked to economic situation.

Development:- Importance of Sea Beggars in helping North and alienating more moderate opinion. William of Orange's adoption of Calvinism. Elements of religion in reaction to Spanish Fury. Divisive nature with adoption of Calvinism as state religion in North.

Candidates may consider religion on its own terms or set against other issues eg political – separatism, repressive nature of Alva's rule. Economic – such as harvest failure, economic growth of North etc. The best answers will show links with other issues and reach a conclusion in line with the question.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 15 (b) **Assess the reasons why the Dutch Revolt was more successful in the North than in the South to 1609.** [45]

Focus: Comparison of developments in different areas during a major event

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.

Issues discussed could include; the more effective rebel leadership of William of Orange as a Northern *stadtholder*, the influence of the Sea Beggars (a negative one in the south), geographical factors such as the importance of the great rivers as a defence system in the North and the rise of Amsterdam at the expense of Antwerp. Might also consider factors which encouraged the south to 'return to the fold' with the acceptable military leadership of the Duke of Palma, greater effectiveness of Spanish military might here, and after 1596 a popular Spanish ruler in Archduke Albert of Austria. Candidates should give a more or less balanced discussion of Northern and Southern issues. The best answers will give both ranking and linkage.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Spain as a Great Power 1556-1598

- 16 (a) **How serious were the financial and economic problems facing Philip II from 1556 to 1598? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of a major issue

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 likely to conclude that they were very serious in spite of bullion from New World and thriving port of Seville. Might make a distinction between earlier and later periods ie Northern Castile flourishing in early period with wool trade with Flanders and commercial links with England and France. All declining following Dutch Revolt and war with France and England.

Financial issues – Inherited debt. Difficulties in collecting *alcabala* and *encabezamiento*. Heavy expenditure in wars with Dutch, French and English. Bankruptcies.

Economic issues likely to be linked eg heavy taxation preventing investment in industry (crippled silk industry in Granada). Effects of social attitudes, lack of middle class, protection of Mesta, natural disasters such as drought and plague. Lack of innovation on *latifundia*. Effects of war on trade.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 16 (b) 'The impact of the Dutch Revolt on Spain was the main problem inherited by Philip III.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of problems faced by a monarch

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.

Many problems could be linked to The Dutch Revolt. In itself it involved a loss of a large part of the kingdom, costs involved - implications for finances and economy eg crippling taxation – *millions*, lack of investment in industry and bankruptcies. Effects on relations with England and France though latter minimised by Treaty of Vervins 1598.

Unrelated issues might include discrete problems with economic situation such as social attitudes to trading and industrial investment, lack of middle class, privileges of Mesta, natural disasters such as plague and drought, religious problems still unsolved eg Moriscos. Candidates should set the impact of the Dutch Revolt against other factors to reach a measured conclusion. There are however likely to be many related issues.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1598 - 1661

Richelieu and Mazarin 1622 - 1661

- 17 (a) To what extent had Richelieu succeeded in overcoming threats to royal authority by 1642? [45]

Focus: Assessment of Richelieu's success against threats to royal authority.

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.

During Richelieu's ministry, it is generally agreed that he largely succeeded. Louis XIII gained greater authority. The issue of absolutism might dominate many answers. However, one might expect more successful candidates, whose answers might be awarded **Band I** or **Band II**, to define and examine the threats with an assessment of their impact. Direct threats came from the nobles, including members of the royal family such as Gaston, the King's brother, and from Marie de Medici, his mother. There were dangers from the supporters of Marillac, the Finance Minister. It can be argued that plots were directed more at Richelieu than at Louis XIII but the minister was the King's choice and the threats to Richelieu applied indirectly to the authority of the crown. Reference might be made to the Chalais Conspiracy and the Day of Dupes. Had not Louis XIII backed him, Richelieu would have fallen and the King's position would have been weaker. There were dangers, but probably not threats, from provincial assemblies such as the Parlements. The crown's control was asserted through officials such as the *intendants* but it was never complete. Candidates might consider how far other groups, such as the Huguenots, were a threat to royal authority. When they rebelled (1625) Richelieu had to compromise initially but the Grace of Alais (1629) represented a clear, if sensible victory for the minister and the crown. Richelieu also used propaganda (pamphlets, newsletters, the *Academie Française*) to enhance the reputation of the monarch. Some might compare and contrast Richelieu and Mazarin (the Frondes). This will be relevant but candidates should keep the comparison within limits so that the focus remains on Richelieu.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 17 (b) To what extent were the Frondes motivated mainly by opposition to the monarchy? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for major revolts in France.

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 might argue that the Frondes were caused by other major issues rather than opposition to the monarchy but answers should normally contain an adequate consideration of the stated factor to reach marks in **Band I** or **Band II**. Consideration of the role and impact of Mazarin and his support for royal absolutism will be very relevant although there were other reasons for Mazarin's unpopularity, such as his foreign birth. Very successful candidates might argue that the opposition was more personal than constitutional, and not primarily against the monarchy as an institution. France had no alternative to an absolute monarchy at the time although some aspects of absolutism were unpopular. Reference might be made to the Princes' Fronde where ultimately order was more important to the participants than anarchy. Richelieu's legacy and social and economic / financial factors might be considered. For example, the costs of supporting France's participation in the struggle against the Habsburgs were heavy. Some very successful candidates might point out that different groups had different aims and grievances, sometimes conflicting.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Problems of Spain 1598 - 1659

- 18 (a) **To what extent did the policies of Lerma and Olivares make Spain's problems worse?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of two ministers in Spain.

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.

Examiners will expect a reasonable but not necessarily an even balance. As always, examiners will look first at the quality of the argument. **Band V** will require a basic knowledge and understanding of one of the ministers. Candidates might argue that Lerma's lack of policies worsened matters, especially as the truce with the United Provinces opened a window of opportunity. His concern to make personal gains and to benefit his family and associates was a major pre-occupation. Candidates might examine the significance for the question of the expulsion of the Moriscos. It might be argued that Olivares caused problems by pursuing too many policies which affected many areas of government, the administration and the economy. With a strong belief in his own rectitude, Olivares brought Spain to the brink of destruction. On the other hand, it might be claimed that his diagnosis was correct. The doses of medicine that Olivares prescribed were too strong for Spain to take. The costs of the wars proved excessive and made it impossible for him to implement internal reforms because he aroused such strong opposition among vested interests.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 18 (b) **Assess the effects on Spain of Philip IV's foreign policy.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of a judgement about the foreign policy of a king.

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.

An alternative approach might be to argue that Olivares had a greater impact on Spanish foreign policy than Philip IV and therefore deserves more attention in the answer. This will be acceptable for many mark bands but not for **Band I**. Olivares died in 1645 and was a minister to 1643, but Philip IV reigned to 1665. A study of Olivares alone or predominantly will be incomplete and he was responsible to the King. Philip IV did not reconquer the United Provinces and Spain's intervention in the Thirty Years' War proved expensive and fruitless. The continued war against France was a failure for Spain. The costs of the wars were a major burden to an already impoverished Spain whilst attempts to reform internal systems were resisted and then abandoned. Candidates might refer to the bankruptcies of 1648 and 1652. Candidates might interpret 'effects on Spain' as involving only domestic issues. This will be valid and a good answer might be able to reach **Band I** but more likely this band will need some views of the effects on Spain as an international power. The Treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees both saw a decline in Spanish influence.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Thirty Years' War 1618 - 1648

- 19 (a) **To what extent was Habsburg religious policy the main cause of the Thirty Years' War?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of the causes of a major war.

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.

An alternative approach might be to argue that other reasons were more important, but answers should normally contain an adequate consideration of the stated factor to reach marks in **Band I** or **Band II**. A Catholic revival encouraged the Habsburgs, especially Ferdinand II the Holy Roman Emperor, to take a more aggressive anti-Protestant line, and to limit or even withdraw concessions that had helped to preserve peace in the Empire. It was significant that the war began in Bohemia, with its Protestant tendencies, and that the Protestants were aided by Frederick of the Palatinate and then by Denmark. Among other factors that can be considered were the political aspirations of Ferdinand II. Catholic, as well as Protestant, princes were uneasy about this. The involvement of other countries added to the complexity of issues. The Question does not have a defined end date and candidates can take a variety of approaches. Those who end in 1618 can reach any mark. Equally, answers that go further can also merit any mark band as long as they focus on the terms of the Question, which is about the causes of the war. For example, it might be argued that the causes of war in the 1630s were different from those that had sparked the conflict.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 19 (b) 'Sweden's intervention in the Thirty Years' War ended Habsburg chances of victory.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the outcome of a war.

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.

Factors that might be considered when examining the Habsburgs' chances of victory include the Edict of Restitution (1629) that helped to turn the Thirty Years' War into a more international conflict and arguably lost the Habsburgs support with the Holy Roman Empire. Sweden's intervention came when the Habsburgs seemed to be in the ascendancy. Wallenstein (and Tilly - but Tilly is not mentioned in the Specification) won notable victories. Swedish intervention, under Gustavus Adolphus, changed the course of the struggle in spite of the death of the Swedish king (1632 Lützen). France was a growing power. It financed Sweden and later provided an army itself. The Habsburgs hung on but could not repeat their earlier successes. Spanish support was not effective, a major reason being its commitments to other wars, for example against the Dutch. It will be relevant, but not necessary, to use the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) to demonstrate how the Habsburgs failed to gain a victory in the war.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Social Issues in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century

- 20 (a) 'The work of Kepler and Galileo was the only evidence of a scientific revolution in the first half of the seventeenth century.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about scientific change.

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 might be argued that the work of Kepler and Galileo showed little evidence of a scientific revolution because their interests were focused on astronomy and did not touch much of science. They also owed much to Copernicus. On the other hand, they helped to shape a new view of the universe that was to lead to Newton. Some excellent candidates might note differences between the two men. Galileo rejected some of Kepler's views of planetary motion that were to prove more correct. In the context of a scientific revolution, candidates might consider the growing reliance on experiment, measurement and observation as the basis of scientific enquiry. Although there were fewer advances in other sciences in the relevant period (and the Specification mentions only Kepler and Galileo), candidates can be expected to be able to discuss 'scientific method'.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 20 (b) **Assess the importance of foreign trade to Dutch economic development in the first half of the seventeenth century.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of an aspect of economic development.

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 is difficult to see candidates denying that foreign trade was vital to Dutch economic development in the relevant period. The Dutch economy, with the background of war with Spain for many years, could probably not have survived without this trade. By the mid-century, the Dutch had established a trading empire that stretched from the Baltic to the East Indies. The geographical extent of the empire was paralleled by its success in securing a Dutch monopoly. There were failures. The economy was under strain in the 1620s and 1630s but its strength was such that it managed to avoid the worst effects of the European depression of the 1640s. Other factors that might be considered as contributing to the Dutch economy are the comparative toleration that allowed (more skilful and wealthier) immigrants, such as Jews and Huguenots, to practise their religions. The social structure was different from most places in Europe. There were few nobles, no monarchy. The money-makers were very influential and had political power for much of the period. Investment was in trade rather than in land or offices.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1660 - 1718**Sweden and the Baltic 1660 - 1718**

21 (a) How strong was Sweden in 1660? Explain your answer. [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.

Candidates might consider both domestic and foreign aspects of strength. Whilst the overall quality of arguments will be paramount in determining marks, one would normally expect answers in **Band I** to discuss both but not necessarily with an even balance. The legacy from Charles X to Charles XI might be a sound basis for an answer. Considerable international diplomatic and military prestige resulted from the Thirty Years' War. The empire around the Baltic was recognised, sometimes grudgingly, by competitors. Generally the country was well governed by the crown but enlightened nobles exercised considerable influence. On the other hand, much of the apparent strength was built on shaky foundations. Sweden was surrounded by potential enemies although the Russian threat was in the longer-term future. In spite of Charles X's efforts, much crown land was still alienated. Charles XI succeeded as a minor, never a welcome situation for a monarchy, and power was exercised by a Regency Council in which nobles pursued self-directed policies at home and weakened Sweden abroad. Candidates might mention the comparatively small size of the population and an economy whose reliance on copper was weakening.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 21 (b) How far was Charles XI successful in achieving his aims in Sweden? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the success of a ruler in achieving his aims.

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 Question mentions Charles XI's success 'in Sweden' pointing to domestic affairs. Credit should be given when candidates define the King's aims overtly; this will probably be necessary for **Band I**. He sought to increase his absolute authority at home with a complementary aim of wakening the nobility. He aimed to restore crown lands and to improve finances. In the short term, Charles's absolutism was popular with wide support from the Church, towns and peasantry. He enforced the *Reduktion*, recovering royal estates, increasing crown land from 1% to about 30%. The *Rad* (Council), dominated by the nobles, lost its powers to the King and Charles's absolutism was recognised formally.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

France and Europe 1661 - 1715

- 22 (a) **To what extent was Louis XIV's foreign policy successful by time of the Treaty of Utrecht (1713)?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of the success of a king'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.

'To what extent..?' invites candidates to consider the achievements and limits of Louis XIV's foreign policy but examiners will not require a balanced answer. Strong arguments in one direction that consider alternatives can reach any mark. There should be a focus on the situation at the end of the reign but the Question allows candidates to discuss earlier developments. A chronological approach will not necessarily denote work of limited value as long as the chronology is under-pinned by sound explanation and assessment. It can be argued that by 1713 Louis had achieved most of his major aims. French borders were strengthened: France retained Strasbourg, Alsace, Franche Comté; Habsburg power was broken; he had achieved glory for himself and France. On the other hand, France was now faced by a powerful Britain and the Dutch remained unconquered, although weakened. Spain had a French King but union between the two countries was forbidden. The question does not ask for a discussion of the internal effects of foreign policy but a brief mention of the domestic consequences will not be inherently irrelevant.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 22 (b) 'Versailles culture had limited influence outside France during the reign of Louis XIV.' To what extent do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a cultural development.

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 be expected to explain what might be understood by 'Versailles culture', including the grandiose architecture, patronage, expense and public display, the role of king and nobles, and the patronage of the arts. Candidates might refer to attempts to copy the building and the court, for example in Austria and smaller German states, and by the Orange family in the United Provinces. French became the language of courts. Versailles itself was visited by many foreigners, usually admirers. Some candidates might point out that Versailles' influence was limited to select classes in Europe (as it was in France).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Development of Brandenburg-Prussia 1660 - 1713

- 23 (a) 'Frederick I's main success was gaining the title "King in Prussia". To what extent do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the success of a ruler.

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 Question allows candidates to discuss both domestic and foreign aspects of Frederick I's reign. **Band III** might be a ceiling for answers that consider only one aspect exclusively. On the other hand, examiners will not require an even balance. There is likely to be more on domestic issues. Some might argue that the title 'King in Prussia' was of limited practical importance; it did not increase Frederick's power in itself. But it was important to him as a recognition of his authority and of Brandenburg-Prussia's independence from Austria. Other achievements might include a strengthened economy encouraged by the avoidance of war and the influx of skilled, religious refugees. Education was improved. There was a growth in court culture. Although he avoided an active foreign policy, he did enlarge the army. However, there is evidence that the administration became more corrupt.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 23 (b) To what extent did relations with France dominate Brandenburg-Prussia's foreign policy during the period from 1660 to 1713? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about 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.

'To what extent..?' invites candidates to consider other factors in the foreign policy of Brandenburg-Prussia and a discriminating factor will be candidates' ability to delineate what was most important ('dominate'). It might be argued that Louis XIV's influence was such that he dominated the foreign policies of most European countries. The Hohenzollerns saw relations with France as important in enhancing their power. They allied with France and opposed it at different times as seemed opportune. For example, Frederick William, the Great Elector, secured subsidies from France but also supported the Dutch when it seemed more advantageous. Other factors that might be considered are relations with other Baltic states, especially Sweden. Frederick William I joined France's enemies, giving support to the Dutch and Austria. He was rewarded with the title 'King in Prussia'. One might normally expect answers in **Band I** to be able to trace developments throughout the relevant period but examiners will not expect an even balance between the reigns of the Great Elector and Frederick I. A sound paragraph on the latter to support a good assessment of Frederick William can merit any mark.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century

- 24 (a) To what extent was religious toleration the main reason for Dutch economic progress in the second half of the seventeenth century? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for economic success.

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.

An alternative approach might be to argue that other reasons were more important but answers should normally contain an adequate consideration of the stated factor to reach marks in **Band I** or **Band II**. The Dutch prized economic success above religious and political bigotry. This led to a society that was not bound to the religious intolerance that was characteristic of many other countries. For example, there was an influx of Protestant Huguenots from France, increasing after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Earlier, Moriscos from Spain and Jews had been allowed to enter the United Provinces. Amsterdam was the most 'open' city and one of the wealthiest, the centre of a Dutch economy that was based particularly on trade. However, it can be argued that the extent of toleration should not be exaggerated. There were strict Calvinists who favoured restrictive policies; immigrants were welcomed when they had skills. Candidates can consider other factors such as the banking system and the success of overseas trade. They might argue about the extent of Dutch economic progress in the second half of the seventeenth century, when there was stiffer competition from France and especially England.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 24 (b) **To what extent did the social structure limit economic development in France during the second half of the seventeenth century?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of the links between social structure and economic success.

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.

France had huge economic potential but it was not fulfilled. A rigid social hierarchy, with the nobility frowning on trade, restricted investment. A strong traditional sense was a brake on innovation. The social hierarchy was based essentially on land. Even the middle and professional classes were more attracted by the gains from, and investments in, offices and *rentes*. Reference might be made to Colbert's attempts to widen interest in economic development, but he was supported only intermittently by Louis XIV and even less frequently by the social hierarchies. It might be argued that Colbert's regulatory mind did not result in the best policies for France. Candidates might compare/contrast France with other countries, especially England and the United Provinces to show how looser social structures helped economic development. This will be relevant but should not be taken too far because the question is based on France.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2586 European and World History 1789 – 1989

Europe 1789-1849

The French Revolution 1789-1795

- 1 (a) To what extent was the weakness of Louis XVI the main cause of the revolutionary events of 1789? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of revolutionary events

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

Royal weakness may involve discussion of the financial problems of the crown as well as Louis XVI's inconsistency, hesitancy and changes of mind. There should be discussion of the circumstances surrounding the Estates-General, the events of July 1789 and possibly also of October 1789. To score in the higher bands candidates should also assess the significance of other factors such as the role of new ideas, general economic crisis, the role of individual ministers, courtiers and politicians and political groups and other members of the court.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 1 (b) **Assess the impact of counter revolution on the French Revolution to 1795.**

[45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of impact of revolutionary events

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

The term Counter Revolution can be interpreted broadly to include the opposition to the Revolution and its course from 1789 onwards, although candidates may date their treatment from 1790-1 (Civil constitution of the Clergy, Flight to Varennes onwards). In general candidates may discuss the seriousness of the threat and the reaction of revolutionaries to it with the resultant radicalisation of the Revolution, overthrow of the monarchy, war, internal rebellion, Terror and so on. To assess candidates may also seek to establish the role of other factors such as war, economic crisis and the sans-culottes to set the Counter Revolution in context or to show the links between them.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815**2 (a) To what extent was Napoleon a dictator?****[45]**

Focus: assessment/evaluation of nature of Napoleonic rule

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

Candidates need to produce a balanced analysis to score in the higher bands. They may argue that he was a dictator because of the authoritarian nature of the Constitutions (increasingly); the elements of a police state and restrictions on freedom (Fouché, Savary, spies, informers, arbitrary imprisonment, censorship, propaganda etc.); the repression and suppression of opposition; and the cult of personality surrounding Napoleon. Some of these points and others may be made. On the other hand, candidates may want to qualify their argument by reference to some of the following points: the constitutions provided for various assemblies and for universal suffrage; the Civil Code enshrined many revolutionary principles (such as equality before law, right of property); the Concordat and Organic articles provided for religious tolerance; and various other reforms, for example in education and economics, were beneficial to France and the French people. In addition they may argue that some elements often associated with dictatorship were relatively rare or not present such as the use of arbitrary arrest and the direct involvement of the military in government.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 2 (b) **Assess the reasons why its enemies were finally able to defeat France by 1815.** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for French defeat

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

No set answer looked for. The key will be to identify, explain and evaluate relative significance and relationship between a number of reasons. These may include consideration of: the role of Britain, the impact of the continental system, the Spanish 'ulcer', 1812, the War of Liberation, army reforms in Prussia, Russia and Austria, the Fourth Coalition, the relative decline of French army, questions surrounding Napoleon's generalship, and the loss of support at home and abroad, the Waterloo campaign.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

France 1814-1848

- 3 (a) To what extent was Charles X responsible for his overthrow in 1830? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of revolutionary events

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

The responsibility of Charles needs to be balanced against other factors to access the higher bands. Factors which point to Charles' responsibility include: the close relationship between Charles and Ultras, the evidence that Charles was an unreconstructed royalist (eg coronation), his pro-Catholic religious policy, his ministerial appointments, the Ordinances of St Cloud. Against these candidates may discuss longer term reasons (revolutionary legacy) for potential revolution, the opposition/criticism of liberals and republicans, the return of economic crisis etc.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 (b) To what extent were long term reasons more important than short-term reasons in bringing about Louis Philippe's overthrow in 1848? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of revolutionary events

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

In relation to longer term causes, candidates may discuss: Louis Philippe's lack of support from start, his uncharismatic, 'bourgeois' image, the lack of change at home, repression, his unpopular foreign policy, long term pressures for political change, the growth of republicanism (and Bonapartism). In relation to shorter term causes, candidates may discuss: the economic crisis in the mid 1840s, the impact of the political reform movement, the appointment and policies of Guizot, Louis Philippe's decisions/actions in 1848.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Revolution and Repression in Europe 1815-1849

- 4 (a) **'Metternich's policies were the main reason why liberal and nationalist movements had little success in the Austrian Empire and German Confederation before 1848.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]**

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for failure of radical movements

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

Key points: Need to discuss Metternich's policies and their impact – including, for example, the Carlsbad Decrees, the Six Acts, censorship, 'divide and rule', limited local reform etc. This discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as, limited support for liberal and nationalist movements generally, the divisions between liberals, nationalists and other reformers, the support of other rulers (eg in Germany), and the conservatism of Church.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 4 (b) How far do you agree that disunity amongst the revolutionaries was the main reason why the revolutions in the Austrian Empire failed in 1848-49? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for failure of revolutions

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

Candidates may discuss the limited degree of unity between Austrian liberals, Magyar nationalists, Czech revolutionaries and so on, and the differences between peasants, urban workers and middle classes. The impact of divisions needs to be balanced against other factors such as economic recovery, recovery of nerve, the loyalty and actions of the army, Russian intervention, lack of support etc.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1825-1890

Italy 1830-1870

- 5 (a) Assess the impact of the failure of 1848 revolutions on Italy to 1861. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of impact of revolutionary events

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

Candidates may point to short term results such as: the return to conservatism and the restoration of the *ancien regime*, repression (except Piedmont – *Statuto* and haven for nationalists and liberals). They may discuss longer term effects such as: the change in attitudes to nationalism and liberalism – most now looked to Piedmont, Piedmont became hope as Cavour and others instituted reforms and Piedmont developed; Austrian power was dented in 1848-49 and never fully recovered, the idea of '*Italia fara da se*' was discredited, the need for foreign support was better recognized (eg by Cavour).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 (b) 'Without Garibaldi there would have been no united Italy.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of role of individual in creation of united Italy

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

The central focus of the question is on Garibaldi and his actions, but in order to score in the higher bands there must be real assessment of his role. This can be done in terms of the impact of his actions and/or in relation to other forces at work.

Descriptive accounts of Garibaldi's actions cannot score in the higher bands, even if full and detailed – there must be assessment. Candidates may focus on the key years of 1859-60 and the exploits of Garibaldi and his 'thousand', but there may be broader treatment to include the 1848 revolutions and/or activities in the 1860s.

There may be discussion of Garibaldi in relation to Cavour/Piedmont, Napoleon III, the force and appeal of his personality and actions, and his abilities as a military leader.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Germany c.1862-1890

- 6 (a) **Assess the reasons why Prussia came to dominate Germany in the period c.1862 to 1871.** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for Prussian dominance in Germany

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

Candidates will need to identify and discuss a range of factors, such as the role of economic developments and Prussian economic expansion and dominance of the *Zollverein*, the reform and development of the Prussian army, the relative decline of Austria, the role of Bismarck, the international situation and the role of war as well as diplomacy in bringing about a Prussian dominated Germany, the winning over of the nationalists.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 (b) To what extent was creating order in the German Empire Bismarck's main aim in his domestic policy from 1871 to 1890? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of aims of domestic policy

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

Candidates need to identify Bismarck's aims – unity of the Empire, elimination of opposition (especially 'Reichsfeinde'), maintenance of executive power against the Reichstag, dealing with threats to the *status quo* – especially socialism, the maintenance of the power of the King of Prussia/German Emperor. Candidates may discuss how various aims are reflected in policies pursued and the shifting from wooing national liberals to conservatives. Candidates may well argue that creating order was indeed the underlying aim, although they may well suggest that this aim was pursued through the prism of maintaining the Emperor's power and that of the existing elites.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

France 1848-1875

- 7 (a) To what extent was the desire to hold on to power the main motive for Napoleon III's domestic policy? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of aims of domestic policy

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

Candidates are likely to concentrate on political issues in order to support the contention in the question – the constitution of 1852 which gave Napoleon III potentially almost unlimited power, tight censorship of the press, control of opponents, rigging of elections. Some may argue that the desire to secure his position on the basis of more enduring popular support explains his 'liberalisation' of the political process and the press from the end of the 1850s. Candidates may also point to other motives – such as genuine social concerns and the desire for economic progress. In relation to the latter, candidates may point to banking innovations like Credit Mobilier, trade fairs and the development of railways. In relation to the former they may refer to legalisation of trade unions, trade boards, public works, slum clearance etc. Some may argue that even in these areas, the underlying motive was the desire to hold on to power.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 7 (b) **'No clear aims and no real success.'** How far do you agree with this assessment of Napoleon III's foreign policy from 1852 to 1870? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of foreign policy

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

On aims candidates may centre their discussion around the somewhat opaque saying 'The Empire – it is peace' and seek to show that as far as possible Napoleon sought peace and security for France in Europe – something they may argue that is difficult to square with French involvement in the Crimea, Italy, Mexico and the affairs of Germany. They may suggest that Napoleon needed to achieve some kind of glory either by diplomatic success or military victory, but others may argue that it is difficult to see a consistent thread running through Napoleon's policies and domestic considerations (such as appeasing Catholic opinion) played as big a role as foreign and personal aims (such as sympathy for nationalist aspirations and the desire to play the role of great power)

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Russia 1825-1881

- 8 (a) 'Nicholas I's main aim was the maintenance of autocracy.' How far do you agree with this view of Nicholas I's domestic policy? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of domestic policy

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

It is likely that candidates will tend to agree with the quotation. Candidates may identify a number of aims – especially those summed up in the phrase 'orthodoxy, autocracy, nationality' – but will contend that the maintenance of Tsarism underpinned all policy whether it was the defeat of the Poles, 'russification', limited reform for serfs, crushing opposition or limitations on education. Candidates may, in this context, discuss issues such as repression, the Poles, serfs, education and evidence of growing opposition.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 8 (b) 'Alexander II's reforms were all failures.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of success/failure

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

Key points: Candidates may deal with reforms in sequence but the key will be the assessment of 'failure' and whether a balanced overall judgement is reached. We can expect a lengthy discussion of the Emancipation of the Serfs and discussion here may focus on the difference between the hopes of the peasants and the reality of the reforms that created as many problems as they solved. We can also expect discussion of legal, judicial, local government and military reforms. In each case candidates may balance evidence of success and failure – the fact that in most cases initial reforms were modified to nullify or reduce their impact. In relation to the military some astute candidates may suggest that changes in military service did not ensure military success. Overall, candidates are likely to be more generous to Alexander II than the quotation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

America 1846-1919**The American Civil War 1861-1865**

- 9 (a) **How effective was Lincoln's political leadership of the Union from 1861 to 1865? Explain your answer.** [45]

Focus: Evaluation of a political leader

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

Key points: Candidates' coverage of leadership may involve discussion of some of the following: Lincoln's attempts to avoid secession, his appointments of generals and his involvement in the conduct of the war, his relations with ministers and quality of ministerial appointments, his handling of public opinion and criticisms in Congress, his handling of emancipation and issues related to war effort (such as recruitment, taxation, civil liberties), the Gettysburg Address, reasons for re-election in 1864. Full coverage is not required to access the higher grades – what matters is the evaluation of effectiveness.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 9 (b) 'Grant's generalship was the main reason the Union won the Civil War.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for Union victory

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

Key points: Candidates may well point to the brilliance of Grant's generalship both before and after his appointment to overall command. We can expect some coverage of his command of the war effort in 1864-5, although details of campaigns are less important than analysis and evaluation of the contribution made by Grant's strategy and its impact. Consideration of Grant's generalship needs to be balanced against other factors such as Confederate strategy and actions, resources, quality of troops and other commanders, problems in the Confederacy, and the role of Lincoln.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Politics and Reform 1877-1919

- 10 (a) 'The main issues facing presidents in the period 1877 to 1896 were the problems facing farmers.' How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of issues facing presidents

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

Key points: The issue of agriculture was certainly important and was an issue for every administration in this period and subsequently. However, there were other issues such as civil service corruption, currency, tariffs and trade, and trusts. Candidates may choose to argue that different issues were more prominent at different times or seek to give an overview.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 10 (b) **Assess the reasons why Progressivism grew in American politics in the period 1880s and 1890s.** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for a development

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

Key points: Candidates may seek to discuss the nature of progressivism – a diffuse movement of reform at political, economic and social levels arising out of the challenges of modern society and conditions. General aims were to place public good over private interest for the betterment of society. The apparent corruption of aspects of government and the economy (eg trusts), as well as the problems facing agriculture and workers, provide a context for explanation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Western Expansion 1846-1900

- 11 (a) **To what extent was the building of railways the most important factor in opening up the west from 1846 to 1900?** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of opening up of West

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

Key points: Candidates must deal with the role of railway building in opening up the west and can point to the impact of various railway projects. The importance of railway building needs to be balanced against the importance of other factors such as cattle ranching, mining, federal encouragement of settlement. Better answers will provide relative evaluation of a number of factors and show how they are interlinked.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 11 (b) **Assess the reasons for the suppression of the Native Americans in the period from 1846 to 1900.** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for Native American downfall

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

Key points: Candidates may consider the actions of Native Americans and the various wars and treaties. Such discussion may be balanced against the pressure of westward expansion – westward migration from the east coast, incompatibility of nomadic and settler lifestyles, extinction of the Buffalo, mining, cattle ranching, railroads but also military inferiority (Indian Wars), the failure of treaties, federal policies towards reservations.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Race Relations in the South 1863-1912

- 12 (a) **How successful was Federal policy in improving the position of Blacks during the period of Reconstruction to 1877? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: assessment/evaluation of success of policy

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

Key points: Candidates may point to the efforts made by the federal government to improve the lot of Blacks – constitutional amendments, Civil Rights acts, the Freedman's Bureau. Formal 'success' may be contrasted with the 'reality' on the ground and the erosion/evasion of new 'rights'. Candidates may suggest that federal actions had limited impact because of the 'context' of the South: opposition in the south and the poor socio-economic position of Blacks, without education, money or property, that placed them at an immense disadvantage that formal legislation could not reverse. Success may be assessed by reference to context (as above), aims and hopes as well as outcomes.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 (b) **'Black reformers like DuBois and Washington had little impact on the position of Blacks.'** How far do you agree with this view in relation to the period up to 1912? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of impact of reformers

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

Key Points: On the positive side candidates may point to the influence of Washington in educating Blacks and the role of the Tuskegee Institute and his supposed influence amongst senior white politicians. In relation to Du Bois, candidates may point out his more aggressive approach and the role of his journalism and the beginnings of the work of the NAACP in promoting and defending Black rights. On the other hand candidates may set this in the context of the lack of any substantial progress in the economic, social or political position of Blacks and Du Bois's lack of influence at this time, as well as the divisions over approach and philosophy between black reformers.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1890-1945**Russia 1894-1917**

- 13 (a) **‘The 1905 Revolution had no lasting impact.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1905 to 1914 in Russia?** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of consequences of 1905 revolution

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

Key points: The focus here is on the impact of the ‘Revolution’. Candidates may point to the short term changes that indicated significant impact – such as the institution of Dumas and the October Manifesto. Such considerations may be set against the Tsar’s emasculation of the Dumas in later years, the return of repression and the limited impact of opposition. Candidates may point to indirect effects in the agricultural reforms of Stolypin and may also suggest that there was not a complete return to the status quo ante.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 13 (b) **Assess the reasons why the Bolsheviks were able to seize power in the October Revolution (1917).** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for Bolshevik seizure of power

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

Key points: Candidates may concentrate on the 'reasons' arising after the overthrow of the Tsar and point to the deficiencies of the Provisional Government, Dual Power, the continued problems of war, inflation, shortages, the popular unrest shown in the July Days, the return of Lenin, the organisation of Trotsky, the Kornilov affair. Candidates may also seek to balance short term reasons against a longer term background of war, opposition, social problems and so on.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Causes and Impact of the First World War c. 1890 - 1920

- 14 (a) **To what extent were the alliances between the Great Powers the main reason for the outbreak of war in 1914?** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of WW1

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

Key points: Candidates should demonstrate sound knowledge of the two main alliances – Triple Entente and Dual/Triple Alliance – and be able to assess their impact on the way events developed in the years building up to the First World War (Moroccan Crises and in relation to the Balkans – especially in the aftermath of the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand in July 1914). Such treatment needs to be balanced against, and links shown with, other factors such as rivalries in the Balkans, German ambitions, other tensions and the wider issues of nationalism, militarism and rivalry amongst the Great Powers in the early 20th century.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 14 (b) **How far does poor military leadership explain the mass casualties on the Western Front during the First World War?** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for a development

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

We can expect discussion of the military strategies and tactics adopted by generals and the casualties that ensued. No doubt the reputations of generals like Haig and Nivelle will come under the spotlight. Some candidates may deal with military leadership at a higher level – in terms of grand strategy and, for example, refer to the defensive strategy of the Germans and the desire of the Entente powers to wear down the Germans. Such considerations and judgements about them need to be balanced against other factors such as the context of industrial warfare and mass armies and the technological realities which favoured defence over attack.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Italy 1919-1945

- 15 (a) To what extent was fear of communism the main reason for the rise of the fascists to power in Italy by 1922? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for rise of fascism

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

Key points: Candidates should show an awareness of the growth of socialism and communism in the post-war period and may well refer to the 'two red years' to demonstrate the strength and threat posed by communism and the fears to which it gave rise amongst other political parties and the Italian people (especially the middle classes and business) more generally. Of course, candidates should relate such analysis to the actions, ideas and propaganda of the fascists and Mussolini, but may also demonstrate other attractions of fascism. They may link such analysis of the rise of fascism also to the desire for strong government and order. They may also point to other reasons such as the impact of war, economic dislocation, unemployment, inflation and the poverty of rural areas as a cause of popular unrest and disillusion with the post-war governments, disillusion with the peace treaties and the growth of nationalism. This may be linked to the fears of the elites and middle classes and, of course, the attitudes and decisions of the government and King in 1922.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 15 (b) **Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Mussolini as leader of Italy from 1922 to 1940.** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of Mussolini's leadership

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

Keypoints: This is a broad question which gives candidates plenty of scope to discuss a range of areas. Among strengths we may expect candidates to refer to Mussolini's charisma, popularity, cult status, his apparent dominance in the fascist party and the way he secured a personal dictatorship, his ability to galvanise Italians, his successful policies in relation to, for example, the Church and some aspects of the economy and foreign policy successes. On the weakness side candidates may equally discuss the compromises he made with the Church, the failure of much of the cultural and educational programme and the criticism that economic policy was dominated by the interests of big business or the needs of political prestige, and the failings of his foreign policy in the 1930s.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Germany 1919-1945

- 16 (a) **Assess the reasons why the Weimar Republic faced so many problems in the early 1920s.** [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for Weimar survival

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

Key points: Problems identified may include: humiliation and psychological impact of defeat, economic dislocation, the impact of Treaty terms, political division and unrest, inflation, introducing democracy. The reasons candidates discuss may include: the history of authoritarian government, the association between the establishment of democracy and the humiliation of defeat in war and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, the opposition to democracy from right and left, the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution, the backdrop of economic and social dislocation exacerbated by returning soldiers, inflation, and a divided and weakened Germany, the weaknesses of Weimar governments in dealing with attempted coups and revolutions, French occupation of the Ruhr and hyper-inflation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 16 (b) 'Economic success was the main reason for Hitler's domination of Germany after 1933.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for Hitler's domination of Germany

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

Key points: Candidates may refer to the economic 'recovery' after 1933, especially the fall in unemployment; refer to the 'benefits' enjoyed by many workers through provision of cheap holidays and leisure activities. They may also refer to the foreign policy successes from rearmament, and re-militarisation of the Rhineland through to the 'Anschluss' with Austria and the annexation of the Sudetenland. Candidates may go on to discuss other reasons, especially those associated with the machinery of terror and lack of freedom built up after 1933 – such as the SS, Gestapo, concentration camps, propaganda, indoctrination, censorship.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe and the World 1919-1989

- 17 (a) **How successful was the Treaty of Versailles in meeting the aims of President Wilson? Explain your answer.**

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

The Treaty of Versailles needs to be examined in relation to Wilson's aims (as set out, for example, in the 14 Points). One test would be to see how far Wilson's points are directly reflected in the Treaty and they may point, for example, to elements like the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France, the provision of territory to the new state of Poland to give it access to the sea, and the clauses setting up the League of Nations. Candidates may also test the Treaty against the principles Wilson espoused, such as self-determination. The assessment of success may also consider how far Wilson had to compromise with the aims of Britain and France in particular and how far Wilson's aims changed as the American army became directly involved in the war.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

17 (b) Assess the impact of Japanese foreign policy in the period from 1931 to 1941.

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

Candidates should focus on the effects of the diplomatic and political developments in Asia and the Pacific during the period 1931 to 1941. Such developments include: the Manchurian Crisis, the decision to leave the League of Nations, the Sino-Japanese War, the deterioration of relations with the USA and the expansionist policies leading to the attack on Pearl Harbour. Discussion of the impact may consider the reactions of Britain, France, USA and Germany, the consequences for the League of Nations, and the general atmosphere of deepening crisis which eventually resulted in World War in 1941.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 18 (a) **Assess the reasons why Stalin was able to consolidate his power in the Soviet Union after Lenin's death to 1941.**

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

Candidates may consider Stalin's background and position in the Communist Party and Soviet hierarchy in the years before and after Lenin's death, his character and ability, his manipulation of events (such as Lenin's funeral), the methods used to eliminate potential rivals like Bukharin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky, the mistakes/misjudgements made by these, the use of fear and terror, the significance of Kirov's assassination and the Purges of the 1930s. Candidates may draw more widely on material like the constitution of 1936 and aspects of economic and social policy but these must be made directly relevant to the question focus.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

18 (b) Assess the reasons why the USSR won the Great Patriotic War (1941 to 1945).

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

Candidates may discuss a range of reasons including: the significance in this regard of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, the population and economic resources of the Soviet Union, the relocation of industry beyond the Urals, the impact of Soviet military tactics and strategy, the ability of Soviet military leadership, the significance of Stalin, the impact German weaknesses and strategic 'mistakes', the impact of other theatres of war (such as Allied campaigns in western and southern Europe, materials supplied by the Allies, the significance of key episodes such as the resistance of Leningrad, the victories at Stalingrad and Kursk etc.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

19 (a) How successful was the Marshall Plan in Europe? Explain your answer.

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

Success may be assessed against relevant criteria such as aims, context and effects. Candidates should show a knowledge and understanding of the key features of the Marshall Plan and may refer developments in Greece, linkage to the Truman Doctrine, the impact in Western states, such as Britain, France, Austria, the western zones of Germany and Italy, the reaction of Stalin and the Soviet Union ('dollar imperialism', tightening restrictions in Eastern Europe, communist takeover in Czechoslovakia, Cominform, Molotov Plan etc.) and its role in the development of the Cold War.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 19 (b) **How effective were Soviet methods of control in Eastern Europe from the Hungarian Rising of 1956 to the Czechoslovakian Revolt of 1968? Explain your answer.**

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

Candidates are likely to discuss how the Soviet Union dealt with the two named crises. They may also discuss the impact of the crushing of the Hungarian Rising on the rest of Eastern Europe. They may also discuss the various methods of control, from the overt use of force to the exercise of political and economic pressure on the states of Eastern Europe. There may be reference to the Warsaw Pact, Comecon, Cominform and the building of the Berlin Wall. There may be discussion of affairs in particular states such as Poland where Gomulka was allowed limited freedom. Candidates may point to how far states like Poland, Hungary and Albania were willing to stray from strict Soviet orthodoxy as a test of effectiveness, alongside judgements about the degrees of opposition, criticism and the extent of the Soviet Union's tight hold, including the misjudgements made over Czechoslovakia.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

20 (a) Assess the success of the UN's intervention in Korea from 1950 to 1953.

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

Success may be assessed against criteria such as aims, context and/or impact. Candidates may discuss the UN's decision to intervene, the linkage with American foreign policy and reliance on her, the early military successes, the impact of the decision to invade North Korea, the intervention of China, the ensuing limited success and stalemate and the failure to resolve the conflict in the longer term after the truce of 1953 and the legacy of suspicion, distrust and military stand off. There may be some discussion of the impact on Korea itself and of the impact on the UN's reputation and prestige both in the East and West.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

20 (b) Assess the reasons for the USA's intervention in Vietnam.

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

The context of Cold War and the defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu as well as US support for the South Vietnamese president Diem may be discussed, as may the development of opposition and the forming of the NLF. The gradual escalation from economic and military aid to full-scale intervention in the presidencies of Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson may be discussed (including the decision to attack North Vietnam). The reasons pertaining to the situation in Vietnam in particular and the context of Cold War tensions are likely to feature in answers as well as the escalation resulting from faulty policy/tactics to try and cope with guerrilla war.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2587 Historical Investigations 768 – 1216

Historical Investigations 768-1216

Charlemagne

1 Study all the passages

Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Charlemagne's main problem in conquering the Saxons was that he was never able to concentrate on that task alone. [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.

In Passage **B** King sets out the kinds of distractions which Charlemagne faced – in this case the pressing need to help the pope, who some candidates may know was important to Charlemagne for internal political reasons. Another major example of a diversion which candidates may use is the expedition to Spain which ended in defeat at Roncevalles in 778 which also provoked a Saxon revolt. Other problems in Italy, the Slavs and the Avar question may also be mentioned. On the other hand candidates should discuss the other problems referred to in the other passages. Collins in **C** mentions the rough terrain, to which knowledgeable candidates may add the problems of distance, weather and roads. But Collins' main point is that resistance to Carolingian conquest was fragmented and that the Saxon polity was highly decentralized, coming together as a whole only to resist the Franks. Becher in **D** mentions some of the separate groupings amongst the Saxons, and adds to this that resistance to Charlemagne extended deep into Saxony society and was not limited to the nobles who, on their own, might have been persuaded to compromise much more easily. In passage **A** Fichtenau points to another range of problems faced by Charlemagne which hindered his drive to conquer Saxony, notably the pressure imposed on Frankish society by military enterprises, of which the conquest of Saxony was only the greatest. Some candidates may know that there is a view that Charlemagne was able to employ willing soldiers without straining his general population and should be given credit for this.

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**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 2 **Assess the view that the Carolingian empire was only superficially unified by the time of Charlemagne's death.** [45]

Focus: The debate on the nature of Carolingian government

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.

At first glance Charlemagne's achievement seems remarkable. He created a great empire, extending even beyond what Rome had achieved in the West, and his memory has passed down to posterity as the greatest of kings. He also reformed the Church and integrated its institutions into his own, making use of clerical literacy. There was an administrative structure, with *Missi Dominici* and Counts who were removable royal officers, supported by *Vassi dominici*. Use of churchmen was a shrewd way of bringing literacy into government. But there was no single body of law for all his subjects – each could only be tried by his own law. Moreover, there is evidence that his control over the lands he ruled was very limited. The Capitularies so often issued in the later part of his reign see him legislating time and again against the same abuses which could only have been committed by the men he relied on to govern for him. The idea has been put forward that only by conquest could the nobles be bound to the ruler and therefore, the empire, because of the rewards it offered, and that when conquest ceased, they began to behave selfishly and destroyed the empire. The use of oaths as a binding force seems to suggest an absence of stronger ties.

On the other hand it has been pointed out that nobody in the West could have had a truly effective and elaborate bureaucracy, and that his structures lasted far beyond his lifetime. Moreover repetition of laws against abuses of power can be seen as evidence of determination to eradicate them rather than helpless gestures. Moreover, the upholding of traditional law was sensible in view of the attitudes of the Frankish nobility who were attached to their customs. At the level of his own concepts it may be that Charlemagne did not see the empire as a unity. He created sub-kingdoms for Louis in Aquitaine and Bernard in Italy, and in 806, when he made dispositions for his succession, seems to have envisaged that these and others would continue and failed to make any provision for the succession to the empire. Candidates need to be careful not to become over-involved in the question of how he regarded the empire – and to concentrate on the institutional nature of the empire which is the focus of the question.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 **Assess the view that Charlemagne wanted to promote learning primarily because of his Christian convictions.** [45]

Focus: The reasons for Charlemagne's interest in learning.

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 likely to know that there is ample evidence of Charlemagne's personal piety. He surrounded himself with churchmen and his legislation, the Capitularies, constantly invokes the aid of the Almighty. In this view he was anxious to improve learning so that the Christian religion should have proper books and be served by literate clergy who could pass on the pure milk of the gospel to the people as a whole. On the other hand, he had solid reasons of state for an interest in learning. Charlemagne inherited from his predecessors a close alliance with the church which was in the interests of his dynasty and provided security for churchmen. He thus had a very strong political interest in regulating and controlling the Church. By reforming the church he created a literate instrument of government, and this, he decreed, could be used to educate the laity as well as the clergy, thus increasing royal influence and making government more regular and systematic. Candidates may suggest that these two views are not incompatible – that personal preferences and considerations informed his political views. What matters is that they should consider a whole range of evidence.

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 it was King John's actions and attitudes which caused the loss of many of the Angevin lands in France in 1204. [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.

In passage **D** Gillingham points to the influence of John's character on events, in that he refused to work with his allies after Mirebeau, alienating them. Subsequently his cruel treatment of Arthur damaged his prestige. On the other hand, he also points to John's military capacity and energy which won the battle in the first place. By contrast, in passage **B** Clanchy points out that Philip was able to exploit John's absence from the duchy after the fall of Château Gaillard to gain surrenders from vital cities and towns: this, as candidates are likely to know, draws on the view that he was lax in his defence of the duchy. Candidates should know that much of the discussion about the 'Loss of Normandy' (really the Angevin Empire) concerns John's personality and the energy or lack of it which he devoted to its defence. But they should also be aware of other factors bearing upon John's ability to resist. Much ink has been spilt on the relative wealth of John and Philip, an issue here raised in passage **C**, where it is suggested that there was parity in wealth between the two, but John's income could not be focused on a single problem, while attention is drawn to the fact that heavy taxation had political consequences for John – and here candidates should note the problem of treachery during the campaign of 1203-4. Passage **A** raises a quite different set of considerations. It suggests that John was not in a strong position at the start of the reign because of the concessions he had to make to Philip at Le Goutlet which conceded the French king's right to intervene in his affairs, and candidates should be able to connect this with the affair of John's marriage and the Lusignans. Moreover, Le Goulet cost him money and, importantly in 1203-4, allies. Candidates may show knowledge of the whole situation and its causes and use it to come to a reasonable conclusion on the question. It may be that some very good candidates will comment on the sources, notably Roger of Wendover and any attempt in that direction should be rewarded.

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**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 **Examine the view that John's treatment of the de Braose family marked a turning-point in his relations with the English barons.** [45]

Focus: The debate on the impact of a particular episode on the relations between John and his baronage

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 affair of William de Braose attracted much contemporary attention and has been highlighted by modern historians. This man, a favourite of King John whom he had used to counterbalance the power of the Marshal in the Welsh March, fell out of favour in 1206-08 and fled from the king. His wife and child were subsequently captured and starved to death in royal captivity. This was a very spectacular event, but it is not at all certain that it can be called a 'turning-point'. The Angevins had always traded favourites and were capable of cruelty. Any man in favour was bound to make enemies who would be only too glad to see him fall.

Probably far more important in determining relations between John and his barons as a whole was the pressure he was exerting in his efforts to regain the 'Angevin Empire'. He was imposing heavy taxes and frequently demanding service from his barons. In addition, he was particularly active in exploiting 'feudal incidents' which affected baronial families – his right of wardship and marriage in particular. These could be profitable for baronial families but not when John was so insistent on profiting for himself. These pressures told much more upon relations with the barons than any particular episode, or so it can be argued. Ultimately John was unsuccessful in his continental ambitions, and that loss of prestige was the trigger for rebellion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 To what extent was John's attempt to regain the lost Angevin territories ruined by the actions of his allies in 1214? [45]

Focus: The debate on the causes of the failure of John's strategy in 1214.

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.

John's strategy in the years leading up to 1214 was to create a grand coalition to help him recover his French lands. On the one hand a number of major magnates, notably the count of Flanders, disliked the encroachments of the French crown upon their freedom of action. On the other, very close to them, Otto IV, John's nephew, needed support against his Hohenstaufen enemies who were supported by the French king who did not want a powerful empire allied to John on his eastern frontier. Creating such an alliance was always difficult in medieval conditions, and it was even more difficult for allies to put armies in the field. At the same time John suggested a military strategy which was certainly viable: he would attack from the south, distracting the French, while his allies invaded in the north. It was a remarkable achievement to do this in 1214, and it can be argued that this showed John in a very favourable light, and that his allies simply let him down at the battle of Bouvines.

There is certainly no doubting the scale of John's commitment: the allies depended on his funds and although he was raising an army for the attack in the south he actually sent a considerable force under his brother, the earl of Salisbury, to fight with the allies in the north. However, the view that this careful planning was simply destroyed by careless allies at Bouvines has to be set against other considerations. Although John was not at Bouvines and was certainly not responsible for that military defeat, he was in charge of the thrust northwards from Aquitaine towards Paris, which stalled very badly when John had to retreat. It can be argued that at least he diverted some 600 French knights and an unknown number of footsoldiers under Prince Louis and thus robbed Philip of them in the operations in the north, but his expedition was inglorious. Moreover, the whole campaign was a terrible gamble for John because England, heavily taxed, was restless in 1213-14, and failure triggered a real rebellion. But had John been successful his prestige would have been enormous and the French monarchy would have been eclipsed, perhaps even destroyed. Candidates can use their knowledge of events as the foundation for a balanced debate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2588 Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725

Historical Investigations 1556-1725

Philip II

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess how far Philip II ruled mainland Spain in the interests of his subjects. [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.

The debate focuses on whether Philip II was an absolute king who imposed Castilian rule on his Spanish provinces, overriding their local privileges and causing revolt; or whether he was a just ruler upholding the inherited system and his duties as king. Passages **C** and **D** take a positive view while **A** and **B** are negative. **C** argues that Philip's subjects expected a personal relationship with their king, and Philip lived up to these expectations as the 'prudent king' - a conciliator who listened to advice, and needed time for tranquil reflection. This is supported by **D**, which cites Philip's religious devotions and messianic vision as reasons for delayed decisions. In **C** Philip is seen as an upholder of the traditions and privileges of his people, while **D** suggests he had a duty to improve their moral welfare defend Spain's reputation and security. Both suggest his policies were supported by his subjects, who saw him as in tune with their aspirations and religious beliefs.

On the other hand, Passage **A** condemns Philip for imposing unpopular absolute rule, Castilianising his territories, suppressing local privileges and provoking opposition in Aragon. Passage **B** emphasises the financial and economic impact of his wars on Castile by the 1590s, which might be cross referenced with the subordination of Castile suggested in Passage **A**. Passage **D** takes the view that the Armada was in the interests of Spain's reputation and security, in contrast to **B**, which argues Philip's neglect of the economy of Spain, with high taxation wasted on wars in northern Europe rather than in defence of Castile's coasts. Whereas Passage **A** sees the Inquisition as outside the law, Passage **D** sees it as necessary for improved morality, Philip's cause being identical with Spain's. **There is a very broad range of material which might be used relevantly, so it is stressed that the quality of argument based on pertinently chosen evidence should be the discriminator when allocating Bands, not the depth or range of knowledge included.** Own knowledge might include: debate on Philip's absolute rule eg disputes with Castilian Cortes over the *millones*, grandee power, corruption of *corregidores*; a defence of his actions in Aragon eg Perez; debate on the Inquisition eg Black Legend and revision of this; evidence for and against his compliance with the law; his personal style of government – administrative practices and his religious fanaticism eg Moriscos Revolt.

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**.

- 2 **How far was Philip II personally responsible for Spain's failure to end the Netherlands Revolt by 1598?** [45]

Focus: the relative impact of Philip II's policies towards the Netherlands Revolt.

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.

The debate on Philip II's policies in dealing with the Netherlands balances traditional blame for his mistakes and religious fanaticism against more recent emphasis on his imperial distractions, national awareness, foreign interference and Dutch grandee ambition. Relevant evidence includes Philip's anti-heresy measures, unwillingness to compromise, choice of governors-general, Castilianisation overriding local privileges, micromanagement from Madrid, imposition of military occupation, bankruptcies and mistakes such as the withdrawal of Parma in 1588 and 1590 - prolonging a revolt which might otherwise have been crushed long before. Imperial distractions might include Ottoman advance, Moriscos in Spain, the annexation of Portugal, French succession and Elizabeth's provocations. The part played by the House of Orange and foreign powers might also be cited to balance the argument. A judgement should be reached on the relative importance of the part played by Philip II in relation to a range of other factors.

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 simply a reaction to events? [45]

Focus: the planned or opportunistic nature of Philip II's foreign strategies.

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.

The debate centres on whether Philip II's foreign policy was proactive and planned, or reactive and opportunistic. Some historians have stressed his religious planning, 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, supporting the view that his foreign policy was driven by religious mission. Others have emphasised his political and imperialist planning, citing his acquisition of Portugal and its empire, his plans 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 view that Philip's Grand Strategy included a range of well established religious and dynastic plans, underpinned by pursuit of reputation, is countered by the view that he was opportunistic, merely reacting to crises as they arose, so had no imperialist strategy. There is also the view that events coincided to make him adapt his plans to crises as they arose, and no pre-planning could therefore succeed, as his empire was so vast and far-flung.

Evidence might include his planning for peace: for example, with France in 1559 and the Turks 1578; dynastic planning for empire – for example, the Philippines and Portugal; and plans for war against heresy – for example against the Turks to 1578, England after 1585 and in France from 1584. His reactions to events which damaged his reputation might be used to argue a case for 'crisis management' – eg Drake's exploits and the Treaty of Nonsuch as provocations for the sending of the Armada in 1588, or support for the Catholic League on the accession of Henry of Navarre as an opportunity to gain control of France. The Netherlands Revolt, as a domestic issue, is only relevant when used in relation to his reaction to events. For the higher bands, an evaluative judgement should be reached on the extent to which his strategies were planned or opportunistic.

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 the survival of Roman Catholicism in Elizabethan England depended on gentry support. [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**, **B** and **D** all refer to gentry support for Catholicism, but give differing opinions on its role and importance within Catholic survivalism. **A** claims that gentry support was only part of a wider body of support, and downplays its significance in comparison with that of 'humbler folk'. **B** in contrast says that Catholic survival was largely dependent on gentry support and **D** also suggests that it was important while acknowledging that it cannot explain survivalism in urban areas. **C** refers to 'a household religion', which could imply gentry support, but also claims that many gentry conformed and that popular Catholicism also died out. Nonetheless, one or two percent did remain Catholic, so the faith did survive. The Passages also refer to other reasons for Catholic survival, such as the work of the missionary priests (whom **B** claims were dependent on the gentry) and the influence of imported books and pious objects, whose introduction into the country is attributed by **A** to 'humbler folk.' Candidates may discuss further the effectiveness of missionary priests, for instance their concentration in the south, which would imply that Catholics in the north did not rely on them for the survival of their religion. They may also consider the argument that after the death of Mary, Queen of Scots Catholics had no figurehead and so tended to conform, an argument that would suggest that survivalism was dependent on the hope of a Catholic England in the future. Candidates may also refer to research on the significance of wealth (the extent to which fines would impact on families) as a determinant factor for recusancy. It is important that arguments about the reasons for the decline in Catholicism are clearly linked to the question asked, that is, why some remained Catholic.

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**.

5 To what extent was Elizabeth's power as monarch undermined by her gender?**[45]**

Focus: the extent to which Elizabeth I's power was affected by her gender.

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 debate centres round the difficulties Elizabeth experienced in managing government and whether these were affected by her gender. Elizabeth was less accessible to courtiers and councillors, but she used this to her advantage, denying them access when she pleased. Cecil apparently viewed Elizabeth as a mere woman who could be ruled. Elizabeth's relationship with Dudley was affected by her gender, and this also caused some of the conflict within the Council. Essex was ultimately unsuccessful in his attempts to take advantage of the aging Queen.

Alternatively it could be argued that it was character rather than gender that was important. Elizabeth's judgement of character when choosing councillors determined how they worked with her and each other. Arguably the Court could not function well under a woman, with increased danger of damaging factions centred on prominent nobles, but kings were also subject to this. Power in Parliament was not affected in theory by Elizabeth's gender; it could be argued that she used it to advantage in her speeches to MPs. Elizabeth was Supreme Governor of the Church, but took an active part in instructing her Archbishops of Canterbury.

Candidates may also consider the image of monarchy, as seen in contemporary written and pictorial views. Was the contemporary view of a woman's role in society and the home incompatible with that of a female ruler? Contemporaries did amend their views to allow for female rule (of course with a male Council), while Elizabeth stressed her standing as God's instrument and hence a 'special' woman on numerous occasions.

Alternatively candidates may assess how far Elizabeth's power was undermined by other factors such as religious belief, faction at court and in Parliament and rebellion compared with the impact of her gender.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

6 How far was Elizabeth in control of her Privy Council? [45]

Focus: the extent to which Elizabeth controlled her Privy Council.

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 is centred on the extent to which Elizabeth managed government decisions or was managed by her Councillors. Elizabeth's management techniques may be considered: Elizabeth rarely consulted with the whole Council, but with individual or small groups of councillors. This prevented her from being presented with a unanimous Council decision with which she disagreed. She was sometimes temperamental, displaying anger and even violence. The role of William Cecil was an important one, and candidates may discuss the extent to which he was faithful as a servant of the queen, or whether, instead, he manipulated government, for example by controlling information and communications and using 'men-of-business' in parliament. Candidates may also consider the role of faction within the Council, and the extent to which factional and personal rivalries were controlled or even encouraged by the Queen. While it is possible to argue that Elizabeth maintained a balanced Council until the late 1580s, the Robert Cecil/Earl of Essex rivalry of the 1590s descended into factionalism that was only ended by the execution of Essex. Candidates may consider the question in relation to issues such as the Queen's marriage and a possible meeting with and the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots. In the former case there is considerable debate over whether the decision to remain single was Elizabeth's or that of her Council. In the latter case, manipulation by the Council may be argued, yet it could also be argued that although Elizabeth was unwilling to sanction Mary's execution, this was the solution she wanted.

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's rise to prominence during the First Civil War was a result of his own scheming. [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** states throughout that Cromwell and his allies manipulated events to ensure Cromwell's continued role in the New Model Army and hence his prominence in the victory against the king, suggesting that the statement in the question is valid. However, **B** and **D** argue that there was only the appearance of manipulating events, denying that Cromwell could have foreseen the outcome and hence implying that Cromwell's prominence was a result of other factors than his scheming. **B** does acknowledge that Cromwell was a skilful politician but does not accept that he manipulated events, while **D** denies that Cromwell could have foreseen the outcome of events. **C** argues that military prowess was the key to his prominence, at the expense of his political role.

Candidates may support the proposition in the question with evidence of how Cromwell emerged from the disagreement on the aims of the war, the formation of the New Model Army (February 1645) and the Self-Denying Ordinance of April 1645 in a more prominent position. They may show how evidence of these events may also be used to demonstrate that Cromwell may have benefited from these events, but that this was not his aim. The argument may depend largely on detailed evaluation of the interpretations of events in parliament in the winter of 1644-45, but equally, may depend more on assessments of the effect of Cromwell's role in fighting the war. Candidates may support the argument that Cromwell's rise can be attributed to his military role with evidence showing Cromwell's role in the military events of 1642-46, such as his important role at Marston Moor and Naseby and his strategies for achieving good discipline among his men and encouraging them to fight for a cause.

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**.

8 Assess the reasons why Cromwell decided to support the execution of the king.**[45]**

Focus: Cromwell's motives in committing himself to the execution of Charles 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.

Candidates should consider a range of possible motives and reach a judgement on the one they consider the most convincing. Possible motives may include Cromwell's ambition to gain power or at least not to lose it; his sincerely held belief in the cause of the army in the Civil Wars, with the king as 'that man of blood', and the attendant view that God no longer wished England to have a king. Cromwell had reached a very powerful position by 1648/9 as he was second-in-command of the army and was also a leading MP. He had acted as an intermediary between Army and Parliament during the protracted negotiations with the King, putting the Heads of the Proposals to the King. This may have made him power-hungry.

Alternatively candidates may argue that Cromwell was motivated by his religious convictions, stemming from his providential belief that God had desired Parliament to win the First Civil War, that the King had gone against God's will in starting another war, and possibly that after the Second Civil War that God thought that England should not have a monarch. There is some debate on the timing of Cromwell's conviction that the King should be removed as well as on the extent of Cromwell's knowledge of Pride's Purge. Candidates who provide an explanation based purely on the sequence of events, especially 1646-48, without including a clear explanation of how these influenced Cromwell's decision, are not taking interpretations of Cromwell's motives into consideration, and so should be rewarded less highly.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 9 'King in all but name.' To what extent is this a fair assessment of Cromwell as Lord Protector? [45]

Focus: Was Cromwell's Protectorate quasi-monarchical or significantly different from monarchy?

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.

Cromwell's Protectorate may be regarded as quasi-monarchical or as a military dictatorship. It is also possible to argue that the nature of the regime changed. Candidates may consider Cromwell's constitutional powers, assessing to what extent these powers were similar to those of the Stuart monarchs in the early 17th century. They may consider how Cromwell exercised his powers. His attendance at Council meetings was irregular and he did not force his views on the Council. Relations with his first parliament were poor; he made significant concessions to the second, yet rejected the offer of the crown. Candidates may also consider Cromwell's use of the army, particularly in the Rule of the Major Generals, and the consequent need for high taxation, possibly referring to decimation tax and Cony's case and perhaps making comparison with Charles I's taxation policies in the Personal Rule. They may consider how Cromwell deposed himself with his assumption of the trappings of royalty. Candidates may also consider differences in policies such as religious ones of King and Lord Protector and consequent differences or similarities in their powers. Contemporary republicans accused him of behaving like a king, but candidates will need to evaluate this interpretation.

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 the Great's achievements in domestic affairs were much more substantial than his failures. [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 might judge that the Passages fall into two groups. Passages **A and B** praise Peter's achievements whilst Passages **C and D** are critical. This means that candidates might well organise their answers sequentially. There is a common factor in Passages **A and B** inasmuch as they focus on social changes. Westernisation is not mentioned in the extracts but candidates might use and consider the term, especially when dealing with Passages **A and B**. However, both Passages look more widely. Pares, in Passage **A**, believes that 'Peter's work was as complete as one lifetime could make it' whilst Passage **B** puts the social changes into the context of foreign achievements and other reforms. Passage **C** contradicts Passage **B**'s picture of a relaxed Peter by portraying an isolated and lonely Tsar. In addition, Peter's reforms resulted in increased burdens for the peasantry and a widening gap between social classes. Passage **D** focuses on the damage to the Russian population. Whilst recognising Peter's achievements, it sees the Tsar as controversial.

Candidates should note that the question is about domestic affairs. Brief references to foreign policy might be acceptable if made as comparisons but their omission should not be regarded as a gap. The domestic effects of foreign policy are very relevant. The Specification mentions the following as aspects of domestic issues: 'economic reforms, military and naval reforms, religious policy, westernisation, the establishment of St. Petersburg.' This list is wide and examiners should be realistic in their expectations when assessing the own knowledge that is used to complement the study of the Passages in this question. Although it is not vital, answers in **Band I** might be expected to integrate the own knowledge with the study of the Passages. However, the most discriminating factors when awarding this Band might be answers' success in providing a balance between the Passages and own knowledge, and the focus on the key issue in the question: the assessment of success and failure at the end of the reign. The clear focus of the Question is on the situation in 1725. References to earlier parts of the reign should be linked to the end. Some candidates might distinguish between short and long-term success. However, they are not expected to have knowledge of developments in later periods and this approach is not required for the highest mark.

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 the most important aim of Peter the Great's domestic reforms was to build a powerful army and navy.** [45]

Focus: evaluation of the focus of Peter the Great's aims in his domestic reforms.

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.

There is an argument that the claim is highly valid. Peter's priority was military success and everything in domestic affairs was subordinate to this. He was at war for most of his reign (but candidates do not need to narrate the wars) and his early experience of defeats persuaded him of the need for radical change. A link can be made between military needs and the reform of government that strengthened Peter's hand. The economic changes were intended to provide resources for the military. On the hand, his reforms included measures that had little to do with the military effort, such as policies towards the Church. Candidates might argue that his reforms arose from a more general wish to westernise Russia or perhaps a tendency to impose rational systems on Russia. Another alternative judgement might be that his reforms lacked any system but were short-term measures, reflecting a Tsar who was impatient for change but lacked systematic thinking. The Specification indicates the areas that candidates might expect to have studied in domestic reforms, 'economic reforms, military and naval reforms, religious policy, westernisation, the establishment of St. Petersburg.' However, the most important discriminating factor will not be the range of reforms that are explained but the focus on Peter's aims.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 **Assess the threats to Russia from foreign enemies during the reign of Peter the Great.** [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the extent of foreign threats to Peter the Great's Russia.

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 debate centres over the extent of the external threats to Russia. The Specification indicates that candidates should study the wars against Turkey, Persia and Sweden. However, even the most successful answers are not required to give equal attention to each and it will be possible to achieve **Band I** without mentioning Persia. However, Turkey should normally be considered for this Band. One can argue that Peter was defending Russia from the powerful Sweden of the aggressive Charles XII and a strong Turkish Empire in the south. Alternatively, it can be claimed that the Swedish threat was deflected by the victory at Poltava (1709) and that Russia did not have to continue the war, whilst the threats from Turkey and especially Persia were not serious. Warfare might be seen to reflect Peter's personal ambitions and love of war. The campaign against Turkey / Azov began Peter's reign with initial success. By 1713 (Treaty of Adrianople), Peter had to surrender his gains. In the Baltic, Sweden had already expanded Swedish power ominously when war broke out (1700). Success at Poltava followed serious setbacks but did not end the war. It continued until the Treaty of Nystadt (1721). One of the reasons for the invasion of Persia was to prevent Turkey controlling the silk trade and Peter added to his areas of control.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2589 Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955

Napoleon I

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Napoleon was the 'heir to the Revolution'. [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 relationship of Napoleon to the Revolution has been a central area of debate ever since Napoleon came to power. Many of his admirers saw him as the consolidator of the Revolution and stress his (limited) liberal credentials, constitutions and benevolent reforms. Marxists have seen him as the man who consolidated the position of the bourgeoisie. His detractors have tended to view him more cynically as unconcerned with the Revolution and motivated solely from a desire for power. There are elements of some of these arguments in the passages which candidates can test/balance against their own knowledge.

From **B and D** candidates may pick up on some of the principles/aspects of the Revolution which did appear to be sustained or defended such as careers open to talents (**B and D**), abolition of feudalism (**B and D**), property rights – to *biens nationaux* (**B**), equality before the law (**B**), education (**B**), religious toleration (**D**) (although they may question the motivation – **D**). From **A and D**, candidates may argue that certain ideas were maintained (government efficiency. Legal equality in **A, D** as above) and others ignored (personal liberty, social equality in **A**, popular sovereignty, equality, freedom of the press in **D**). From **C**, candidates may argue that revolutionary principles had little to do with Napoleonic rule (comments on equal subjection and dictatorship) and from **B and D** that keeping the middle classes sweet was the key priority that led to the confirmation of certain revolutionary ideas. Own knowledge may provide detail to support or refute some of these ideas and may include new perspectives (such as that Napoleon was the 'Messiah in army boots' predicted by Robespierre – the inevitable dictatorship resulting from a decade of chaos; or that Napoleon was keen to display his revolutionary heritage at least until he was secure in power).

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**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 2 **‘Napoleon’s only concern in policy towards the satellite states and the Empire outside France was to subordinate them to the needs of France.’ How far do you agree with this view?** [45]

Focus: Napoleon’s aims and motives in dealing with his empire and satellite states

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 debate about Napoleon’s motives centres on his claim to have consciously promoted nationalism, modernisation and liberty as opposed to the view of his detractors that his aim was to achieve exploitation, oppression and tyranny.

There is a tendency in much more recent writing on Napoleon’s impact on Europe to stress the detrimental impact and his use of allies, satellites and Empire as a great ‘spoils’ system, a resource for Napoleon’s martial ambitions and as a means of rewarding his family and marshals. They also stress the attempt to remodel the European economy to be subservient to French interests (principally through the Continental System). Such arguments need to be balanced against the ‘benefits’ that French rule may have brought to different areas and to varying degrees – the Code Napoleon, abolition of serfdom, efficient government, and so forth. Candidates are likely to draw their evidence from Italy, Holland, and perhaps satellites like Warsaw Bavaria and Westphalia. Candidates may not draw clear distinctions between ‘Empire’ and ‘satellite states’ and examiners can be lenient on this (certainly do not expect balance) – what will matter is the quality of the analysis and evaluation. Candidates may also seek to differentiate between different areas providing evidence of both exploitation and also of relative benefits and also of the relationship between the degree of exploitation/benefits and the time under French control and nature of acquisition. Some historians have sought to generalise along the lines that proximity to France and time under Napoleonic control were key influences over the degree of Napoleonic control/influence for good or ill; others have suggested that all depended on local circumstances and the degree of exploitation depended on such circumstances and how far Napoleon was forced to compromise.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 To what extent do Napoleon's campaigns from 1805 to 1815 support the claim that he was a great military commander? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on Napoleon's generalship

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 defenders of Napoleon as a military genius often focus on the campaigns against the Third Coalition 1805-7; the detractors of Napoleon's generalship tend to focus on the later campaigns – Russia and after – to illustrate his failings. The Wagram campaign of 1809 is often seen as the watershed. Some candidates may well argue forcefully that the later campaigns undermine the claim of greatness, pointing to defeat in 1809 at Aspern-Essling, the follies and disaster in Russia in 1812 especially, but also to the Battle of Nations and the Waterloo Campaign. However, there needs to be some recognition of balance – between 1805 and 1807 Napoleon was unsurpassed and candidates may well refer to Ulm, Austerlitz, Jena and Friedland both in terms of campaign strategy and command in battle. They may also argue that with limited resources Napoleon fought brilliantly in 1813 and 1814, and defend the Waterloo campaign as strategically sound; they may even argue that the Russian campaign was only partly due to Napoleon's mistakes and misjudgements. Defenders of Napoleon may cite the deterioration in the quality of the French army and the improved quality, determination and quantity of his opponents; they may also refer to the coalition strategy of avoiding direct battle with Napoleon until they had overwhelming force in 1813.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-1880

- 4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Gladstone's Irish policy to 1880 was determined by his moral outlook. [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.

Passages **A** and **C** argue the moral motives most strongly. **A** refers to genuine grievances and to the principles of justice. **C** is concerned with the broad moral vision and Gladstone's deep sense of religious purpose. **B** argues that for Gladstone a moral purpose and party advantage came to the same thing and candidates could give other examples where this was the case. Passages **A** and **B** refer to the Fenian outrages which could be seen as a motive, although **A** says Gladstone denied this. An opportunity was provided by the Fenian activities and candidates could mention Gladstone's reputation for right timing.

All four Passages contain hints or more definite mentions of Gladstone's desire to unite the Liberal Party and appeal to popular opinion. Passage **A** claims the Fenian activities softened up public opinion and **B** stresses the opportunity to draw all wings of the party together. Even **C**, the Passage most ready to credit Gladstone with moral motives, says that Irish disestablishment was the only issue on which the party could unite. **D** argues that Gladstone's priority was to unite his party and win public support and that Ireland was the ideal way to do this. **D** also indicates that Gladstone skilfully avoided the thorny question of land reform at first and **B** backs this up. In similar vein both **B** and **D** refer to the need to give the Liberals a success after the triumph of Disraeli over parliamentary reform.

In order to offer supported evaluation, candidates could mention Gladstone's other moral crusades and his pursuit of justice to support one view. His reliance on his conscience and religious beliefs in deciding political issues was a consistent part of his outlook. He disliked the aggressive and immoral foreign policy of Palmerston and for a long time refused to serve under him. Principle led him to support the removal of the ban on Jews being MPs and to attack the tyranny ruling Naples when he visited Italy. Alternatively his desire to win power and to be revenged on the traitor Disraeli would support the view that he was simply seizing the chance offered to him. It has been argued that in his rivalry with Palmerston he summoned the masses to his aid, courting popular support in the press and through public meetings to advance his cause and bring him personal success.

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**

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 How far was Disraeli's contribution the main factor in the development of the Conservative party to 1868? [45]

Focus: the extent to which Disraeli shaped the Conservative party as compared with other factors.

What matters here 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.

The debate is centred on whether Disraeli made a crucial difference to the development of the Conservative party or played a more minor role. The first view might involve discussion of his role in reconciling the party to free trade, which he did in his 1852 budget and thereafter he pursued orthodox financial policies. There was also his maintenance of clear opposition to other parties, his skill in the House of Commons and most of all his achievement in the Second Reform Act. Most historians give Disraeli the credit for the passing of the Second Reform Act by the Conservatives, giving them a rare success in this period. He can also be given credit for broadening the appeal of his party away from the landed aristocracy. Ideologically his novels made a contribution.

The alternative view is that he was fortunate in the lack of rivals and that the divisions in the Conservative party propelled him from the back to the front bench far more rapidly than would have been the case in normal circumstances. In addition the grandees in the party made policy and never trusted him, his relationship with Lord Derby was poor, his failures as Chancellor of the Exchequer, notably to reduce taxes for the urban middle classes, suggested he lacked ability and the capacity to win the support of this vital group. His Jewish background told against him and lessened his influence. He was widely viewed within his party as an opportunist and an adventurer and so his role was minimalised.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 To what extent were both Gladstone's and Disraeli's foreign policies motivated by a desire to promote British interests? [45]

Focus: Did Gladstone and Disraeli follow foreign policies which aimed primarily to serve British interests or did they have other motives ?

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.

Candidates could argue that both men claimed to promote British interests, but that each of them interpreted this in their own way. Thus Disraeli felt it was the role of Britain to be dominant in Europe, reflecting the policy of Palmerston, while Gladstone put more emphasis on co-operation within Europe, perhaps harking back to Castlereagh. Gladstone's actions over the Black Sea clauses and reaction to the Franco-Prussian war show his attitude, whereas Disraeli's very different approach to the Eastern crisis and the Congress of Berlin could illustrate his methods. Another view could be that Disraeli was devoted to British interests above all else and that Gladstone favoured a moral foreign policy which might even run counter to British interests. Disraeli's purchase of the Suez Canal shares could be contrasted with Gladstone's settlement of the *Alabama* issue. It could also be suggested that their policies were quite similar at times. Both were reluctant to support heavy expenditure on defending British overseas possessions. The divergence might be seen as coming when Disraeli saw the electoral possibilities in a more pro-active foreign policy. Imperial examples may be used but candidates who do not include discussion of European affairs are unlikely to reach higher Bands.

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 Using these **four** Passages **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that Bismarck was personally responsible for provoking war with France in 1870. [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 be aware of the debate that surrounds the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. Bismarck's later claim (Passage **A**) that he used the Hohenzollern Candidature and the consequent Ems Telegram as a deliberate trap to push the French into declaring war needs to be considered against theories that say war occurred more by accident than design. None of the views expressed by historians in the passages agree fully with Bismarck's version of events. Taylor's version (Passage **B**) has Bismarck the opportunist, almost blundering into a war that could have done serious damage to German nationalism had the French won. Feuchtwanger in Passage **C** attributes some responsibility to Bismarck but not in the dramatic fashion Bismarck claimed - Bismarck's real achievement was not in tricking the French but in using the incident to rouse German national feeling against a common enemy. Passage **D** suggests that it was not so much that Bismarck was controlling events but rather events were controlling him in the form of anti-French national sentiment and the designs of the Prussian army.

In support of their evaluation candidates could refer to some of the following. In terms of own knowledge, a wider discussion of Bismarck's intentions could begin with the Treaty of Prague (notably its secret clauses concerning the South German States). Candidates may well also indicate that something of his intentions was shown by his manipulation of the Luxembourg Crisis. Aspects of the Hohenzollern Crisis may also come under scrutiny as being either by accident or design – such as Bismarck's handling of the Spanish *Cortes*, his pressure on Prince Leopold, the mix-up with the Madrid telegram and Benedetti's approaches to William I. Candidates may also wish to discuss French reactions and responsibilities as a counter to Bismarck's role. Perceptive candidates may also offer comments on how the nature of much of the evidence (not least Bismarck's own secrecy) has created much confusion and controversy around these events.

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**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 8 To what extent did the Zollverein enable Prussia to dominate the other German States in the period from 1858 to 1871? [45]

Focus: To evaluate the factors that led to the unification of 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 should demonstrate an awareness of the process by which Prussia established and developed the *Zollverein* not only to create greater hegemony over her own provinces but also to increase the strength of her economy and trade. A detailed history of the *Zollverein* is not required but candidates should be aware that by 1841 the majority of German states had willingly joined it. Bismarck later exploited its membership to deliberately exclude and isolate Austria.

The debate surrounding the *Zollverein* hinges around the extent to which economic union within the German States necessarily acted as a pre-cursor to political unity. Its supporters would argue that it paved the way for the leadership of Prussia and set up a model of co-operation based on the exclusion of Austria. Critics would point out that within its constitution there was little or no provision for political decision-making between its members and when put to the test in 1866 most of its members chose to fight against Prussia rather than side with her. Some candidates may also refer to the point that the South German states, even when they became members of the *Zollparlament*, still retained grave doubts about Prussia's political dominance and in 1868 opposed plans for closer union with the North.

Candidates may well broaden the debate further still and argue that there were **other factors** that allowed Prussia to dominate the other German states, such as: the size and strength of her army, the political skill and diplomacy of Bismarck, the development of an economic infrastructure of communications (railways and telegraph), the decline and defeat of their potential allies (Denmark, Austria and France) and indeed, internal forces of German Nationalism. The best answers may well combine a number 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 How important were military factors in the expansion of Prussia in the period from 1862 to 1867? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the factors upon which the strength of Prussia was based

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 factors which led to Prussia's military victories over Denmark, Austria and France. Military strength will be seen as one of a number of reasons for the emergence and dominance of Prussia. Although detailed knowledge of the various campaigns is not required, arguments in favour of the question will most likely offer such reasons as: superior Prussian generalship, tactics and strategy, mobility and weaponry as examples of Prussian military strengths. However, in terms of a debate, candidates will need to evaluate these factors against other points such as: the diplomacy of Bismarck, the strength of Prussia's economy, her leadership of the Zollverein, the relative weakness of the other European States and a favourable international situation (especially after the Crimean War). Good answers will also look at the possible linkage between these factors, eg Prussia's military strength was underpinned and made possible by her economic strength. Candidates may well conclude that Prussia's victories during this period were the result of a number of factors. Answers dealing with military aspects alone, however well written, will have little opportunity of progressing past a **Band III**.

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 benefits of Prohibition outweighed its disadvantages. [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.

Passage **A** suggests that if it had been properly implemented National Prohibition could have succeeded. Also it states that Prohibition did have a beneficial impact on the drinking habits of the nation. Passage **B** suggests that Prohibition did work. It provides statistics and contemporary commentaries that support the view that it did bring benefits. However, the passage has limitations. It refers only to the early part of the Prohibition era, up to 1925. Passage **C** suggests that in rural America Prohibition did have considerable success. However, it does mention that in the cities it did create social problems. Passage **D** suggests that Prohibition did create a lot of problems associated with crime. However, it also supports the view that rural America did have some benefits.

Using own knowledge, candidates could mention widespread disobedience; illegal distilling, bootlegging, rum running. Candidates may mention the increase in political corruption and the role of organised crime such as the activities of Capone and Chicago mobsters.

In the higher bands candidates should be rewarded if they are able to differentiate between the benefits of State Prohibition, which preceded National Prohibition in many States, and National Prohibition from January 1st 1920

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**

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 11 **Assess the view that the Wall Street Crash of October 1929 was the most important reason for the Depression.** [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the debate on the causes of the economic depression from 1929.

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 could mention the traditional view of the Stock Market Crash causing Depression. Over speculation in shares, and the panic caused by Black Thursday helped to fuel economic downturn. However, candidates may offer other views. Overproduction in the 1920s, fuelled by under consumption, created underlying weakness in the US economy; the Crash of 1929 acted only as the catalyst for collapse. They may also mention the inherent weakness of the US banking system based on state rather than national banks. They may mention the negative impact on world trade of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff of 1930. Finally, they may look at depression in a broader context referring to dislocation of the world trading system following the First World war. This was Hoover's explanation at the time.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 How far did opposition reduce the effectiveness of the New Deal in the period from 1933 to 1941? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of debate on the opposition to the New Deal

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 the following opponents:-

The Liberty League; Socialists and Communists; Father Charles Coughlin; Senator Huey P Long; Francis Townsend; Upton Sinclair; the US Supreme Court.

Candidates may argue that Coughlin and Townsend offered alternatives to the New Deal which received considerable media coverage but little practical political support. Lemke, their presidential candidate in 1936, received a derisory amount of votes. The Liberty League galvanised support from Big Business and also received support from former New York Governor, Democrat Alfred E Smith. It helped organise opposition to the NRA in 1933-35. Socialists and communists also offered radical alternatives but received little political support. Most important opponent was the Supreme Court and its judgements on NRA and AAA in 1935 virtually torpedoed First New Deal. When Roosevelt tried to pack the court in 1937, this led to the creation of a conservative coalition in Congress.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24

- 13 Using these **four passages and your own knowledge**, assess the view that the failures of the Provisional Government were more important than the activities of Lenin and the Bolsheviks in explaining their successful seizure of power in Russia in October 1917. [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.

The debate is likely to centre on the degree to which Lenin can take credit for skilfully orchestrating the seizure of power against the argument that the power of the Provisional Government simply melted away (having little to do with the activities of Lenin and the Bolsheviks) and, in the absence of any other effective power bloc, Lenin assumed power in October 1917.

Passages **B** and **C** focus principally on the problems facing the Provisional Government and its failure to solve them. Passage **A** focuses on the growing strength of the Bolshevik party whilst passage **D** places the blame for the collapse of authority not only on the Provisional Government but also on left-wing parties (other than the Bolsheviks) in failing to offer effective solutions to Russia's problems.

Passage **B** implies that the Provisional Government failed because it did not offer the peasants or the workers prospects of a better future. This point is reinforced in Passage **D**. Indeed, the decision to continue Russia's involvement in the war ensured that economic conditions at home would deteriorate even further thus providing the Bolsheviks with an opportunity to exploit the popular unrest. Passage **B** also makes reference to the position of the Provisional Government being undermined by being forced to share power with the Petrograd Soviet. Passage **C** takes the argument a stage further by claiming that the Provisional Government was doomed to fail from the outset given the immense problems it faced and the lack of time it had to solve them.

Passage **A** focuses on the other side of the argument – that the Bolsheviks were making positive progress in terms of popular support in the autumn of 1917, as evidenced by their increased vote in elections for the soldiers' section of the Petrograd Soviet. Lenin's role is also highlighted with emphasis placed on the fact that the Bolsheviks, unlike the Provisional Government, offered policies which would appeal to the people – land redistribution and peace. Passage **D** contributes one more point to the debate – the decision by the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks to support the Provisional Government thus ensuring, when the power of the Provisional government collapsed, that the only left-wing party with any credibility left was the Bolsheviks.

In terms of own knowledge candidates could refer to Lenin's April Theses and his ability to capture the popular mood with slogans like 'All power to the soviets' and 'Peace, bread and land'. The failed summer offensive of 1917 and the decision to arm the people in the face of the Kornilov rebellion could be cited as factors which contributed to the weakening of the Provisional Government.

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**

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

14 Assess the problems facing the Bolsheviks from 1903 to February 1917. [45]

Focus: Assessing the nature and importance of problems facing the Bolshevik party between 1903 and 1917.

What matters here 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.

There is not likely to be much disagreement about the lack of impact made by the Bolshevik Party during the period in question despite later claims by men like Trotsky that during this period Lenin was formulating and refining the policies which swept the Bolsheviks to power in October 1917. There are a range of arguments which can help to explain why their impact was limited. The split with the Mensheviks in 1903 weakened the role of the left and Lenin's insistence on a small, tightly-knit and highly trained group of revolutionaries meant that they were always likely to be overshadowed by the Mensheviks. Indeed the Tsarist police regarded the Mensheviks as a far more dangerous challenge to state authority as they were actively campaigning amongst the workers. Before 1914 estimates of membership of the Bolshevik Party ranged from only 5,000 to 10,000. Lenin was not in Russia for much of this period, the Bolsheviks were taken by surprise by the events of 1905 and even the reconciliation with the Mensheviks in 1906 proved to be short-lived. Differences over Duma elections, attitudes towards other political parties and the Bolshevik insistence on using bank robberies to provide party funds ensured a permanent split with the Mensheviks in 1912. Even during the First World War the impact of the Bolshevik Party on revolutionary politics was negligible, as Lenin's continued insistence on a small, elitist party and his refusal to co-operate with the new government ensured that the Bolsheviks remained firmly on the fringes of political activity. Lenin even suggested that defeat in war would be the 'lesser evil' than support for the post-Tsarist administration.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 15 **Assess the view that necessity rather than ideology determined Lenin's policies from 1918 to 1924.** [45]

Focus: Assessing the nature of Bolshevik rule between 1918 and 1924.

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.

Much of the debate is likely to centre around the extent to which the introduction of War Communism and the NEP can be seen as practical responses to a crisis situation ('necessity') or as part of a carefully orchestrated policy to establish a communist state ('ideology'). The Civil War was used by the Bolsheviks as an excuse for the introduction of War Communism and the use of terror but in reality the Bolsheviks were prepared to use any means at their disposal to maintain their control with or without a civil war. By 1921 the system of government which had emerged was much different from that proposed in Lenin's 'April Theses'. Did this single party state evolve simply as a result of crisis conditions in Russia or was it Lenin's intention all along to end up with a dictatorship? The introduction of the NEP in 1921 can be seen as a practical response to the food shortages and as a compromise with capitalism and thus as a product of 'necessity' Yet on the other hand although there may have been compromise economically there was no compromise politically. Censorship was tightened; the number of political prisoners grew dramatically and the activities of the Cheka expanded. Lenin also made moves to centralise authority further and to stifle open debate. Thus, it could be argued that 'ideology' triumphed in the period 1921-24.

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 economic interests were more important than political considerations in determining British policies towards Germany from 1919 to 1936. [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.

Of these passages, Passage **A** refers to City opinion being pro-German and choosing to accept Hitler's promises – though the City is not seen here as representing the whole nation. There are political issues here, such as the feeling in the Daily Mail that it is unfair to keep Germany down regardless of economic issues. However, the City's minimising of the danger and anti-French sentiment could be seen as evidence for the greater importance of economic considerations. Passage **C** confirms the views of the City and suggests that economic factors were extremely important, stressing the Anglo-German trade before 1914 and British economic interests in seeing a German economic revival. Trade was also seen as a way of persuading Hitler into moderation. The blaming of the rise of Hitler on the Depression is evidence for the importance given to economic issues. The importance could be supported by economic knowledge of the high levels of unemployment through the 20s, increasing from 1929; the desire for 'normalcy' reflected in the return to Gold in 1925; the resentment of French policies which seemed to affect economic stability.

However, City opinion did not always hold sway, and **A** is quite critical of it. Other factors might seem to have had more importance, for example, public revulsion against the losses of 1914-18, the bad reputation of Versailles, concern for Imperial Defence Issues. Thus while recognising trade as important, Passage **D** saw fear of Bolshevism and hostility to a French domination of Europe as being key factors. Passage **B** too sees a range of issues, with economic factors being part of a general insecurity and Imperial tensions being important. These could be explained in order to evaluate the passage, especially problems in India and fear of Japanese power in the Far East. The important point that Dominion support could no longer be taken for granted as it had been in 1914 is also mentioned. It is unlikely that economic factors were of no importance; the discussion here should try to weigh economic factors against other considerations.

In order to support evaluation, candidates could refer to some of the following points. However, the additional knowledge suggested here is only an indication of what *might* be referred to. The British economy suffered heavily because the trading context was so radically disturbed by the First World War. From 1921 older industries resumed the decline that had been temporarily arrested by war; agriculture suffered from world wide price decline. Aware of these problems, it was natural for governments to try to restore normal economic and financial relations which meant having Germany back as a trading partner. Also, with declining revenue, it was natural to want to reduce defence spending, hence the 10 Year Rule which lasted until 1932. With the onset of the Great Depression, the pressures were greater for international understanding and reduction of financial obligations.

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**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 17 **Assess the view that the domestic critics of appeasement offered no realistic alternatives in 1938.** [45]

Focus: Evaluation of alternatives to appeasement

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 should be focused on 1938 and not later historical views, though these may be considered when assessing contemporary criticism. The question is whether (in terms of the alternatives offered of armed opposition to Hitler, forging new international alliances or relying on Collective Security), the opponents of Chamberlain had a less realistic view of Britain's military capacity, (the strength of possible allies, the possibility of working through the League, public and Empire opinion) than Chamberlain.

Candidates may consider views without specifying them, but are likely to know Churchill's alternative policy of a Grand Alliance; Labour's general hopes for Collective Security may be discussed, though this was receding by 1938. Candidates may refer to opposition among sections of the press and public opinion to Munich and perhaps to some feeling within the mainstream of the Conservative party, for example by Eden.

However, the essential element is to consider the arguments employed about the *Anschluss*, the conduct of the Czech Crisis and the Munich agreement. Criticism of failure to defend Versailles and honour international agreements might not have taken into account Britain's military position, the attitude of the Empire, the lack of allies and public opinion. However, the alternative view is that public opinion was much less solidly against intervention and it was to an extent manipulated; that Britain's military position may have been better in 1938 than 1939, given the German opportunity to rearm and to ally with USSR. The Grand Alliance idea has been much criticised as unrealistic, and candidates might discuss whether serious consideration of war, such as was undertaken in the Czech crisis, was realistic without a strong eastern ally. A discussion could be entered into about the strength of Czech defences. Answers should focus on criticisms rather than just whether Appeasement can be defended.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 18 To what extent was public opinion the main factor in bringing about changes in British policy towards Germany from October 1938 to September 1939? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the importance of public opinion in determining 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.

Did public opinion, alarmed by the betrayal of the Czechs at Munich, by increasing extremism in Germany and the occupation of Prague, force Chamberlain to adopt a stronger line, beginning in March 1939 and culminating in war? Or was it more to do with hardening attitudes in the Conservative Party, the cabinet and the greater confidence brought about by rearmament together with Hitler's increasingly unsupportable policies which threatened the balance of power in Europe?

The changing policy refers to the reaction to the invasion of Bohemia and Moravia, Guarantee to Poland, the reaction to the invasion of Poland and the decision to present an ultimatum to Germany. Even if the argument is made that there was limited change as Chamberlain still believed in Appeasement, the fact is that there was change and war was declared. So the debate is whether public opinion, shocked by German anti-Semitism at the end of 1938, by the breaking of Munich, by the invasion of Memel and by the seeming impossibility of negotiation was the crucial factor in leading Chamberlain, however fitfully or reluctantly, towards a stronger line; or whether it was the attitude of the elite in cabinet and parliament; or Chamberlain himself coming to analyse the situation with his relentlessly logical mind and accepting that appeasement could not continue; or the greater defence capability – Spitfires, Hurricanes, ARP, Radar, Conscriptio, a BEF; or whether it was the greater likelihood of Dominion support. It is possible to argue that the impossibility for Britain of maintaining her role as a great power by further concessions after Hitler had actually invaded Poland on 1 September might be the key, regardless of public opinion. The focus is on evidence for changing public opinion and it is reasonable to expect consideration of the key issue before it is set against other factors.

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 the development of Soviet atomic weapons was mainly responsible for raising Cold War tensions in the period from 1948 to 1955? [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.

All the passages do suggest that the development of atomic weapons by the Soviet Union was responsible for raising Cold War tensions. Passage **A** states that 'The Russians' first test explosions took place in 1949. Millions of people now lived in fear of nuclear war.' Passage **B** shows that by 1950 the USA was very suspicious of the Soviet Union: 'The communists in the Kremlin are engaged in a monstrous conspiracy to stamp out freedom all over the world' and 'a Soviet Union believed to be planning war, 'probably in the form of a surprise attack''. Passage **C** shows that after 1949 the 'arms race took on an increasingly destructive and dangerous dimension'. Passage **D** demonstrates the hysteria that gripped the USA by the 1950s during the 'red scare', with school-children training to take cover in case of a Soviet atomic strike.

However in arguing against this interpretation candidates could use also use all of the passages. Passage **D** suggests that the threats supposedly posed to the USA by the Soviet Union were a 'strange fantasy' and 'just not quite real'. Passage **C** even-handedly suggests that both sides fuelled the rising nuclear tensions and also shows that the arms race was more a result than a cause of Cold War tensions. Each of **A**, **B** and **C** can be used to argue the case that the USA was mainly responsible for escalating the nuclear arms race. In using contextual knowledge to evaluate this interpretation, candidates are likely to consider the Berlin Blockade and airlift (prompted by passage **C**) and could use this either in support or to refute this interpretation. Candidates may well refer to the formation of NATO in 1949 and the Warsaw Pact in 1955. Candidates might refer to McCarthyism to support passage **D**. Candidates may also mention the 'thaw' after the death of Stalin in 1953. The specification has a focus on the Cold War in Europe so candidates must not be expected to display knowledge of events in Asia. However, candidates who bring knowledge of the fall of China to communism in 1949 and / or the Korean War to bear in answering this question should be rewarded.

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**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 20 **Assess the view that Stalin's policies in Eastern Europe in the period from 1944 to 1948 were mainly a response to the suffering of the Soviet Union in the Second World War.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for formulation of Stalin's policies

What matters here 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 is centred on whether Stalin was expansionist or defensive in relation to his actions in Eastern Europe from 1944 to 1948. An understanding of how and why Stalin's policies in Eastern Europe can be viewed as both a reasonable response to the need for future Soviet security, and as a cold and brutal expansion of the Soviet Union's evil empire, should be displayed. Candidates may argue in favour of the interpretation in the title, and are likely to use revisionist and / or post-revisionist interpretations when doing so. Candidates may demonstrate a good knowledge of the extent of Soviet suffering during the Second World War and of Stalin's frustration at the delays in the launching of the Second Front in Western Europe. Candidates may also make the point that the Red Army freed much of Eastern Europe from the Nazis. 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. Candidates may use events such as the Warsaw Rising, the Czech coup and the Berlin blockade to argue against the revisionist interpretation in the title. Candidates are likely to discuss Stalin's attitudes and actions towards the countries of Eastern Europe and Germany. 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.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 21 **Assess the view that the defence of freedom was the main reason why the USA developed the policy of ‘containment’ of communism in Europe in the period from 1945 to 1948.** [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for the development of the USA’s foreign policy

What matters here 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 is centred on whether the USA developed the policy of containment as a necessary response to the Soviet threat to Western Europe, and to freedom and democracy, or whether the USA had less selfless motives. The first view is that the threat posed by Stalin’s expansionism was so great that the USA had to develop containment in order to protect the ‘free world’. The counter-argument suggests that the USA misunderstood the largely defensive nature of Stalin’s actions and in turn that US policy was provocative and aimed at maintaining capitalism and acquiring a sphere of influence in Europe. Candidates may display an understanding of the different approaches of Roosevelt and Truman, and the significance of both Roosevelt’s death and Truman’s inexperience. The influence of ‘hardliners’, such as Kennan may be mentioned. The impact of Kennan’s telegram of February 1946 and ‘Mr. X’ article of July 1947 on the development of policy and Churchill’s ‘Iron Curtain’ speech may be demonstrated. Candidates may have a clear understanding of both the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan and how they have been interpreted. Candidates may deal with a range of significant events, from Stalin’s failure to implement agreements reached at Yalta, to the communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the Berlin Blockade of 1948 with confidence.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2590 Themes in History 1066 – 1796

England 1066-1228

The Government of England 1066-1216

- 1 'The effectiveness of English central government depended mainly on the Church.'
How far do you agree with this assessment of the period from 1066 to 1216? [60]

Focus: assessment of the importance of the church compared with other groups in the effectiveness of central government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Throughout the period there seems plenty of evidence that the effectiveness of English central government rested largely on the contribution of churchmen. Kings depended for their full royal authority on the coronation, performed by the archbishop of Canterbury, and Stephen's very accession depended partly on the support not only of Canterbury but also Winchester and the papacy. Lanfranc helped William to establish Norman rule and Langton tried to mediate between John and the rebels which would have helped to restore more effective government. For much of the period effective government depended on establishing mechanisms which enabled it to function in the absence of the king, and churchmen were particularly significant here. The office of chief justiciar whose origins lay in the work of Ranulf Flambard, Bishop of Durham, and developed under Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, was in many ways the lynchpin of the administration, reaching its highest point in the hands of Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, who set in motion the largest administrative, financial and judicial investigation then seen. Walter was also responsible for the growth in importance of the office of chancellor in John's reign. Particularly in the later part of the period these officials virtually ran the country in the king's absence. However, in order to access the highest bands, candidates should assess other possibilities too. Some may wish to argue that it was the work of individual churchmen which was so important to the effectiveness of government rather than the church as an institution and/or that these men were contributing to the smooth running of government in their capacity as royal officials rather than churchmen. Moreover, throughout the period effective government also depended on the work of kings who gave the impetus to the growth of government centralisation and whose reforms (eg those of Henry II) strengthened government. Effective government came closest to breaking down in times of weak kingship.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2 Assess the importance of feudalism in the development of English Common Law in the period from 1066 to 1216. [60]

Focus: assessment of the importance of feudalism compared with other factors in the development of common law.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Arguably, the rapid growth of feudalism after the Conquest was fundamental to the development of common law. William I's distribution of land to his followers in return for service led to the classification of different types of land-holding which was an essential prerequisite to the development of a standardised common law for cases involving land-holding. In addition the growth of common feudal custom and of seignorial courts which tended to follow the same practices as each other also led to that increased standardisation which was the precursor to the growth of common law. To reach the highest bands, however, candidates will need to assess these developments in comparison with a range of other factors. These could include the importance of Anglo-Saxon developments such as strong kingship which made it possible for the king to exercise effective authority over the country, hundred and shire courts and the writ; the work of Henry I in using local justiciars and being involved in land cases, for example by directing that cases between tenants of different lords should be heard in the shire court rather than honorial courts; and, perhaps most likely, the stimulus given to the development of common law by Henry II and the machinery established by him eg the possessory assizes, the returnable writ, use of professional justices, the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton which tightened up criminal law, and general eyres. Some candidates might also assess the importance of Magna Carta which stated, for example, that no-one would be denied or delayed justice, or of canon law and the church courts.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 'The main turning-point in the impact of the continental possessions of the Crown on English government came in the reign of William II.' How far do you agree with this judgement in relation to the period from 1066 to 1216? [60]

Focus: assessment of the relative importance of developments in the reign of William II compared with those at other times.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Two arguably very significant results of owning the continental possessions emerged in William II's reign after his acquisition of Normandy as a mortgage in 1096: the need to devise a system of government which could function in the absence of the king and the need for more systematically controlled and effectively exploited finances. This led to William's great official, Ranulf Flambard, becoming the forerunner of the chief justiciars who in later reigns were the key to this system of government, and to Flambard investigating tirelessly the king's revenues and supervising their collection, so in some ways fulfilling the role of the later exchequer. However, to reach the higher bands candidates need to assess other possible turning points too and to compare the importance of developments in William II's reign with these. They could argue that the main turning point came in Henry I's reign when both the office of chief justiciar and the exchequer developed, or in that of Henry II who dealt with absentee kingship and the expense of maintaining the Angevin lands by imposing rigorous government and justice and who took centralisation to new heights. Some may wish to argue that the main turning point was under William I when possession of the continental lands led to the import of Norman ideas and particularly to the growth of feudalism, or even in the reigns of Stephen and John when the impact was negative in the form of tension which helped to lead to baronial revolt.

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 To what extent did the role of archbishops of Canterbury change during the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]**

Focus: evaluation of the extent to which the role of archbishops of Canterbury changed.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will probably focus on the archiepiscopates of Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton as these are in the specification and this is perfectly acceptable, but credit should be given to relevant reference to other archbishops. In some ways the role stayed the same: archbishops had a role in both the state and in the church, although some put more emphasis on one than the other. Throughout the period archbishops crowned kings and from Lanfranc to Langton there are examples of archbishops being actively involved in government. For example, Lanfranc helped William to establish Norman rule, Walter effectively ran the country in Richard's absence and Langton attempted to mediate in the struggle between John and his barons. Most archbishops also supported and attempted to strengthen the church. Lanfranc protected the English church from the excesses of Gregorian Reform while also introducing reforms of his own which brought it into the mainstream of the European church and overseeing the beginnings of separate ecclesiastical justice. Anselm and Becket supported the rights of the church against royal authority, first in the Investiture Contest and then over the issue of crimonous clerks and the independence of church courts. On the other hand the emphasis placed on their various roles varied from archbishop to archbishop. While Walter concentrated on government, Becket had no inclination to fulfil the political role which Henry had envisaged. Some even managed to weaken the church, albeit temporarily, for example through exile (Anselm), quarrel (Becket), or suspension (Langton). Candidates may wish to argue that there was no pattern of change over the period. Answers in the higher bands will evaluate change in the context of continuity.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 **'More conflict than harmony.'** How far do you agree with this assessment of relations between the archbishops of Canterbury and York during the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]

Focus: assessment of the degree of conflict compared with harmony in the relationship between Canterbury and York.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

There were certainly periods of marked conflict between Canterbury and York. Some of this was caused by the unresolved primacy dispute which caused problems at the beginning of Lanfranc's archiepiscopacy when William, supported by Lanfranc, wanted subordination of York to Canterbury, and again in 1115 when Thurstan of York refused to profess obedience to Canterbury. There was more ill-feeling during the Becket affair when, in 1161-2 for example, papal intervention granted York privileges exempting him from Canterbury's jurisdiction, and again shortly after when Henry II used the archbishop of York to crown Young Henry, so undermining the traditional position of Canterbury. Becket exacerbated the situation by publishing papal bulls suspending York. However, there were also periods of relative harmony. York's recognition of Lanfranc's personal supremacy improved relations as did the granting of legatine authority to Canterbury in 1125 which gave him superiority without resolving the primacy issue. Primacy was more of a bone of contention during the Anglo-Norman than the Angevin period for it eventually became clear that the pope would not formally recognise the supremacy of Canterbury. Other negative factors helped to reduce conflict too. For example, Anselm's concerns were with lay investiture and his resulting difficulties with the king rather than with York, while the problems of appointing a successor to Thurstan at York in Stephen's reign, which produced schism there, undermined the authority of the archbishop. Moreover, by the later part of the period both archbishops had trouble with their diocesan authority and this rather than rivalry over the primacy demanded their attention. By the end of the period Langton's problems were with the king and the pope rather than the archbishop of York. To reach the higher bands answers should assess the degree of both conflict and harmony and draw a conclusion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 To what extent was the work of Lanfranc the most important factor in the development of English monasticism during the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]

Focus: evaluation of the importance of the work of Lanfranc compared with other factors in the development of English monasticism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Lanfranc radically changed life in English abbeys such as Canterbury by abolishing some of the more idiosyncratic English customs and writing his own, and bringing over Norman monks and abbots, some of whom made an important contribution to the development of their houses. He brought English monasticism into the European mainstream and without this it would have been more difficult for the new orders to take hold. However, candidates may argue that it was those new orders which were more important for they reinvigorated English monasticism from the reign of Henry I. If the Cluniacs, Augustinians, Premonstratensians, Gilbertines and the Cistercians had not offered a purer form of monasticism contrasting with that of the worldly Benedictines, there would have been no twelfth-century golden age of English monasticism. It is also possible to argue that the most important factors were those which lay behind this flowering such as papal, royal and noble patronage. Henry I not only founded the great abbey of Reading but also five Augustinian houses, and his queen founded the Augustinian Holy Trinity at Aldgate. Among baronial patrons were Walter Espec who gave land to the Cistercian abbey of Rievaulx and William Brewer who, at the other end of the century, founded the Premonstratensian house at Torre. Other factors include the papal reform movement, economic factors, organisation which firmly linked daughter houses to the mother institution and the fundamental attraction of finding salvation through meritorious works such as founding monasteries. Candidates should evaluate the work of Lanfranc in comparison with a range of these.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Rebellion and Disorder in England, 1485-1603

- 7 **‘A typical Tudor rebellion.’ To what extent do you agree with this view of the Pilgrimage of Grace in relation to the period from 1485 to 1603?** [60]

Focus: Comparison of the Pilgrimage of Grace with other rebellions in respect of its typicality.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to know a lot about the Pilgrimage and should use their knowledge to compare its features with a range of other rebellions. They could do this in respect of the main causes – religious changes, disaffected factions, reaction to Cromwell, government taxation and economic hardship; its location – Lincolnshire and the six northern counties; its duration – Oct-Dec 1536; its support – 30,000+ rebels led by Aske and backed by lesser nobles, gentry, clergy, professional groups and peasants; government response – played for time, offered pardons, raised a larger army, reprisals after Bigod’s uprising; its outcome – failed to achieve its main aims but succeeded in redressing some of their grievances, the leaders and over 200 rebels executed, some changes in government policies. Not all candidates will cover each of these themes but they should compare some of them with other rebellions, most likely those in 1487, 1497, 1549 1554 and 1569 (possibly 1601). Some will agree that the rebellion was typical; others will point to its different perhaps unique features (eg the large number of monks, nuns and abbots among the pilgrims); some may discuss the unique features of other rebellions (eg the camps in 1549).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

8 Assess how far Tudor rebellions were caused by religious changes. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of religious changes as a cause of Tudor rebellions.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are required to balance the importance of religious changes with other causes of rebellion, with better candidates establishing a pattern over time in the relative importance of factors. Religious issues underlay the disturbances of 1536-7, 1549, 1554, and 1569-70 ie the reaction in Lincolnshire and the northern counties to Henry VIII's reforms of 1533-36; the west country's response to Edward VI's Protestant changes of 1547-9; dissatisfaction with the speed and degree of reform in Norfolk in 1547-9; opposition to and fear of Catholic reforms in Kent in 1553-4; and Catholic responses to the effects of the Elizabethan Settlement in the north of England in 1569. In some cases, the clergy encouraged or led the protests; in others, they were the target of public disorder. However, none of these rebellions was caused solely by religious reform and in some cases (eg Kett's), it was a minor issue. Better candidates are likely to explain why religious factors were not important before the 1530s or after the 1570s when disturbances were caused by political, dynastic, economic and social factors eg Simnel, Warbeck, Yorkshire and Cornish rebellions against Henry VII, the Amicable Grant (1525), the Oxfordshire rising (1596) and Essex's rebellion (1601).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

9 To what extent did rebellions pose a serious threat to Tudor governments? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the serious nature of Tudor rebellions.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Some rebellions were more threatening than others and candidates should be able to explain which ones were and why. The nature of aims, competence of leadership, length of rebellion, strength of defence and of the rebels, their numbers and geographical extent, may all be considered. Arguably the most serious threatened the life of the monarch, notably Simnel, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, and Essex. Some occurred in London (Northumberland, Wyatt, Essex) or reached the outskirts of the city and so threatened the welfare of the government. Government ministers (Wolsey, Cromwell, Cecil) and bishops (Exeter, Canterbury, Durham, Norwich) were often the target of attack, and though none fell directly as a result of rebellion, they and the government's credibility were under threat. Some candidates might discuss the measures taken by governments to reduce the threat (eg the execution of rebel leaders and hundreds of commoners, offers to negotiate and consider the rebels' demands, the creation of lords lieutenants to maintain order in the counties). Some may argue that most rebellions lacked competent leadership, unity of purpose and direction, and that inherent weaknesses reduced the seriousness of the threat. On the other hand, some rebellions lasted several weeks and the longer they went on the more the government was vulnerable to a more widespread protest or to enemies exploiting the situation. Some rebellions involved prominent nobles, gentry, abbots and clergy and, as social leaders, their opposition to the government was a serious embarrassment that could become a threat. Some disturbances were so large that they outnumbered the initial forces raised by the crown (eg Pilgrimage, Western, Kett and Northern Earls).

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 how far changing relations with Spain affected English domestic developments from 1485 to 1603. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of Spain upon English domestic affairs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should look at how Spain influenced various English domestic developments to show that there were elements of continuity and change over time. The main areas of discussion are likely to be political issues – Henry VII's alliance of 1489 against pretenders and the betrothal of Arthur (and later Henry) to Catherine of Aragon; the influence of the Aragonese faction at court in the 1520s and 1530s, and Charles V's pressure not to proceed with a divorce; hostility towards Philip in England in the 1550s at the court, council and parliament surfaced in Wyatt's rebellion. Religious issues – pressure to remain a Catholic country after the break from Rome. This may have curtailed Henry VIII's reform programme, compromised Somerset, supported and aided Mary's restoration of the Church, and influenced Elizabeth in determining the Settlement of 1559 and her subsequent treatment of Catholics. Economic issues – trade links since 1489 with Aragon and Castile, and from 1515 with the Low Countries. English merchants traded extensively with Iberia until the 1580s and privateers became a source of friction from the 1560s. The outbreak of the Dutch Revolt had a serious effect and Elizabeth faced political pressure to intervene. Military issues – war against Spain from 1585 had serious financial, economic and political consequences.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

11 Assess the importance of religious factors in shaping Tudor foreign policy. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of religious and other factors that shaped foreign policy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Religious factors were important in forming, influencing and developing Tudor foreign policies from the 1530s to the end of the period. Cromwell, Somerset and Burghley favoured Protestant alliances. In the 1550s Edward went to war with Scotland and France, and Mary joined Spain in war against France, although neither war was caused by religion. The Protestant Church established by Elizabeth, however, did lead to her intervention in Scotland in 1559-60, and to worsening relations with Spain after 1570. However, candidates should be aware of the relative importance of religious factors and compare them, for example, with political, economic, financial and personal influences, to achieve a full assessment. Until the 1520s, the Tudors had developed policies based upon dynastic, personal and economic factors: Spain and the Netherlands were England's trading and political allies, France remained an enemy at bay and Scotland presented a diminishing threat. It may be argued that political security and overseas trade were more compelling and enduring factors than religion if the Tudor period is taken as a whole.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 How far did England's policy towards France depend on Anglo-Scottish relations in the period from 1485 to 1603? Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of Anglo-Scottish relations on Anglo-French affairs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Henry VII viewed France as a possible ally but probable enemy due to her occupation of Brittany and support for Warbeck but he skilfully prevented Scotland from affecting relations by preparing for war and offering a marriage alliance in 1497. Henry VIII saw France as a rival to be attacked, and her lands seized. The auld alliance with Scotland needed to be neutralised by military invasions, which he sent in 1513, and expeditions to Scotland and France brought military victories. Henry's attempt to secure a marriage between Edward and Mary Stuart however led to his declaration of war on both countries in 1542 and mixed results (success at Solway Moss and Boulogne but the Mary Rose sank). Somerset, concerned that France would renew war in 1547, acted pre-emptively and invaded Scotland but defeat led to the surrender of Boulogne to France in 1550. Mary was keen to support Spain against France but ignored Scotland. Elizabeth desired to recover Calais and expel the Guise from the Scottish court and waited till Scotland could not be exploited before attacking France. Her failure led to amity with France thereafter though not with the Guises. Elizabeth's treatment of Mary and support for Moray and Murray in Edinburgh and later James VI was well received by Catherine de Medici. Some candidates may point out that Scotland was always a minor European power and at times, notably after 1568, her influence upon English policy making was negligible. Candidates are therefore likely to look at other factors (eg Spain and the Netherlands, political security, traditional rivalry) that had a more direct bearing on Anglo-French relations.

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 significance of the Interregnum in the development of monarchical power from 1558 to 1689. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the Interregnum in the context of monarchical developments.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to compare the Interregnum with earlier and later periods. Some may adopt a linear approach while others may prefer to compare the monarchy's theoretical and practical power. Between 1558 and 1649, there was a marked growth in the monarchy's power. What had often been held in theory was actually practised by James I and Charles I, such that Elizabethan absolutism became Stuart despotism. The monarchs called, prorogued and dissolved parliament at will, appointed unelected ministers, judges and bishops, made war and peace, raised taxes and arrested subjects arbitrarily. The Civil War and Interregnum changed many of these practices. The abolition of the Lords and bishops meant that even after their return in 1660, the Commons emerged as a more powerful political force, theoretically capable of constraining the monarchy's spending power, and of monitoring the calling of parliament, the faith of the country and management of the armed forces. However, the Restoration Settlement only constrained monarchs who were willing to be constrained and who relied on parliament for finance. Charles II, James II and William III still called, prorogued and dissolved parliaments, made war and peace, and appointed ministers, judges and bishops. Whereas Charles and William understood the political significance of the Interregnum, James II did not. By 1689, although the monarchy still exercised some prerogatives, there were financial, military, religious and political limits in place – largely as a result of the Interregnum.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 14 **‘English monarchs were mainly responsible for the crown’s disagreements with parliament in the period from 1558 to 1689.’ How far do you agree?** [60]

Focus: Assessment of the responsibility for crown-parliament disagreements.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The personalities and policies of English monarchs played a key part in antagonising parliament and some candidates will agree with the premise. They are likely to refer to James I who dissolved 3 of his 4 parliaments in a pique of temper, Charles I who allegedly vowed never to call parliament again in 1629, and James II who never gained parliament’s trust and support. The views and policies of monarchs caused disagreements throughout the period, though it may be noted that Elizabeth and Charles II had fewer disagreements because they handled their parliaments more skilfully. Candidates should therefore open up their argument to other possibilities for the cause of disagreements. Changing political and religious circumstances in England, for instance, or developments on the continent affected crown-parliamentary relations and would be a valid area of discussion. The developing nature of parliament may also be considered. It exercised increasing financial control over the monarchs and used this lever in the 17th century as a constitutional weapon. The key areas of conflict were over financial, military, religious and constitutional issues and a thematic approach may work well.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 15 **Assess the impact of social changes on the powers of the monarchy in the period from 1558 to 1689.** [60]

Focus: Evaluation of social changes on the development of the English monarchy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main social changes that affected the power of the monarchy were: the growth in the politically interested gentry; the economic and political decline of the crown's natural allies, the aristocracy and the bishops, at the hands of the gentry and non-conformists respectively; and the financial constraints on the crown, which weakened its influence as a patron and increased its dependence on elected MPs. From 1660 the monarchy was strengthened by support from nobles and gentry, anxious to prevent another civil war, and from bishops keen to keep the non-conformists at bay. Some candidates may trace these developments chronologically but more effective responses are likely to be thematic and will perhaps compare the power of the monarchy at various times during this period. Some candidates may choose to assess factors other than social. This is a justifiable approach provided sufficient consideration has also been given to the impact of social changes.

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 To what extent did government policies towards Catholics in England change in the course of the period from 1558 to 1689? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of changes in government policy towards English Catholics.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

In spite of Elizabeth's desire to rule a country rather than lead a religious party, which underpinned her Church Settlement, relations between the government and Roman Catholics declined steeply after 1570 following the Excommunication, plots to kill the Queen and outbreak of war against Spain. Penal laws were enforced and Catholics were fined, exiled, imprisoned and executed. Government policies fluctuated under the Stuarts. James I favoured toleration and periodically suspended the penal laws. Charles I allowed Jesuits into England, married a Catholic and pursued a pro-Catholic foreign policy in the 1630s. Charles II used his dispensing power to support Catholics and allied with France while James II, who hoped to convert his subjects to Catholicism, became one. Parliament and the Church of England, however, favoured repression, and government policies reflected this tension, most notably in the reaction to the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 and 1687. The period when government policies were most anti-Catholic was the 1650s, when Cromwell and parliament were of one mind, and in 1689 when Catholics were excluded from the Toleration Act. A possible line of approach is to argue that in this period, monarchs became more pro-Catholic while parliament became increasingly intolerant. Better candidates will understand the difference between government and parliament, and concentrate on evaluating rather than explaining the changes in policy.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 17 To what extent was Laud's time as archbishop the main turning-point in the development of the Church of England from 1559 to 1689? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of Laud's impact on the Church of England in the context of other turning-points during the period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should consider several turning-points in the development of the English Church, and compare them to the impact of Laud's archiepiscopacy. The work of Whitgift, Bancroft and Hooker in the 1580s and 1590s, James' support for Arminianism, the impact of the Restoration or the Tories formation of an alliance with the Anglicans in the 1670s that proved so formidable in the 1680s, are all possibilities. Most candidates will argue that Laud had a significant effect on the Church of England in the 1630s. His attempts in England to purge the Church of unorthodoxy and corruption, to establish a 'beauty of holiness', outraged many Protestants and led to widespread criticism of the government in general and the Church in particular. He and Charles were suspected of crypto-Catholicism and by 1642 his policies had split the country into high and low church groups. Victory for the low church in the civil war led to the demise of the Church of England during the Interregnum. However, the Church revived after 1660. Supported by the gentry and crown and no longer tainted with latent Catholicism, the Clarendon Code secured its position and enabled it to suppress Presbyterianism and resist attempts by Charles II and James II to take a more tolerant view towards dissenters. Expect candidates to compare developments both before and after Laud, and to compare the changes with other selected periods. Some candidates may point out that many of Laud's principles were based on ideas advocated by Hooker in the 1590s and on Arminianism, which became popular in James' reign.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

18 Assess the strength of Protestant nonconformity in England in 1603, 1660 and 1689. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of Protestant nonconformity at various times during the period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should attempt to define 'strength' and apply it to the three periods in question. They do not have to begin in 1558 but should be aware of key developments during Elizabeth's reign. 'Strength' may be interpreted as numerical size, influence in military, political and religious circles or perhaps resilience in the face of persecution. Nonconformity underwent significant developments in the course of this period. Elizabeth marginalized the more radical elements and appeased the majority thereby reducing their potential strength. James I's accession revived their hopes of greater toleration but his personal antipathy towards Presbyterians, which surfaced at the Hampton Court Conference, ended their hopes. Many emigrated in the 1620s and 1630s. Cromwell took a more lenient line and in the 1640s and 1650s they grew in numbers and importance in military, religious and political circles. In 1660 they were excluded from the Restoration Settlement. Though Presbyterians in Monck's army and the Convention Parliament threatened political and religious stability and forced Charles II to make some concessions, a policy of non-conciliation followed in the Cavalier Parliament which was exemplified by the Uniformity, Conventicle and Five Mile Acts. Thereafter their only protection from persecution was royal dispensations. According to a survey in 1676, they numbered 100,000. Only in 1689 were Quakers, Baptists, Presbyterians and Independents granted religious toleration, though they were still excluded from holding public office or entering university. At all times during the period, nonconformists lacked unity of purpose, widespread support and equality of opportunity, so their strength was limited.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610

- 19 Which social groups in France gained most and which lost most during the period from 1498 to 1610? Explain your answer. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of different social groups during this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely either to organise their response thematically according to those groups that gained most and those that did not, or to take a chronological approach and look at society as a whole at different periods between 1498 and 1610. Synoptic analyses are possible in both routes although the former may be easier to achieve and sustain. In general the social groups that gained most were the aristocracy, nobility, bourgeoisie, merchants and clergy; and those that lost most were the urban poor, peasantry, persecuted religious minorities, and anyone caught up in the civil wars after 1562. Some candidates may attempt to define 'gained' and 'lost', and may do so in terms of living and working conditions, religious freedom/ uniformity, economic circumstances, political stability and domestic prosperity. Better answers are likely to explain their comparative selections and point out that social benefits were not consistent or uniform. For instance, many aristocrats and nobles exercised limited political power under Francis I but enjoyed far greater independence when the government was de-centralised and weaker in the years between 1560 and 1598.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 20 **Assess the impact of the Wars of Religion (1562-98) on the development of the French nation state from 1498 to 1610.** [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the effects of the wars on the nation state's evolution.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should consider the different ways in which the wars affected the French nation state, identifying areas where developments were halted, accelerated or changed by examining the years 1498 to 1562 and 1598 to 1610. Most candidates are likely to argue that the wars weakened the French monarchy for 30 years and slowed down political centralisation but under Henry IV it emerged much stronger and capable of building on the work of the earlier Valois kings. The wars divided French society but arguably such divisions existed before 1562 and remained after 1598. Religious differences were also militarised and long standing issues brought to a head which were not satisfactorily resolved at Nantes. Economically, earlier developments were severely affected in terms of government finance, trade, industry and agriculture, and recovery under Henry IV was slow. Internationally, France had already lost her dominant position in Europe by 1559 thanks mainly to Francis I but the civil wars further sidelined France and enabled Spain to overtake it.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 21 How far were the domestic problems facing Henry IV from 1589 to 1610 similar to those that faced the Valois kings after 1498? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the problems facing Henry IV compared with the Valois kings.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Henry IV faced a number of similar problems to his predecessors. For example, a powerful nobility caused problems for all rulers. Francis I held them in check but the situation worsened under Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III. Under Henry IV, several nobles still caused problems. Religious issues presented difficulties for Francis I and Henry II but peaked during the civil wars; Henry IV resolved them with a compromise solution at Nantes. Weak monarchy was not a problem under Louis XII, Francis I and Henry II but was from 1560 until Henry IV began to restore royal authority. Financial problems faced Henry for most of his reign but he built upon the reforms of Francis I and had overcome most of his difficulties by 1610. Economic decline was due largely to the civil war but long-term problems remained eg slow transport, lack of state investment, poor rural agricultural conditions. Sully redressed many problems. Separatism remained an issue even though Francis I had cowed the regional estates and parlements. The pays d'états and municipal governments had separate customs, privileges and jurisdictions. Administration collapsed after 1560. Henry began its restoration from 1598 but the Paulette in 1604 gave officers their freehold. Problems unique to Henry were: (1) a disputed succession which was not resolved until 1594; (2) impoverished peasantry in the 1590s epitomised by the Croquants; (3) occupation of France by Spanish troops between 1590 and 1598. Candidates are likely to compare Henry's problems with his predecessors but the focus should be on his problems in the context of the whole period rather than the problems of another king.

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 Assess the reasons why the Jesuits were the most successful reforming order in the sixteenth-century Catholic Church. [60]**

Focus: Explanation for Jesuits' success in comparison with other reforming groups.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A number of reasons may explain the Jesuits' success. They did not live in common which enabled them to travel, often internationally. Their structured organisation had clear leadership and objectives. They were supported by wealthy patrons and secular rulers, and as papal agents often performed diplomatic tasks. They were excellent publicists most notably arising from their missionary activities. The quality of their education was highly admired and their influence in schools, colleges and universities had a lasting effect. The strength of their preaching in the face of Protestantism. Their lack of restrictive practices (eg exempt from canonical routine and episcopal control) and privileges (eg exempt from fasting and clerical dress).

These conditions should be compared with the more limited impact of other reforming orders. For instance, the older regular orders were enclosed and though some had reformed, they were out of touch with the needs of the community. Travelling friars practised pastoral work but were conditional by their spiritual education and rules. Lay orders such as the Brethren of the Common Life inter-acted with communities but were subject to the rules governing their order and had traditional aims based on piety and service. New orders (such as the Theatines, Ursulines, Angelici, Barnabites and Oratorians) performed charitable work mainly in Italy though the Capuchins, who began in Ancona, spread to several countries and numbered 7,000 by 1600.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 23 To what extent was the Council of Trent (1545-63) the most important turning-point in the reformation of the Catholic Church from 1500 to 1600? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the Council of Trent in the context of the Catholic Reformation.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to set the reforms decreed by the Council of Trent against other key developments in the 16th century. These may well be the pronouncements of Luther (1517-20), the sack of Rome (1527), the establishment of the Jesuits (1540). What is important is that Trent is assessed in terms of what changed or continued as a result of its sessions and decrees, and this will entail looking at the period between 1563 and 1600 as well as the half-century before. The main arguments in favour of its significance are: the implicit re-assertion of papal authority; the affirmation and definition of Catholic doctrine and rejection of Protestantism; the recognition of the pastoral role of bishops and the sacred authority of the clergy; the importance given to confessionals, education and the establishment of seminaries; the desire to stamp out clerical abuses. In theory the Church became a more united, confident and coherent organisation. A counter-argument is that the Council of Trent had several limitations: contentious issues (eg reform of the Breviary, Missal and Catechism) were not resolved; its decrees depended entirely upon the quality of future popes (generally good) and support of secular rulers (endorsed by Spain and Portugal but not France); reforms would take time and money to implement (eg few seminaries set up by 1600); little was said about the future role of the Index, Inquisition, regular orders and women, and the laity was not involved in the Catholic Reformation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 24 How far had the Catholic Church by 1600 solved the problems that it faced in the first half of the sixteenth century? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the Catholic Church's success at solving problems in the course of the 16th century.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates can be expected to review a range of problems apparent in the early 16th century – poor leadership and quality of popes; clerical abuses and indiscipline; remoteness of many regular clergy; lack of understanding of spiritual needs of most Christians; widespread appeal of alternative faiths, especially Lutheranism and Calvinism; lack of clarity and uniformity in doctrine; reluctance to call a general council; limited support for reform from secular rulers, especially Charles V and Francis I. Candidates may suggest some of the following achievements by 1600: the doctrine was clearly defined at Trent; strong papal leadership had emerged aided by a more efficient Curia; education was seen to be the key to future success in reforming abuses and improving the quality of the clergy; conversions to Protestantism were generally halted and some areas returned to Catholicism; the Index, Inquisition and state authorities exercised greater control and uniformity; the city of Rome had been transformed into an attractive centre for pilgrims. On the other hand, candidates should point out some of the problems not solved: Europe remained divided between the Catholic and Reformed churches; inequality remained between lower and upper clergy's livings; the spiritual understanding of most people remained very basic, especially in rural areas; some states (eg France) were unwilling to recognise the papal decrees at Trent; there was still an inherent distrust between religious orders; there was insufficient money and well-qualified clergy to bring about a quick reformation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

The Decline of Spain 1598-1700

- 25 How important were social factors as a cause of the decline of Spain in the seventeenth century? Explain your answer. [60]**

Focus: Assessment of social and other factors as causes of Spain's decline.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to assess social factors before considering alternative causes of decline. The main social issues are: low levels of literacy and poor standards of living of most Spaniards; a disparity between privileged and unprivileged groups; rural poverty, food shortages and recurrent diseases; fluctuating levels of employment and declining wages at times of inflation; impact of war on a falling population; the expulsion of the moriscos that weakened society especially in Valencia; the Church's limited contribution to the wealth and well-being of the state; the effects of the Inquisition upon culture, education and liberal ideas; the reluctance of many nobles to invest their wealth or to work manually. To assess the relative importance of social issues, candidates should compare them with other factors. The most likely alternatives are financial and economic, which some candidates may see as indistinguishable from social; political mismanagement by kings and ministers; foreign wars and defeats at the hands of the French, English and Dutch.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 26 **'Military and naval defeats were a symptom rather than a cause of Spain's decline as an international power in the seventeenth century.'** How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: Assessment of military and naval defeats as a cause of Spain's international decline.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Naval defeats in 1637, 1639 and 1658, and military defeats in 1643, 1648, 1651-2 by the Dutch, French and English, were underlined by territorial losses at Westphalia and the Pyrenees. Later defeats against Portugal and France brought further humiliation. By 1700 Spain's armies and navies were under-funded, badly organised and incapable of defending her mainland and overseas empire. An argument can be made that military defeats, particularly against the United Provinces and Portugal, weakened Spain politically, economically and psychologically, and encouraged France to launch attacks that eventually led to the threat of partition. A counter view, however, is that its problems went back to the beginning of the century and beyond and were more economic and political than military. It may be argued that economic cracks in the Spanish empire occurred a long time before military and naval defeats, and some candidates will agree that the latter were merely a symptom of a much deeper malaise. Candidates may point out that Olivares attempted to reform the economy and armed forces but met with much opposition, that Philip IV's desire to assist his Austrian cousin committed Spain to a war it did not need, and that Charles II and his advisers lacked the ability and resources to halt Spain's decline in the face of Louis XIV's aggression. Lerma and Haro saw the need for diplomacy and peace but Philip III and Philip IV were unwilling to compromise Spain's pride and reputation by default. A combination of factors, therefore, explains Spain's international decline.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

27 Compare the effectiveness as kings of Spain of Philip III, Philip IV and Charles II. [60]

Focus: Comparison of the effectiveness of three kings.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to consider some of the following attributes that make up an effective ruler: his political power and qualities of leadership; his skill as a statesman and administrator; the peace, prosperity and stability enjoyed by his people; his success in international affairs. Spanish monarchs relied heavily on their validos, and the effectiveness of their administrations often reflected the competence of ministers and royal favourites. A comparison of the work of Lerma, Olivares, Haro and Oropesa is therefore a viable line of argument. Revisionist historians view Philip III (and Lerma) more favourably than Philip (and Olivares and Haro), and none has rehabilitated Charles II, who was intermittently ill-advised by his mother, wife and foreign favourites. Some candidates may argue that Spain was most effectively governed between 1624 and 1639 under Philip IV and Olivares before it was hit by a series of wars, revolts and economic setbacks, and that the least effective ruler was Charles II, who presided over the near collapse of his empire in the 1690s. Some candidates may compare particular problems eg finance and the economy, the administration, separatism, domestic revolts, the threats from France, England and the United Provinces. In general candidates should make comparative points to illustrate the 'effectiveness' of the three rulers and their administrations, and focus on the outcome and not just the aims of their policies.

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 how effectively Louis XIII, Louis XIV and their ministers dealt with France's domestic problems from 1610 to 1715. [60]**

Focus: Comparison and evaluation of the effectiveness with which Louis XIII, Louis XIV and their ministers tackled France's domestic problems.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The following problems may be assessed. The princes of the blood and noblesse d'épée were troublesome (eg 1624-30, and 1649-53) until Louis XIV ended his royal minority, executed Fouquet and moved the court to Versailles. The noblesse de robe were cowed by Richelieu and excluded from royal councils but remained powerful as governors. The parlements were strong under Louis XIII, and reacted to Mazarin in the Frondes. Though their decrees were declared inferior to royal councils, Paris was still capable of being obstructive (eg over Unigenitus). Estates had their powers reduced by Richelieu but he failed to introduce élus into the pays d'états. The Huguenots were a problem till 1629, but Louis XIV reopened issues again between 1661 and 1685. Jansenism was not a problem until 1653 but remained one thereafter. Gallicanism surfaced in reaction to the régales controversy and deepened in 1713. Finances were a constant problem. Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert made no basic reforms, and corruption and inefficiency remained. Colbert tackled economic problems but failed to combat foreign competition and low private investment. Judicial anomalies remained in spite of Colbert's Codes. The armed forces saw a major improvement, especially under Louvois, Le Tellier and Vauban. On balance Louis XIV was more effective in most areas, even finance, but some problems worsened (eg, Huguenotism, Jansenism and Gallicanism).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

29 Assess how far the role of the French nobility changed from 1610 to 1715. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the contribution the nobility made to the greatness of France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The nobility was not a homogeneous class. Most nobles however had three features in common: they were exempt from direct taxation, they were socially privileged and they held land but their role changed in the course of the 17th century, especially after the Fronde and the building of Versailles. Before 1653, the princes of the blood and the noblesse d'épée were politically very active but also a liability, causing anarchy in the 1620s and 1640s (eg Gaston, Chalais, Marillac, Cinq Mars, les Importants). After 1653 they were brought under control by Louis XIV; a turning point may have been the incarceration of Fouquet in 1661. The noblesse de robe held government offices and defended their family interests through rents, pensions, the Estates and the Paulette. After 1653 the crown harnessed and extended their power and talents in provincial administration, the Church and army. Any private armies were brought under state control and governorships were monitored by intendants. The noblesse de province were landowners whose situation fluctuated according to agricultural conditions (they suffered after the depression of the 1680s) and many became impoverished. If candidates take a thematic route, they may well look at how the nobles fared militarily, politically, administratively, fiscally and socially. While all retained their social and fiscal privileges, most lost their political and military power in the course of the period. Reward candidates who address the different types of nobility and link their contributions to making France 'great'. They should be aware that the nobles could be a positive as well as a negative force.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 30 How far did the Fronde (1648-53) mark a turning-point in the development of French absolutism from 1610 to 1715? Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: Assessment of the Fronde's impact on the development of absolutism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Until 1648 absolutism in France had been limited by powerful nobles, parlements anxious to protect the Estates and local privileges, and crown officers who wavered in their loyalty. The Fronde brought these groups to the surface. Candidates could argue that as a result of the civil war (1648-53), royal absolutism increased. They may suggest that fear of anarchy produced a stronger monarchy when Louis moved his court to Versailles, which became the epitome of absolutism. Louis also saw the need to resume sole political control (accomplished after Mazarin's death), to take the army away from nobles like Condé and Turenne and place all troops under state control. The Fronde also demonstrated the need to expand the administration, suppress the Parlement of Paris and increase royal revenue without jeopardising the officers, all of which was attempted in the years between 1653 and 1715. However, an argument can be made that there was considerable continuity after 1653. The *grands* remained very influential in the provinces, the *pays d'états* kept their independence, there was still resistance to tax increases and continuing self-interest among state servants, which reduced Louis' absolutism. *Intendants* were not strong enough to control the provinces, parlements remained a powerful body and judges retained their independence. The king moreover still relied upon small committees and a handful of advisers. Alternative turning points may be considered by way of comparison eg the expansion of the administration under Richelieu, military reforms due to France's entry to the Thirty Years' War, the accession of Louis XIV, the creation of Versailles.

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 'Louis XVI had faced more serious challenges to his absolute power by 1789 than had his predecessors from 1661.' How far do you agree with this view? [60]

Focus: Assessment of problems in French absolutism over an extended 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.

Some candidates might tackle the question sequentially to show how problems unfolded. Others might consider a series of themes within the challenges to absolute power, for example personality, finance, institutions, and the power of social groups. Another approach will be to look at short and long-term factors that brought about the situation in 1789. All of these will be valid and can produce answers of the highest quality. In theory, Louis XVI's absolute power was intact in 1789 but it faced greater challenges. Financial crises were serious and the King was unable, or unwilling, to tackle the causes. The nobility as a class opposed change. Institutions were either obstructive (eg the *parlements*) or in disuse (eg the Estates-General). Louis XVI's personality was not one that would sustain an effective absolute monarchy. Many candidates might argue that Louis XIV had no problems in maintaining absolute power but one would normally expect answers in **Band I** to be aware of some difficulties from 1661 to 1715. Versailles reflected his grandeur and the subservience of the nobility. Bossuet and others justified absolutism on religious grounds. Others saw it as fully within French traditions. However, there were practical limits to his power in the provinces. Local traditions remained strong; intendants and other royal officials had difficulty enforcing government orders and policy. Growing financial weakness had its effects. Some, such as Fénelon, began to criticise the nature of absolute rule. Nevertheless, Louis XIV was as absolute as any French king could expect to be. His overbearing personality and dedication to government made him able to resist serious challenges to his authority. Louis XV's reign began with the problem of a minority, which encouraged the revival of aristocratic and parlement's ambitions. The financial problems worsened. Unlike Louis XIV, Louis XV saw his ministers openly challenged. He himself lacked the steel of his predecessor. The ideas of the *philosophes* and the Enlightenment, whilst not necessarily antipathetic to the absolute power of monarchy did open up the political debate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 32 **Assess the view that Joseph II was the only monarch of Austria or Russia whose rule was based on Reason during the period from 1682 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 influence of Reason on 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.

A valid alternative approach might be to argue that Joseph was not the only one of the four rulers to be influenced by Reason but that he was more influenced than the others (that is a rule 'based on Reason'). Another valid approach might be to argue that even Joseph II was not really impelled by Reason but by prejudice. He was impatient and unrealistic, perhaps 'unreasonable'. The primary requirement of answers is that they deal with all four rulers. However, answers are not required to spend an equal time on each of them. The balance, within the extended period, will depend on the argument. For example, candidates might choose to dismiss Peter the Great quite quickly, spending more time on the claims of Catherine the Great and Maria Theresa and even more time on Joseph. Good answers, certainly those in **Band I** should give attention, either explicitly or implicitly, to the phrase 'based on Reason'. The idea of Reason and its political role in the period might be explained. This can be done quickly but examiners should read carefully answers that are based on studies of Reason with the four reigns being used as subordinate examples. At one extreme, these essays might be the product of very thoughtful candidates who can link abstract ideas with practical developments. At the other extreme, they might represent the vague efforts of limited candidates. As always, examiners should refer to their Team Leaders if they have doubts about which Band to award. In some respects, Peter showed signs of being influenced by Reason, as in his regard for the good of the state, support for education and training, his regard for a working nobility, and his opposition to a reactionary Church. However, his violence and short-term plans argue against the influence of Reason. Catherine the Great was interested in writers such as Voltaire and Montesquieu. She began a codification of the laws. Her court was westernised. She was a patron of education. However, she was reluctant to challenge many Russian traditions, including the position of the nobility. She was alarmed by the outbreak of the French Revolution. Maria Theresa introduced reforms in Austria but it can be argued that these were more pragmatic, to strengthen her Empire, rather than responses to the call for Reason. Laws were reformed. The Church was brought further under state control. There were improvements in education and charity provision. However, she showed her doubts about the implications of the Enlightenment during the period from 1765 when her rule was harnessed to that of Joseph II. His reign experienced radical changes in many (most?) spheres: government and administration, religion, the economy, social practices, and the law. Higher credit should be given when descriptions of these are linked to the extent to which they reflected Reason in government.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 33 **Assess the view that the Roman Catholic Church was untouched by the Enlightenment during the period from 1661 to 1796.** [60]

Focus: Assessment of a judgment about the Roman 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.

The focus should be on the Roman Catholic Church. Answers that spend much time explaining the nature of the Enlightenment and reduce the discussion of the Church to a sub-section cannot expect a high mark. However, sound answers will consider the Church effectively within an explanation of what might be considered enlightened, or unenlightened. The latter aspect(s) can be covered separately or integrated into the argument about the Church. Examiners should note that the Study Topic uses Austria, France and Russia as examples. Russia is irrelevant to the Roman Catholic Church (but some might make some valid points of comparison with the Orthodox Church). Candidates are not expected to have knowledge and understanding of the Roman Catholic Church elsewhere, but accurate references would be given credit. Most candidates might agree with the claim in the question. The broad view would be of a Church that defended uncritically a traditional view of the monarchy and society. It saw challenges in new ideas in science, politics and society. Austrian rulers regarded it as reactionary and adopted policies to bring it under closer control. The link between the Church and throne, and its unwillingness to concede on its privileges, helped to make it unpopular in France by 1789. Yet there were churchmen in Austria and France who had more liberal views. Some of them saw the Jesuits as targets. Many clergy performed their spiritual duties faithfully and some were attracted by the new ideas.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

2591 Themes in History 1763 – 1996

Britain 1798 – 1921

- 1 'Apart from granting independence, British governments were prepared to concede anything to pacify Ireland in the period from 1798 to 1921.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of British policy towards Ireland, 1798 to 1921.

The question may be argued with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to focus on government reaction and policy to a variety of Irish pressures - constitutional, revolutionary, economic, religious and cultural -over the period. Clearly, at different stages, changes of policy occurred. Better candidates will be able to distinguish the various stages of policy. The **Union** was seen as the benchmark for policy throughout the period, in itself a major policy development at the end of the 18th century. Less pacification (the crushing of the Wolfe Tone Rising was military) than a permanent solution, it can be seen as a concession or as coercive. No British government until 1920 was prepared to change it and certainly no government considered complete independence as an option. Even in 1920 – 21 Home Rule within the Empire (Dominion status) was the government's fall back position. Liberal governments after 1886 were, to a greater (Gladstone, Asquith post 1912 and Lloyd George) or lesser extent (Rosebery, Campbell Bannerman, Asquith pre 1912) prepared to concede Home Rule, although whether that meant very much (Dublin Parliaments were to be very limited in the power granted) is open to question. Conservative governments after 1886 granted considerable locally devolved power to elected authorities, undermining RMs and the Protestant Ascendancy. What was politically possible at Westminster clearly determined its success or failure as well as the nature of the opposition (here independence was a minority demand, Home Rule divisive within Ireland and only intermittently pursued before the 1870s). On **religious issues** (emancipation and reform of the Church of Ireland, bridging the sectarian divide of North and South) no progress was made between 1798 and 1829 and governments were divided. Much more was conceded 1829 – 1873. After that governments were very reluctant to treat north and south separately, until forced to do so in the 1910s. Some **economic** and **land concessions** were made, tentatively in the 1830s and 1840s, more specifically in the 1870s with considerable movement on dual ownership of land, subsidy and agrarian compensation from the 1880s onward. It was clearly recognised by the end of the 19th century that Ireland could not stand economically on its own two feet, a firm belief in the Pitt -Peel and Russell -Palmerston era. Much of this successfully pacified Ireland but better candidates may well point to considerable coercion throughout the period denoting that concession was often intermittent and very reluctant throughout the period. They will also be aware of disagreements between governments and parties and between them and the castle administration in Dublin. Thus it is not a question of governments being prepared to concede randomly on Irish issues.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 2 **How effective were the leaders of revolutionary nationalism in achieving their aims in the period 1798 to 1921? Explain your answer.** [60]

Focus: an evaluation of the effectiveness of the leaders of revolutionary nationalism in achieving their aims.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Revolutionary leaders (Tone, Emmet, O'Brien, Davitt, Griffith, DeValera, and Collins etc.) varied in effectiveness and the achievement of their aims (the heroic struggle for an all Ireland independent republic). Before the 1870s they failed to secure an independent Republic because of their methods and, with the exception of Tone, their inability to attract large scale support. Violence and terror before the 1870s was negative and not channelled towards targeted guerrilla war, (as the IRA did post 1916), land Issues (as Davitt did in the land War) or peasant grievance (the Tithe War of the 1830s). Later generations did this with some profit. Earlier leaders lacked the identification with local issues, Tone, Emmet and Young Ireland being enthused more by enlightenment or romantic aims within a much undeveloped sense of Irish Nationalism that owed more to local elites and their desire for prestige. At most these earlier leaders could only contribute to a history of blood sacrifice for a general aim of an independent Republic. Formal risings like 1798 or even 1916 could, often with ease, be crushed. However, candidates could point to more success by Davitt and later leaders. Davitt successfully focussed British governments on Land Reform. Griffith created an organisation, Sinn Fein, which could become both a successful political party and a vehicle for Irish nationalism that secured a particular type of Irishness. Later leaders were assisted by cultural nationalism, a growing myth of heroic struggle and especially the rise of democracy (1918) which came under the leadership of small Catholic Tenant Farmers, a powerful group in rural Ireland, although the price was social conservatism after 1920. The Fenians had built up Irish America which funded violence and helped produce a changed international climate to assist the cause. DeValera was able to take refuge in the US. Via local democracy, Sinn Fein was able to infiltrate local government which, when combined with government mistakes and over-reaction post 1916, enabled them to ignore Westminster and proceed in a de facto fashion. IRA guerrilla tactics under Collins were much more effective in challenging the police, government and authority than the risings of 1798 - 1860s which had encountered the Army. Ultimately the revolutionary leaders gained from the continued failure of the constitutional nationalists to secure Home Rule and their subsequent divisions. Better candidates may point to continued failure – an all Ireland Republic was not achieved in the period, Ireland was partitioned given the failure to address Ulster Unionism, compromises were made with the Catholic Church and a bitter civil war engulfed the pro and anti Treaty leaders. Many may approach this by assessing individual leaders, a perfectly acceptable route provided it is done comparatively with the focus on the achievement of aim.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 3 To what extent did the influence of the Protestant Ascendancy change in the period from 1798 to 1921? [60]

Focus: an evaluation of the extent to which the influence of the Protestant ascendancy changed in the period 1798-1921.

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 are likely to argue that considerable change occurred but are more likely to vary on the various levels of influence and at what point change occurred in each. They will need to be aware of these levels, politically and electorally at Dublin and Westminster, economically via land ownership and wealth, religiously via monopoly of the Irish Church and socially through their status and control of office. At a **political level** the Ascendancy lost much influence when the Union itself removed the Dublin Parliament in 1800. In the first half of the century however politicians like Peel were dependant on their good offices for electoral control and local administration. The elimination of the 40 shilling freeholder in 1829 made this easier. Later through politicians like Butt and Parnell they retained much political influence, although not all changed from Conservative and Liberal to nationalist. Politically they began to lose power at the grass roots in the form of local government reform in the 1880s and it could be argued their influence with mainland parties had died in the 1870s. Organisationally they were shouldered aside by Ulster Unionism and its politicians (Craig and Carson) with their Covenant and the UDF. Most were divided on the tactics to adopt. **Religiously** the Irish Church was dealt a body blow by emancipation in 1829 and Disestablishment in 1869 so that the Anglican aspect of the Ascendancy never effectively recovered. It was eclipsed by Catholics and Presbyterianism. **Economically** the Ascendancy was cumulatively harmed by the Tithes war of the 1830s, the Famine of the 1840s (which led to a relaxation on the disposal of great estates), the Agricultural Depression of post 1876 and the ensuing Land War of the late 1870s. They were finally eased into retirement via Wyndham's Land Act and its predecessors from the 1880s onwards. The landlordism of the Ascendancy was a shadow of its former self by the time the 1st World War killed its sons and the Civil War burnt many of its houses. Candidates may conclude that the 1870s and 1880s saw the main changes in Ascendancy influence, with few signs of real influence after that (the Curragh Mutiny?). The initiative in Ireland was lost to Ulster Unionism and the Ascendancy collapsed in the South.

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 To what extent were the British Army and Navy resistant to change in the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]**

Focus: an evaluation of the extent of resistance to change amongst the armed forces.

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 argue that both the Army and the Navy were resistant to change throughout the period, the Army especially so. They could point to the aristocratic links of both the social class of generals, admirals and policy makers (the Colonels in the Commons) who argued that 'success' meant little or no adaptation was needed. Economy and cost, a semi-privatised officer class in both services, traditional methods in training and weaponry all meant considerable resistance to change. Political pressure was relatively rare, there were difficulties in predicting the next 'type' of conflict and there was a reluctance to import foreign ways (a 'General Staff'; conscription etc.), with a preference for 'fortress Britain' and an impregnable Empire. There was a lack of innovation, especially in the army, during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars (a preference for mercenaries), a very conservative High Command post-1815, obvious complacency during the Crimean War and the failure to act on recruitment until the 1870s. Given that much warfare was colonial there was little incentive to modernise. The Boer War also revealed problems, whilst the 1st World War continued to see resistance to new methods like the Tank. The Navy was reluctant to abandon its grand battle fleets to do Convoy Duty. However it is possible to point to exceptions. The Navy under Howe and Nelson proved very open to change and was very flexible during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, becoming 'rotten' only post-1815. It was similarly responsive to the Ironclad challenge in the late 1850s and initiated the Dreadnought race pre 1914. It was the Navy that developed the Tank. The Army too developed some flexibility under Wellington in the Peninsular War post-1807, immediately created a Secretary of State for War in 1854, developed and introduced the machine gun, reacted to changes in South Africa (khaki uniforms) and developed the BEF in the years before 1914. Air Power was developed as an adjunct to the Army post-1914 and was the world's largest by 1918. A variety of conclusions are to be expected, with reference to both army and navy to gain Bands I and II.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 5 **How consistent was British military and naval strategy in the period 1793 to 1918?**
Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: an evaluation of British military and naval strategy 1793 – 1918.

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 argue that strategy was remarkably **consistent** – a Bluewater naval one with gunboat diplomacy to protect trade and colonies, the army acting as a colonial or expeditionary force whether in the Peninsular after 1807, the Crimea in 1854 or Belgium in 1914. It could also be argued that British governments consistently sought to avoid a Continental commitment, acting in both 1815 and 1918 to reduce army and navy size to pre-war figures which prevented Britain from interfering, other than as an expeditionary force in conjunction with more major military allies. The army was largely to be based in Ireland during the period. Even an expeditionary force was not considered as a permanent feature until Cardwell's period in the 1870s and was not to be properly developed until initial Boer War mistakes made planning essential. All this was inevitable given Britain's trading, global and island status and the grip that low costs and laissez-faire had in an industrialising and democratising country. However better candidates will point to moments of **inconsistency** when Britain was forced to change her traditional strategy in the face of military powers bent on some form of continental domination. It is surprising that it was not until 1807 that Britain accepted the need to support a large army in one of the European theatres of War. Then, strategy under Wellington proved remarkably flexible, frequently denying Napoleon his large scale battle. Britain was forced to adapt to guerrilla warfare in South Africa after 1900 and to expand her Army via Voluntarism from 1914 to 1916 to enable a full commitment to be made by the time of the Somme. By 1916 strategy was attritional and entirely 'new'. There had also been a change in Naval Strategy in the late 19th century, away from a Bluewater strategy to one based on maintaining a huge battle Fleet in the North Sea and Channel against first France, then Russia and finally Germany. This was further distorted during the 1st World War by the U-Boat challenge of 1916 – 18. The 'British way of warfare' was thus distorted when the need arose to wage major land war in Europe.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 6 'Except for its scale, the First World War (1914 – 18) was little different from the wars fought by Britain in the period 1793 to 1902.' How far would you agree? [60]

Focus: a comparison of the wars fought by Britain 1793 – 1918

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 need to maintain a comparative focus and assess the typicality or otherwise of the Great War. They can range as widely as they like, addressing such matters as strategy, tactics, artillery and weaponry, logistics and supply, conditions for the armed forces and wider issues like aims, allies, propaganda, morale, opinion and Home Fronts. This is a wide ranging question and not all aspects need be pursued. The scale of the Great War is a 'given', except for its length. In terms of similarity four years was fairly normal in relation to the length of Britain's 18th and 19th century wars. Here the exceptions were the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. Possible differences could lie in aims. The Great War was for grandiose reasons, even to end war itself, other wars were for definable and clearly self interested goals, although Belgium played a similar role in both 1793 – 1815 and 1914 – 18. Both these wars saw economic blockades on a European scale, the navy functioning as the key tool in both. All Britain's wars saw British naval surface supremacy, the key differences in 1914 – 18 being the U Boat challenge of 1916 – 18. Naval/military expeditions were used in both the 1st World War (Gallipoli) and the Crimea in an attempt to achieve victory. The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars also saw many fronts and were on a global scale. All Britain's wars saw supply problems, at least initially. The state of the ordinary soldier had often been grim. Although reasonably paid, healthy and fed by 1914 and much less likely to die of sickness and poor hospitals, the Great War saw a much higher incidence of slaughter and psychological damage (shell shock). The intention remained the same – hand to hand combat, but there was much less of this given trenches and weaponry. Many candidates will stress the differences – wars pre 1914 were fought by professionals and had little impact back home. The Great War was fought by Volunteers on a huge scale until 1916, a Home Front being a pre-requisite of victory. Women were involved on a huge scale. Propaganda and censorship were tightly controlled, despite superficial similarities with Pitt's legislation in the 1790s. High Commands were miles from the Battlefields. Communications, whilst similar, also saw the telephone but were just as difficult given the scale. Artillery bombardments occurred before the battle, less so during it. Trenches were not a feature of Britain's earlier wars, unless sieges were involved in a traditional sense. Air power was new, if largely used for reconnaissance. The Tank was certainly an innovation, as was Chemical Warfare (gas). Provided candidates focus on similarity and difference they will be answering the question.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948

- 7 **‘Governments had limited success in dealing with the poor throughout the period from 1834 to 1948.’ How far do you agree? [60]**

Focus: an assessment of government policies to deal with the poor from 1834 to 1948

Candidates are likely to discuss the attempts by governments to deal with the poor by making reference to causes (unemployment, underemployment, old age, sickness, family and childhood etc) and effects (poor diets, sickness, high infant mortality etc). They might point out that governments had limited success as the causes and effects of poverty were not always clearly identified such as in the 1830s, the 1870s (the so called Great Depression) and the 1920s–30s. In fact, it could be argued that real success only occurred after Beveridge pointed out how the ‘Five Giants’ were interrelated and could only be tackled by ‘cradle to grave’ provision. Others might claim that success was due to a lack of political will and laissez-faire individualism, which resulted in the view that poverty was due to personal failing. Many are likely to take a different tack and claim that governments achieved success but only at certain points in time. The Poor Law Amendment Act reduced the cost of treating the poor, legislation in the second half of the 19th century improved the administration of the Poor Law, the Liberal Reforms of 1906-11 laid the foundation for a welfare state and unemployment insurance was continually adjusted in the interwar years to meet the growing needs of the unemployed. However, poverty was always an issue as revealed by social investigators, the growing importance of charities and by official government reports. Some might claim that given the complexity of the problem over the period and the changing political, economic and social context, governments did make great progress.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

- 8 **Assess the view that improvements in housing provision were mainly the result of public health concerns in the period from 1834 to 1948.** [60]

Focus: an explanation as to why housing conditions improved from 1834 to 1948.

Candidates may use a thematic framework to answer this question. They are likely to begin by discussing public health concerns throughout the period making reference to disease (eg cholera outbreaks, TB), sanitation, water supplies, lighting, paving and the provision of medical facilities. Some link should be made with the issue of national efficiency and how this was partly to be addressed by improvement in housing provision. Other factors should then be discussed. Political pressures from below (rise of trade unions and the labour movement, working class consciousness) undoubtedly pushed governments into passing legislation to impel local authorities to make housing improvements, especially from 1870 onwards. This was connected with the fear of social unrest such as in 1918 and the early 1920s. Party leaders often used the housing issue to gain political points (Disraeli, Lloyd George and Attlee). However, candidates should point out that political will often went hand in hand with the helpful economic conditions at a local and national level. The Mid Victorian Boom saw the proliferation of mass, albeit very cheap, and poor quality housing. From the 1880s to 1914 and at times during the interwar period there were housing booms and significant advances in the quality of provision. Social change was also important as in the longer term living standards improved and aspirations for better housing increased. This was especially true of the rising middle classes and the so called aristocracy of labour. Some may point out though that for the masses improvement was rather negligible until the slum clearance programmes of the 1930s. Wars also played a role in determining the nature of provision, especially in 1918 with Lloyd George's Land fit for Heroes proposal and in 1945 with the coming of the Welfare State. Better candidates should aim to show how factors are linked and should also make a judgement about relative importance. A strictly chronological and narrative approach is unlikely to get above Band III, however well informed it might be.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

- 9 To what extent was war the main reason for changes in welfare provision in the period from 1834 to 1948? [60]

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for changes in welfare provision.

Better candidates should consider long and short term causal factors. They are likely to discuss how the Welfare State evolved from ad hoc institutions of welfare provision under laissez-faire individualism to an integrated social services state influenced by collectivism. The Second World War will be seen as short term or even triggering events through the emergence of shared adversity (the blitz, evacuation, rationing and a common will to create a better future). Beveridge claimed the war created a climate for revolutionary change, but he also pointed out that his views were not totally original or unique. He was simply pulling together ideas and evidence that had accumulated over previous decades. Other wars (Crimean War, second Boer War, First World War) also had an impact on welfare provision either by acting as a locomotive for change and/or by affecting resources. Other factors influencing welfare provision should also be discussed. Candidates will probably highlight 1906-11 (Liberal reforms) as something of a turning point, laying the foundation for what was to come later. There might also be discussion of how provision changed with economic fluctuations and with key political developments such as extensions to the franchise and the rise of the labour movement. Weaker candidates are likely to make broad generalisations about the period before 1939 or may offer descriptions of welfare changes culminating in the legislation of 1944 to 1948. Some may even focus only on Beveridge and the Second World War, resulting in seriously unbalanced responses, and hence, a mark within Band V at best.

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 the reform of the franchise the most important influence on the development of democracy in the period from 1868 to 1992? [60]

Focus: an assessment of the importance of franchise reform.

Franchise reform was obviously integral to the development of democracy, although candidates might argue that the pace of change was relatively slow, especially for the lower working classes and women. The 1884 Act resulted in only 6 out of 10 males receiving the vote, with universal male suffrage not being achieved until 1918. Women, of course, did not receive the vote on equal terms until 1928. There is likely to be an attempt to show how such developments were relatively meaningless without other political reforms, such as the 1872 Ballot Act, the introduction of salaries for MPs in 1911, and the reduction and final abolition of plural voting in 1918 and 1948. Candidates should go on to show how franchise reform was linked with other political, economic and social developments to reach the higher Bands. Parties reorganised and new parties emerged in response to an expanded electorate. Pressure groups, such as Trades Unions, played an increasingly important role in the democratic process until the Thatcher years. Economic and social policies changed, partly in response to franchise reform. These included the Liberal Welfare Reforms, and the coming of the Welfare State. Some may argue that there were factors that were more important for the development of democracy and that were not connected to the reform Acts. These might include the expansion in the provision of education and the rise and influence of the mass media. Generally, candidates should aim to consider a range of factors and make a judgement about relative importance to achieve marks in Bands I and II.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

- 11 **How far can the changing fortunes of the Liberal party be explained by the rise of organised labour in the period from 1868 to 1992?** [60]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Liberal party.

Candidates may start by defining the term organised labour. They are likely to discuss the impact of the growth in trade unionism, the development of the Labour party, the emergence of working class consciousness and various forms of grassroots protest. Some may claim that with the rise of organised labour the decline of the Liberal party was inevitable and that there was little that they could do to prevent it. Another line of argument could be that the Liberals were strong when the party was genuinely united under strong leadership (eg Gladstone); their fortunes changed for the worse when the leadership was divided (eg Lloyd George and Asquith) and/or discredited (eg Thorpe). Discussion of this is likely to be balanced against the strengths of the Conservative party in the early part of the period, especially under Disraeli, Salisbury, and Balfour and the rise of the Labour party to become the second party after the First World War. Some may argue that the Liberals failed to adapt quickly to rapidly changing economic, political and social conditions. Thus, they failed to deal with Irish issues, the Liberal Welfare Reforms were limited, female suffrage was opposed and the handling of the First World War was, at first, disastrous. By the 1920s they were struggling to achieve any kind of unity and had little to offer that was different when it came to tackling the interwar economic problems. There was some revival in the post World War Two period, partly due to alliances (especially with the Lib-Lab pact), but more generally as a result of some public disillusionment with the other parties. Candidates must attempt to assess the relative importance of reasons to achieve marks in the higher Bands. This is probably best achieved by adopting a thematic rather than chronological approach.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

- 12 To what extent did the rise of the Trade Union movement have a harmful effect on the development of democracy in the period from 1868 to 1992? [60]

Focus: an assessment of the importance of Trades Unions in the development of democracy.

Candidates may argue that, as Trades Unions became more general in nature, they were also more militant and obstructive towards the development of democracy. Up to the 1880s the 'New Model' Unions, representing the Labour Aristocracy were seen as the respectable voice of the working classes and institutions that were acceptable to a developing democratic nation. The General Unions were a threat and, in particular, a restraint on trade, which in turn, was a challenge to laissez-faire ideology and the very roots of democracy. Militancy in the form of strikes (1880s, 1914-18, 1926, late 1970s) continued throughout the period and the union movement was also associated with radical political groups (Syndicalists, British Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party), which in turn, were linked with non democratic regimes, post 1917, in Eastern Europe. Some may also discuss the relationship with the Labour party and how this affected attitudes of working people about political allegiance. An alternative view is that Trade Unions were essential to democracy, as without them working people would not have been able to voice their concerns about political, economic and social change. This was especially true of the period before 1918, but also of other times, such as the 1930s and, ironically, the Thatcher years. A balanced response can be expected for marks in Bands I and II.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

- 13 **How far do you agree that the emergence of radio and then television diminished the importance of the press in the period from 1896 to 1996?** [60]

Focus: The growth of radio and television in the twentieth century

It is generally assumed that in the course of the century from 1896 the printed media became less popular and thus less important and influential as the novelty and more attractive features of the new broadcast media came along. However, access to these new media was not initially very widespread (newspapers and magazines were cheaper and more easily available/portable) and circulation figures tend to show, especially until the 1960s, that the battle was not so easily won by the broadcast media. There is also the issue of 'important to whom': it can be argued that to governments and the elites the power of the press remained, perhaps for most of this period and arguably even now, supremely important. Examiners should be prepared to accept a wide range of interpretations of how best to answer this question and how to interpret/measure 'importance' in candidates' essays, and even for 'importance' to include some discussion of whether the impact of the press on society and government changed because of the emergence of radio and then television. Other legitimate approaches would be to assess whether the relative importance of the roles to educate, inform and entertain of the press were affected by the rise of the new media; whether circulation, influence or range of the press were affected; if governments were more or less influenced by the press. For a valid assessment of how far the press changed as a result of the rise of the new broadcast media, the role and importance of the press in the period before their emergence will have to be fully understood and discussed, and the danger may be that some candidates focus too heavily on just the later period. However, it is vital for success that the influence or competition of radio and television is set against consideration of other possible explanations of the changes in the press's importance, such as changes in society more generally.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

- 14 How far would you agree that in the period from 1896 to 1996 the press informed and educated the public better than did the broadcast media? [60]

Focus: the changing balance between the three main roles of the popular press and radio and television.

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 particular medium, the press, against that of the broadcast media. 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 the press and the broadcast media, however well done and informed, is unlikely to rise above Band V. 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).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

- 15 **Assess the view that the media had more influence during the period of appeasement in the 1930s than in any other period of national crisis during the century from 1896.** [60]

Focus: The role of the press and broadcasting in times of national crisis.

It is arguable that the media played a very significant role in the appeasement era of the 1930s and candidates are likely to include a variety of examples of ways in which this was the case. These may include the almost unanimous support for the policy (until at least September-October 1938) of the printed media, especially the mainstream press dominated by the 'press barons'; the role of cinema, including newsreel coverage of Guernica and Abyssinia but also films such as 'Things to come'. Equally, the abandonment of support for the policy of appeasement was arguably seen first in the press, and certainly it anticipated the cabinet's wholesale defection by several months: even as Chamberlain's return with the Munich agreement was being greeted with wild popular enthusiasm, sections of the press, including by now even the Times, were offering some colder evaluations, and the widespread and condemnatory coverage of Kristallnacht just the following month was very important in changing public opinion and that of politicians. Arguably, press anger at Chamberlain's calm initial acceptance of Hitler's seizure of Prague in March 1939 was the key reason he changed his tone in Birmingham two days later, and the press may have played as important a role as the House of Commons in ensuring that Britain went to war on 3rd September. Certainly, the press did a great deal to prepare the public for war's outbreak, contributing to the air of resigned but determined acceptance with which the news was received. A successful answer could spend a good part of the essay just on a good evaluation of the period of appeasement, but no candidate can access the highest grades without comparing the role of the press in other national crises, drawn from other eras, because of the nature of this Theme paper.

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 did the mid 19th century Wars of Unification mark the most important turning point in the development of planning and preparation for war in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]

Focus: the middle 19th century as a turning point in planning and the preparation for war.

The question may be accepted or rejected no set answer is expected. The concept of turning point is at the core of the discussion.

Key ideas for discussion might be mass conscription, a meritocratic/professional officer corps, higher army organisation, the mobilisation of mass armies, the development of general staffs, the planning of campaigns (military concentration, speed of movement, control of corps etc.), and the search for rapid and decisive victory. This list is not exhaustive.

A positive answer might concentrate on the rise of Prussian styles of warfare and would use evidence from the Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian Wars. A counter might be the Italian War of 1859 which was characterised by incompetence in both planning and preparation. Alternative turning points might be the Revolutionary & Napoleonic periods or the early 19th century – perhaps the planning & preparation by the Great Powers for WWI. The American Civil War could be used either way, pointing to American armies copying & developing European styles of war or pointing to a general state of disorder.

The concept of turning point might be rejected altogether, rather planning and preparation for war was part of an ongoing process.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 17 **How far did developments in weapons determine battle-tactics in the period from 1792 to 1918?** [60]

Focus: the impact of technology on the battlefield

The question may be rejected or accepted no set answer is expected. Battle tactics is the organisation and operation of troops on the battlefield.

Two common lines might be expected, either technology did drive the development of battle tactics or it did not. The former line might point to the development of longer ranged and more rapid firing weapons and the impact this had on battlefield formations, the deployment and manoeuvre of bodies of troops. Alternatively, candidates might argue that battle tactics did not keep up with developments in weapons technology. Indeed, much of the modern literature points to essentially Napoleonic tactics being used until very late in the period. The American Civil War fits neatly into this debate.

At the start of the period – the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars - infantry weapons fired no further than 100 yards and even at this close range were relatively ineffective leading to movement in column and fighting in lines – both densely packed formations. Artillery fired about a mile. Both infantry and artillery weapons were relatively slow firing with long 30 second reload times. Cavalry were an important component of an army. As the period goes on ranges extend and reload times shorten. Technology such as the percussion cap make infantry long arms more reliable. Key developments might be the introduction of Minie technology in the middle of the century creating rifled muskets with long ranges and very fast reload times. Another development might be the Dreyse needle rifle as the first breech loading rifled carbine in the middle of the century which allowed Prussian infantry to put out a much larger volume of fire. In the Franco-Prussian War the French use the Chassepot, a true breech loading rifle, which led in turn to the smokeless powder weapons of the last years of the century and full metal jacket ammunition.

Artillery makes similar advances with the introduction of rifling and breech loading technology greatly increasing rate of fire and range, developments in the Austrian army in the 1866 war and Prussia's use of advanced artillery in the Franco-Prussian War are examples. In the Russo-Japanese War the first advanced recoil systems are used allowing continuous fire without the need to adjust the aiming point of guns. By WWI indirect fire and super-heavy artillery transforms the battlefield.

Candidate might also use developments in machine guns from the middle of the period onwards. WWI sees gas, tanks etc.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 18 To what extent was the outcome of wars in the period from 1792 to 1918 mainly determined by superior resources? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of a given factor in bringing about success in war.

The question may be rejected or accepted no set answer is expected.

Candidates need to grasp what is meant by resources. Superior manpower, industrial or economic strength are suggestions. They might discuss the organisation of said and the application of resources to different types of military situations. A good example might be to compare wars of short or long duration.

Good examples of the impact of superior resources might be the defeat of Napoleonic France by an alliance of European states with a superior manpower base and economic structures. Candidates might point to the financial and industrial might of Britain in this context. WWI & the American Civil War are other obvious examples with the candidates respectively comparing the resources of the Entente to the Central powers, Union to Confederacy. Counter arguments might point to the wars of shorter duration, the Wars of Unification, the Crimean War or the Russo-Japanese War where resources were less of a factor.

Candidates should discuss the impact of resources in relation to other factors, generalship, organisation, quality of armies, etc which appear in the specification. The importance of these alternate factors should be weighed against the argument for or against the importance of superior resources. Note as outline above the military situation being addressed is important in this regard.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Europe 1792 – 1919

The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815 – 1919

- 19 How far would you agree that the Franco-Prussian War (1870 - 1871) was the most important turning-point in the growth of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the relative significance of the Franco-Prussian War as a turning point in the growth of German nationalism in the period 1815 - 1919.

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 focus on the phrase ‘**most** important turning point’ in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the Franco-Prussian War as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. In assessing the significance of the Franco-Prussian War candidates are likely to stress the formation of the Second Reich and the consequent domination of Germany by Prussia. What follows is not an exclusive list of other potential turning-points, but obvious consideration could be given to 1848-49, 1862, 1866, 1888 (and / or 1890) and 1914. 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 Franco-Prussian War, 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.

- 20 To what extent did German nationalism enjoy mass support in the period from 1815 to 1919? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the extent of the mass support for German nationalism.

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 focus on ‘to what extent’, ‘German nationalism’ and ‘mass support’ in their answers in an attempt to evaluate the mass support of nationalism in this period. Candidates should evaluate the extent to which nationalism had mass appeal and demonstrate awareness that such appeal was not uniform but fluctuated. Candidates may demonstrate that concepts of romantic nationalism had a limited intellectual appeal. Candidates could consider the extent to which nationalism appealed to the people at various points, for example 1848 and 1871 and 1914. Candidates may well demonstrate that they understand that Wilhelmine Germany increasingly looked to exploit nationalist yearnings and the mass appeal of German nationalism, pursuing a populist foreign policy to distract the masses from social discontent. Candidates might choose to demonstrate that the mass appeal of nationalism may be compared to the mass appeal of other philosophies. For example the growing industrialization of Prussia and the German Empire was mirrored by the growing mass appeal of socialism, an appeal that proved relatively immune to either appeasement, in the form of state socialism, or repression. Distress from the winter of 1916 / 1917 onwards, and defeat in 1918, led to the socialist uprisings of late 1918 and early 1919 and the establishment of Ebert’s republic. However, even in 1919 the appeal of unrequited nationalism was never far from the surface, as evidenced by the Freikorps and the emerging ‘stab-in-the-back’ theory.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 21 **To what extent did the factors influencing the development of German nationalism change in the period from 1815 to 1919?** [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the factors influencing the development of German nationalism in 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. 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. Candidates could consider economic factors and the Zollverein and the impact on the development of nationalism of the failure of the revolutions of 1848 / 1849. Candidates are likely to demonstrate understanding of the debate about Grossdeutschland or Kleindeutschland. Candidates may well consider the extent to which the development of German nationalism was subverted by Bismarck and the creation of the Second Reich. The institutionalisation of nationalism in Wilhelmine Germany as Kaiser William II grasped at 'world power' could also be considered. The impact of defeat in 1918 and humiliation in 1919 may also be understood.

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 **To what extent was the industrial and urban working class of Russia failed more by communist rulers than the Tsars in the period from 1881 to 1956?** [60]

Focus: Comparative assessment of the condition of the industrial and urban working class peoples of Russia in the period 1881 - 1956.

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 focus on an understanding of the experience and impact of communism on the living and working conditions of Russia's industrial and urban working class. Some candidates may compare and contrast Marxist ideology with the actual experience of life in the USSR. Candidates should compare the experience of the working class under the tsars with their experience under the communists. Candidates may treat Russia's peasants as **part** of their discussions as the growing proletariat consisted largely of urbanised peasants, but the main focus should involve a consideration of the experience of Russia's industrial working class or proletariat and candidates who fail to discuss the industrial and urban workers may **not** be put into bands (i) or (ii). Candidates are likely to compare the impact of industrialization on the lives of the people, both before and after 1917. Similarities could include the grim experience of industrialization experienced by the proletariat, both as a consequence of Witte's 'Great Spurt' and Stalin's Five Year Plans. Candidates may wish to compare the scale of the suffering under Lenin and Stalin with that experienced before 1917. Candidates may argue that the working peoples gained benefits from Soviet rule, for example in the sphere of education.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 23 **Assess the view that in the period from 1855 to 1956 the communist rulers tried to modernise Russia whereas the Tsars did not.** [60]

Focus: Assessment of the relative impact of the communist and Tsarist rulers on the modernisation of Russia in the period from 1855 to 1956.

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 evaluate the assertion that ‘the communist rulers tried to modernise Russia whereas the Tsars did not’ in this period. Candidates will probably find much to argue about in support of this assertion: they may well cite various examples of both Lenin and Stalin (perhaps with particular reference to the Five Year Plans and collectivisation) doing much to modernise Russia. Some candidates may well challenge the assertion by reference to such events as the Emancipation of the serfs and Witte’s ‘Great Spurt’. Expect a discussion of political and social developments as well as economic in the better responses.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 24 **Explain why the opponents of the Tsars from 1855 to 1917 were more successful than those who opposed the communist regime from 1917 to 1956.** [60]

Focus: Explanation for success of tsarist opposition and failure of opposition to soviets in Russia in the period 1855 - 1956.

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 focus on why the opponents of the Tsars were ultimately able to be more successful than the opponents of the Communist regime. Candidates will certainly focus on the abdication of Nicholas II in 1917 and the reasons why the Romanov dynasty fell. Comparisons will be made with the way in which the communist regime secured control in the period 1917 – 20. Why the opponents of the Stalinist regime, even from within the Communist Party, were so unsuccessful may well be discussed? Comparisons may be made between the relative effectiveness of the rulers eg why Nicholas II was a much less efficient autocrat than Alexander III, or why Lenin and Stalin were ultimately much more efficient in their use of dictatorial powers than the Tsars were in their wielding of autocratic ones. The fact that the opponents of the communist regime lacked a populist ideology for people to unite behind may be discussed.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Struggle for the Constitution

- 25 To what extent was the Compromise of 1850 the major turning-point in sectional relations in the period from 1776 to 1877? [60]**

Focus: Assessment of a turning-point in sectional relations.

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 that Compromise of 1850 was extremely important because it dealt directly with a wide range of issues between North and South. These included the admission of California as a free state and the issue of fugitive slavery and slavery in the District of Columbia. It seemed to have solved many of the issues raised by the Mexican War and tensions which had dated back as far as the Missouri Compromise of 1820. These included the admission of Texas as a slave state in 1845 and the Wilmot Proviso of 1846. In particular it brought to an end the tension between Slave and Free states in Congress. However, it left unresolved the issue of the extension of slavery into the Western Territories, maintaining the Missouri Compromise of 1820 decision on this issue.

Candidates may also suggest that Compromise of 1850 began to unravel very quickly. The Kansas-Nebraska Act 1854 reopened the whole issue of slavery in the Western Territories by putting forward the idea of popular sovereignty. That Act led directly to the creation of the Republican Party and can be seen as a major cause of the sectional conflict which resulted in Civil War in 1861. The sectional conflict of 'Bloody Kansas' in 1856-1860 and the election of Lincoln in 1860 all came back to unravelling of the Compromise from 1854.

Candidates may offer other turning points such as the creation of the US Constitution. This solved the problems associated with the Articles of Confederation which had created a loose association of colonies during and after the American Revolutionary War. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 sustained the balance between free and slave states through extending statehood to Missouri and Maine and limited the extension of slavery to the western territories to 36 degrees 30 minutes north. The outbreak of civil war in 1861 can be seen as a very negative turning-point as compromise between North and South collapsed. Also the Civil War and Reconstruction 1863-1877 can be seen as a turning-point as the resolution of conflict through armed force saved the Union and re-united the country during the Reconstruction era of 1863-77.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 26 **Assess the view that there was more continuity than change in the role of the presidency in the period from 1789 to 1877.** [60]

Focus: Assessment of the changing role of the presidency from 1789 to 1877.

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 can mention that precise role of president was left unclear by 1787 Constitution. Was the president to be a figurehead or an active force in national politics? Washington (1789-1801) attempted to define role by being 'above party'. Therefore, the presidency was more a head of state rather than a head of government. Jefferson (1801-1808) was more pro-active, with actions such as Louisiana Purchase (1803) and acting as head of the Democratic-Republican Party. Candidates may also focus on roles of Jackson. Jackson helped create the Democrat Party and used his powers of president effectively in the Nullification Crisis of 1832 with South Carolina and in the expulsion of the Five Civilised Tribes of Native Americans from the South East to Indian Territory. Polk was closely associated with the extension of presidential power in foreign affairs in his role in the Oregon Treaty with Britain, the acquisition of Texas and the launching of the Mexican War. Lincoln was a very pro-active president in the Civil War. He suspended habeus corpus calling up volunteers and effectively leading the Northern war effort. A counter argument might be to highlight the role of other presidents who made little or no change to the role of the president: John Adams and John Quincy Adams, John Tyler, Franklin Pierce, Millard Fillmore and James Buchanan. Candidates may mention that the constitutional position as outlined in the US Constitution did not change. President was still head of state and commander in chief of armed forces and had power to conduct foreign policy with advice and consent of the US Senate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 27 To what extent was social change the main cause of amendments to the US Constitution in the period from 1791 to 1877? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons behind constitutional amendments.

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 mention the first 10 amendments of 1791 (The Bill of Rights), these were included because several states refused to ratify the 1787 Constitution without specific social/civil rights included within the Constitution. Candidates may argue that these were the result of social changes brought on by the Revolutionary War and its immediate aftermath. During the Revolutionary war many Americans had fought against what they saw as military occupation and arbitrary rule. They fought to defend their liberties. Therefore the Bill of Rights of 1791 contained the right to bear arms (2nd Amendment), the prohibition of quartering of troops in private homes (4th Amendment). Protection of individual rights, which was a main issue in the Revolutionary War were enshrined in 1st Amendment which produced the freedom of the press and freedom of assembly. Fear of the power of the Catholic Church as shown in the Quebec Act of 1773 was also prevented by 1st Amendment with separation of church and state. The 11th and 12th amendments were due to technical issues. 11th Amendment separated elections of president and vice president following the electoral college impasse of 1800 presidential election.

Candidates should mention that the main areas where amendments were due to social change were the three civil war amendments of 1865-1870 associated with the abolition of slavery as a result of civil war. These stated that slavery was abolished for all time (13th) in 1865; the 14th Amendment gave African Americans full civil rights and all citizens equal protection of the law; 15th Amendment forbade discrimination in voting on the basis of race.

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 to 1980

- 28 To what extent was advancement for African Americans due to their own efforts in the period from 1865 to 1980? [60]**

Focus: Assessment of African Americans and other factors in the development of their 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.

A balanced response that considers the role of African Americans and the part played by presidents, Congress and the Supreme Court is expected of better candidates. Some will argue that at important times, African American did play an active role in pursuit of their civil rights. They may mention their roles in southern legislatures during Reconstruction and in particular the work of the Freedmen's Bureau. They could refer to the contributions of Booker T Washington in respect of social and economic rights in the 1890s to 1917 era, the work of WEB Du Bois and NAACP, which became a major force in developing rights through the legal system. Many landmark developments in civil rights were a result of NAACP action, most notably the Brown v Board of Education case of 1954, which struck down legal segregation in education. Others who might be mentioned are Marcus Garvey in the 1920s and A. Philip Randolph in the 1940s. Perhaps most candidates will assess the work of CORE, SNCC and SCLC. These groups highlighted injustice through Freedom Rides on Inter-State buses, lunch counter protests against segregation in restaurants and on buses, such as the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955-56. Many answers are likely to refer to individuals such as Martin Luther King, Malcolm X and groups such as the Black Panthers. King was central to the end of bus segregation in Alabama, the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and in gaining world-wide attention to the cause of African American civil rights.

Candidates should set some of the above contributions alongside the role of presidents, especially Grant, FD Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson, without whose support and initiative progress would have been limited. Better answers are also likely to discuss how Congress legislated to advance civil rights and how judgements by the Supreme Court were necessary if unpopular legislation was to be enforced in the Deep South, most notably from the 1950s onwards. Most candidates may well argue that a combination of all these factors was required before African Americans could make any significant advance in their civil rights.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 29 To what extent were the presidencies of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson (1961-1969) the major turning-point in the development of Asian and Hispanic American civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1980? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the presidencies of 1961 to 1969 in the development of 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 could mention that the general civil rights legislation of this era benefited all ethnic minorities. Although little was achieved under JFK, his desire to help ethnic minorities did lead to legislation under Johnson. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1968 all helped Asians and Hispanics by guaranteeing them the right to vote and by ending discriminatory election practices. They also guaranteed full civil rights in employment and federal housing. Candidates may also mention LBJ's decision to change immigration laws in 1965, which had discriminated against Hispanics and Asians. Before 1965 there had been strict quotas that limited non-White immigration; after 1965 large numbers of immigrants entered the USA. Candidates may also mention that in the JFK/LBJ period a large amount of social legislation was passed by Congress, which aided the poor and in particular Asians and Hispanics. These included increases in the minimum wage, Inner City regeneration, health care reforms and housing reforms.

Candidates need to counter the assertion in the question by referring to other potential main turning-points. They may mention negative turning-points such as the Asian Exclusion Act of 1882 and the internment of Japanese-Americans during the Second World War. Some candidates may refer to the New Deal era, which offered the poor employment opportunities and pensions. Some answers might discuss affirmative action from 1969, which established quotas for ethnic groups in Federal employment and greatly aided economic and social advancement. Others may mention the role of Hispanic Labour leaders in the 1970s, such as Cesar Chavez who helped get better working conditions for Hispanics, especially in California.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 30 'Native Americans played no part in the development of their civil rights.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1865 to 1980? [60]

Focus: Study of the development of civil rights of Native Americans

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 that much of the changes involved Native American rights came from the Federal Government. From 1865 to 1887 the creation of Indian Reservations had been the result of Federal Action, such as the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868. The passage of the Dawes Act 1887 marked a milestone in Native American rights by allowing Plains Indians to become US citizens. In 1924, by act of Congress all Native Americans could become US citizens. In 1934 the Indian Reorganisation Act, created the 'Indian New Deal' . In the 1960s Civil Rights legislation (The Civil Rights acts of 1964 and 1968 and the Voting Rights Act 1965) aided all ethnic groups, including Native Americans. All these developments had virtually nothing to do with the action of Native Americans. As a result, in 1865 Native Americans were not US citizens but members of separate Indian nations. By 1980 they still had this right, on reservations but Native Americans also had US citizenship rights.

However, candidates may mention action by Native Americans did aid their rights. The Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868, it could be argued was forced on the Federal Government by Red Cloud of the Oglala Sioux. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the development of the American Indian Movement (AIM) raised the profile of the Native Americans and resulted in Federal action to deal with Native American social and economic problems. Candidates may also mention actions by individual Indian nations to gain greater economic wealth through court action against the US Federal government (Passamaquaddy Indians of Maine in the 1970s) or in developing their reservations (Mohawks of New York or Jicarilla Apaches of New Mexico).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE (Subject) (Aggregation Code(s))
January 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2580	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2581	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2582	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2583	Raw	45	35	31	27	23	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2584	Raw	45	35	31	27	23	19	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	68	61	54	48	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2588	Raw	90	68	61	54	48	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2589	Raw	90	68	61	54	48	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2590	Raw	120	91	81	71	61	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2591	Raw	120	91	81	71	61	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie 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	480	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	19.40	44.51	72.59	92.40	98.64	100.00	821
7835	14.91	47.37	81.58	95.61	99.12	100.00	136

957 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.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

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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 2008

