OCR
RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

ADVANCED GCE **2588**

HISTORY

Historical Investigations 1556–1725

WEDNESDAY 4 JUNE 2008 Morning

Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Additional materials (enclosed): None

Additional materials (required):
Answer Booklet (12 pages)

CUP/T46522

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Write your name in capital letters, your Centre Number and Candidate Number in the spaces provided on the Answer Booklet.
- Read each question carefully and make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- Write your answers, in blue or black ink, in the separate Answer Booklet provided.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- This paper contains questions on the following four Options:
  - Philip II (pages 2–3)
  - Elizabeth I (pages 4–5)
  - Oliver Cromwell (pages 6–7)
  - Peter the Great (pages 8–9)
- Answer on **one** Option only. In that Option, answer the question on the Passages and **one** other question.
- The number of marks for each question is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question.
- The total mark for this paper is **90**.
- You should write in continuous prose and are reminded of the need for clear and accurate writing, including structure of argument, grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- The time permitted allows for reading the Passages in the one Option you have studied.
- You are advised to spend equal time on the Passages question and the essay you select.
- In answering the Passages question, you are expected to use your knowledge of the topic to help you explain and evaluate the interpretations in the Passages, as well as to inform your answers.
- In answering the essay question, you are expected to refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations to help you develop your arguments.

This document consists of **10** printed pages and **2** blank pages.

[Turn over

Philip II

If answering on this Option, candidates **must** answer **Question 1** and **one** other question.

1 Study all the Passages.

Using these **four** Passages **and** your own knowledge, assess Philip II's role in causing revolt in the Netherlands to 1572. [45]

A From: Andrew Pettegree, 'Religion and the Revolt', an article published in 2001. This historian refers to foreign influences and suggests that the Dutch nobility tried to turn religious divisions to their own political advantage, unleashing popular revolt in 1566.

Ironically, Netherlandish Calvinism in the 1560s was largely a creation of the ruthless repression of Charles V's later years, but it was no more than a shadow of its French counterpart. The French Religious Wars had a profound impact in the Netherlands, giving the Dutch nobility an example of how political crisis could be turned to their own advantage. Consumed with their own exclusion from power, and anxious to show the absent Philip II their indispensability, they began to associate themselves with calls for a relaxation of the laws against heresy. Emboldened by open revolt in France, Dutch Calvinist communities were increasingly willing to resort to attacks on Catholic images. To the nobility, iconoclasm was a powerful signal that the forces they had unleashed posed a real threat to the established political order.

B From: Patrick Williams, *Philip II*, published in 2001. This historian argues that Philip II was forced to take determined action in 1567 as his previous concessions had endangered his Netherlands inheritance.

Rebellion was an insult to the King's majesty. Philip had been forced to retreat on a number of key issues in the years since 1561, such as the recall of Spanish troops, the dismissal of Granvelle and the moderation of his religious policy. He had now been driven to the point where he would retreat no more. The Netherlands were part of the inheritance to which his father had committed him. He was immovably determined to preserve what remained of it. Philip's policy towards the Netherlands sprang from his obligations as king of Spain; but equally he had a duty to the Netherlands. Philip could not allow this key part of his inheritance to be at risk. To do so would be to betray his very heritage.

C From: Graham Darby, 'The Dutch Revolt', an article published in 2002. This historian suggests that both Philip II and the Dutch rebels bore responsibility for the outbreak of revolt in the Netherlands.

The revolt was a struggle for freedom and religion. But freedom did not necessarily mean freedom from Spanish oppression, rather it meant that the King of Spain had to respect the local rights and privileges of the towns and provinces. As he was not prepared to do this he was overthrown. Religion too did not mean the replacement of Catholicism by Calvinism but rather a moderate settlement that allowed for freedom of conscience. Who was responsible for the outbreak of the revolt? Was it Philip who rode roughshod over local liberties and privileges, and insisted on Catholic conformity? Or was it the Netherlanders who placed their liberties and privileges and a compromise religious settlement above their allegiance to their ruler?

D From: Geoffrey Parker, 'What if . . . Philip II had gone to the Netherlands?', an article published in 2004. This historian blames Philip's absence and Alva's misguided policies for the outbreak of a second revolt in the Netherlands in 1572.

Philip wrote to Alva instructing him to delay his plan to round up all those identified for punishment before the King's arrival. He told him that a delay might lead William of Orange to feel secure and want to return to the Netherlands, and then Alva would be able to deal with him as he deserved. But Philip said 'If you punish the others first, it will make it impossible to deal with William forever'. Orange and other rebels who had fled as Alva approached were unlikely to have dared resist a direct summons from Philip in person to return to the Netherlands. Arresting or discrediting Orange would have removed the only opposition leader facing Philip II. Without the costs of defeating the 1568 invasion, Alva would not have needed to raise new taxes and the King's presence would have compelled the States-General to grant financial support. It was rare for a revolt to break out again after the personal intervention of a monarch. The second Netherlands revolt of 1572 was largely provoked by the misguided policies followed by the Duke of Alva. Philip's decision, in August 1567, not to travel to the Netherlands, forfeited his best chance of restoring order there and thus of preserving Spain's status as a Great Power.

Answer **either**

2 Assess how far Philip II's religious policy strengthened or weakened Spain. [45]

or

3 How far do you agree that the Battle of Lepanto (1571) was the **main** turning-point in Philip II's foreign policy? [45]

Candidates are reminded that they must refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations in developing the argument in their essay.

[Turn over

Elizabeth I

If answering on this Option, candidates **must** answer **Question 4** and **one** other question.

4 Study all the Passages.

Using these **four** Passages **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that Elizabeth's main method of controlling Parliament was to use her personality. [45]

A From: Geoffrey Elton, *The Tudor Constitution*, published in 1960. This historian argues that control of the House of Commons was mainly through councillors and the Speaker.

Tudor governments relied on managing the House once it was elected. It was a question of providing guidance, not domination. Elizabeth's councillors were active in the preparation of business and the guiding of the House, effectively comprising a government group in the Commons. The Council relied heavily on 'men of business' for getting its business done in the House. The Speaker was as a rule a Crown nominee who, as a result, felt obliged to the Crown and assisted in the management of the House. In the last resort it was possible to bring the monarch into play. Elizabeth used those 'rumours and messages' that so annoyed Peter Wentworth. Elizabeth never hid her frequent anger or contempt for the Commons' 'idle brains' and for mischief-making members.

B From: Alan Smith, *The Government of Elizabethan England*, published in 1967. This historian argues that Elizabeth I controlled Parliament using a range of methods of varying importance.

It was the Queen alone who had the right to summon, prorogue and dissolve Parliaments. The infrequency and shortness of the sessions suggest that for her they were necessary evils. From the government's point of view Parliament was essentially an assembly for granting taxes and passing laws, with the emphasis on the former function. Subsidy bills and other important government acts would, however, have passed less smoothly than they did if the government had not been conscious of the need for effective management of Parliament, especially the House of Commons. One of the Queen's greatest weapons in the management of Parliament was her personality. She sometimes intervened directly, taking action to halt matters which she disliked. The Queen was determined to preserve the rights of her prerogative. The Commons did not always submit readily to her commands, but the combination of tact and firmness which she regularly employed usually enabled her to get her way.

C From: Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, published in 1988. This historian argues that neither Elizabeth nor the MPs liked parliamentary sessions.

Elizabeth adopted a tone of condescending superiority towards her Parliaments, confident that if she explained things often enough and slowly enough, the little boys would understand. For Elizabeth, parliamentarians *were* little boys – sometimes unruly, usually a nuisance, and always a waste of an intelligent woman's time. Queen Elizabeth I did not like Parliaments, and it showed. The Queen's lack of enthusiasm was widely shared by MPs, and there was a marked reluctance to participate in the real work of the two Houses. Such ill-attended Parliaments are unlikely to have been occasions of dramatic constitutional conflict between Crown and Commons. Whatever was happening in Parliament, most MPs and most peers seem to have thought it was not worth turning up to join the fun. When Elizabeth met her Parliaments, she did not face a large number of rising gentry, calling for their parliamentary rights; at the end of a session, she faced only the unfortunate few who had nothing better to do.

D From: David Loades, *Power in Tudor England*, published in 1997. This historian argues that, although Elizabeth was in contact with her MPs, management was left to her councillors.

In normal circumstances the monarch attended Parliament only at the opening and closing of each session. Elizabeth received parliamentary delegations from time to time, an experience which the members involved often found distressing; groups who waited upon Elizabeth often left with their ears burning. Elizabeth might have harshly rebuked her Parliaments but she did not expect to have to manage them herself. This was a matter for the Council, or, more accurately, for particular councillors. The Commons could not be fully managed through personal contact with the Queen. What is clear is that by 1601 MPs felt perfectly entitled to hold, and promote, their own views about what constituted the good of the commonwealth.

Answer **either**

5 Assess the reasons why Elizabeth remained unmarried. [45]

or

6 How far was the Church of England influenced by Puritans during Elizabeth's reign? [45]

Candidates are reminded that they must refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations in developing the argument in their essay.

Oliver Cromwell

If answering on this Option, candidates **must** answer **Question 7** and **one** other question.

7 Study all the Passages.

Using these **four** Passages **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that Cromwell was a man of little significance before the outbreak of Civil War in 1642. [45]

A From: Christopher Hill, *God's Englishman*, published in 1970. This historian argues that Cromwell played a prominent part in parliament, 1640–42.

We should be wrong to think of Cromwell simply as the military leader on Parliament's side. He was that, of course, but he also played an important part as a political leader before, during and after the civil war. His political connections and loyalties had been formed long before Parliament met in November 1640. When it met he was at once assured of a prominent part in its deliberations – not in the very first rank, but far from the back benches. He moved the second reading of the bill for annual Parliaments. He took the lead in calling for reform of the Exchequer. He was on innumerable committees. Cromwell attracted considerable notice by his aggressive behaviour in defence of the poor commoners of Somersham. Oliver's contemporaries later liked to emphasize the contrast between the simple country gentleman, the back-bencher of 1640–42 and the uncrowned king of 1654–58. But we should not allow ourselves to be deceived as to his standing in the House before the Civil War.

B From: Antonia Fraser, *Cromwell Our Chief of Men*, published in 1973. This historian argues that by 1640 Cromwell was an established politician.

On 3 November 1640 the crucial gathering, known to history as the Long Parliament, met for the first time. Cromwell was now a man of forty-one, which put him at least in the older half of the members. By 1640 Cromwell already fell into the category of an established politician. He was among those two hundred or so members who had already sat in a previous Parliament. An immense number of the members were related to each other, and no faction more so than that of Pym, to which Cromwell already belonged. In 1640 Cromwell was in many ways a very typical member of this Parliament, with his educational record at university and the law courts, and his membership of a political clique based on family allegiance and geographical grouping.

C From: John Morrill, 'The making of Oliver Cromwell', an article published in 1990. This historian argues that Cromwell's status was precarious in the 1630s.

Cromwell was not, then, as he is often portrayed, the typical country squire: the secure, obscure gentleman who rose from solid respectability to govern England with all the experience and all the limitations of a godly magistrate. His economic and social standing was far more brittle than that implies. His reference to himself as being 'by birth a gentleman, living in neither any considerable height, nor yet in obscurity' takes on a tenser, more anxious meaning. His family connections looked more impressive than they were. Economic circumstances for much of his early manhood beckoned him to a farming career; and his political miscalculation in Huntingdon seems nearly to have led to this.

D From: Colin Davis, *Oliver Cromwell*, published in 2001. This historian argues that despite his social connections, Cromwell was of little political significance in the 1630s.

Cromwell's social standing in his mid-thirties was ambiguous but with every sign of deterioration. Potentially, he was well connected. His relations included John Hampden and Oliver St John, and he was linked to the circles of the Earl of Warwick and Viscount Saye and Sele. On the other hand, he was at best a member of the urban gentry in a small provincial town. In Huntingdon he had become embroiled in disputes over endowments and the remodelling of the town's charter. In both cases he had been humiliatingly defeated. In St Ives he held no office, was a tenant rather than a landlord, had few dependents and worked for a living. He looked downwardly mobile and the political and social networks on whose margins he existed appeared to be in long-term eclipse, excluded as they were from royal favour. In 1636 Cromwell moved to Ely. He became one of the more substantial members of Ely's urban community but it is worth reminding ourselves that this was still a small, provincial town.

Answer **either**

8 Assess the view that Cromwell was true to the parliamentary cause from 1649 to 1653. [45]

or

9 To what extent did the Cromwellian Protectorate become increasingly conservative? [45]

Candidates are reminded that they must refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations in developing the argument in their essay.

Peter the Great

If answering on this Option, candidates **must** answer **Question 10** and **one** other question.

10 Study all the Passages.

Using these **four** Passages **and** your own knowledge, assess the claim that Peter the Great's reforms did not improve the government of Russia. [45]

A From: D. Ogg, *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*, published in 1961. This historian argues that Peter's reforms were unplanned and had harmful effects, especially on the peasantry.

Peter the Great's reforms were not the result of co-ordinated policy. They were a series of hasty improvisations, sometimes defeating their own purpose, but resulting eventually in the creation of a powerful military state. The changes affected only a small part of the population, because they were mostly limited to the governing and administrative classes. Peter did little for the peasants who had to bear a very heavy share of taxation. They could not leave their landlords' service. Many of these serfs were originally free and some of them even had noble ancestors. Peasants lacked land and rights. Their conditions worsened because the state ceased to intervene between them and the landlords.

B From: G. Treasure, *The Making of Modern Europe*, *1648–1780*, published in 1993. This historian argues that the later years of Peter the Great's reign saw important reforms in government although Russia still lagged behind other European states.

The last ten years of his reign saw more effective and wide-ranging reforms in government, reflecting, as Sumner wrote in the 1960s, 'a broadening of Peter's outlook and a changing realisation of the functions of the state, of the meaning of good government, and of the importance of efficient institutions'. Most important of all, nine administrative colleges which were modelled on the practice of Sweden were founded in 1718. They were staffed largely by foreigners, or by specially trained Russians. In 1716 Peter sent forty civil servants to Berlin to learn German. There was a rational division of work, with each college being responsible for a certain activity, for example the army or commerce, throughout Russia. It was still far removed from the methodical routines of a Scandinavian or German state, but Peter had taken steps in that direction.

C From: L. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, published in 2000. This historian claims that Peter's reforms did not increase efficiency in Russia and that crime was a serious and widespread problem.

It is evident that Peter failed to establish a well-regulated state which would function efficiently with the minimum of intervention from its ruler. We have to agree with Peterson's conclusion in 1979 that 'instead of Peter creating a rational and efficient administration, reforms in the provinces led to an even greater disorder in the Russian administration'. Order only existed in the Tsar's immediate surroundings. In provincial towns, the strong continued to exploit the weak without any fear. There was extensive robbery and pillaging. In 1710 landlords complained that bands of armed robbers were burning their houses, killing their peasants, carrying off their women, and stealing horses and food. A man reported that even the centre of Moscow was unsafe because of robbers. Recent studies speak of organised crime and a 'Mafia'. Russia's problem was not so much excessive government as under-government and the lack of law.

D From: D. J. Sturdy, *Fractured Europe 1600–1721*, published in 2002. This historian believes that Peter's reforms were well planned and enjoyed wide support.

Peter continued to introduce astonishing reforms throughout his reign. As an autocrat, he alone created law and decided policy, but to make sure that they were carried out, he replaced many of the existing administrative procedures with new ones. At the centre, he created a small executive council, the Senate, through which he ruled. He adopted Swedish models in administration. Russia was divided into provinces which were subdivided into counties. These were the basic units in which taxes were collected. He ordered a census which was driven through despite much popular resistance. Town government and administration were brought under central control. Justice was reorganised. Courts were established in the provinces, subject to a central College of Justice. The state could be compared with a well-organised and efficiently run machine whose purpose was to organise the human and material resources of Russia, so that the country could overcome any challenges that it met. Peter inspired others with his vision. Many leading aristocratic families and members of the service nobility shared his political ideas. So did bureaucrats who served in offices in central and provincial administration.

Answer **either**

11 To what extent was Russia 'westernised' at the time of Peter the Great's accession in 1696? [45]

or

12 Assess the extent to which Peter the Great reformed the Russian Church. [45]

Candidates are reminded that they must refer to and evaluate relevant interpretations in developing the argument in their essay.

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE