

Mark Schemes for the Units

June 2008

3835/7835/MS/R/08

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
AS/A2 HISTORY SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS	1
2580 Document Studies 871 – 1099	22
2581 Document Studies 1450 – 1693	28
2582 Document Studies 1774 – 1945	38
2583 English History 1042 – 1660	53
2584 English History 1780 – 1964	93
2585 European History 1046 – 1718	117
2586 European and World History 1789 – 1989	165
2587 Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	205
2588 Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	211
2589 Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	223
2590 Themes in History 1066 – 1796	244
2591 Themes in History 1763 – 1996	277
2592 & 2593 Independent Investigation	308
Grade Thresholds	318

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 marks 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.

GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2580-2582

AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

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

the 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 in content]

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

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

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

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

Question (b)
BAND/40: Context

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

V (11-16) The response provides little comment on the context of the key issue. There is some evidence of knowledge of the key issue, but the relevance is implicit with a limited attempt to analyse the Sources. The argument lacks a coherent structure. The writing

shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some frequent errors.

*[There is likely to be a clear imbalance here between Sources and own knowledge. Although there will be little comment on the context of the key issue there will be **some**, just as there will be some awareness and evidence of the key issue. Sources will largely be used for reference and illustration of an argument (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.
- 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****Unit 2580 Document Studies 871-1099****The Reign of Alfred the Great 871-899****1(a) Study Sources A and C.****Compare these Sources as evidence for the impact of the Viking invasions on England.****[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 highlight dimensions of the threat. The dates are significant, marking out the low point towards the end of the first phase of attacks (871-8) and the start of the second phase (892-6). The threat is seen as far greater in Source **A**. In **A** there is retreat (to Athelney) with loyalists and a strong sense of desperation ('great distress') while in **C** the Viking army presents a new threat to Prince Edward, Ealdorman Aethelred and others. In **C** the Anglo-Saxon forces fight back, while in **A** there is but the suggestion of a fightback (though such did occur, culminating in Edington). In both Sources the Viking threat is strong, severe and wide ranging; the fact that it is so in **C** is of note. In Source **A** much of Wessex is under Viking control, areas have submitted, Alfred is forced to live off the land. In Source **C** Viking forces devastate areas under Alfred's control; there is savagery; there is support from Danish settlers in East Anglia and the North-East. **C** does suggest more resilience in the face of such attacks. Source **A** comes from Alfred's biographer, possibly over-dramatising events but reliable enough while Source **C**, written much later, can reflect upon what had passed into received historical accounts. Language, tone and content can be commented upon. The Sources are reliable and useful to analysis and understanding.

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

1(b) Study all the Sources.

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred's success from 878 in resisting the Viking invasions has been over-estimated. [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, 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 Sources focus upon Viking activity and responses from Alfred and his forces. Source **A** comes at the height of the seminal crisis of the reign, culminating in the heroic fightback and defeat of the Guthrum-led forces. Survival is the goal. Sources **B** and **C** focus upon 892-3, after the military reforms outlined in Source **D**, and show Viking attacks and responses on land and at sea. The Viking threat remained formidable as shown by the references to their allies in East Anglia and Northumbria. Source **D** points up the reforms that were a basis to the responses in 892-6 but also shows problems ('revealed weaknesses'). Sources **B** and **C** point to the power and danger of Haesten and his forces, still able to range far and wide, attacking the frontiers of Wessex and raiding inside on occasion. Source **D** outlines the key features of the military reforms tested out in Sources **B** and **C**, and makes the comment that the arrangement of the army had 'revealed weaknesses'. Clearly, those were overcome in 892-6, though **B** and **C** do suggest Viking successes and raise some doubts as to the full effectiveness of the military (and indeed naval) reforms. Own knowledge can support the above and aid evaluation – the contrasts of 871-8 (many defeats and much of Wessex occupied) and 893-6 (more Alfredian successes and Wessex much more secure); the nature of the reforms of the 880s (*burhs*, *fyrð*, navy); Alfred's leadership; his development of alliances with Mercia (Aethelred) and Welsh chiefs. The exact success of the reforms of the 880s in the context of the Viking attacks of 892-6 can be assessed. It is certainly possible to question the effectiveness of the navy and there were geographical limits to Alfred's successes. Viking settlements were developing (the future Danelaw areas). Links here can be made to Source **C** and some of Source **D**. Knowledge of the severe crisis evident in 878 (and resolved then) can be used to test Source **A** while Sources **B** and **C** can be tested by knowledge of the unevenness of fighting in those years. The contemporary sources are all Alfredian so that over-estimation is to be expected, although the historian in **D** is also largely appreciative of Alfred's success.

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

The Normans in England 1066-1087**2(a) Study Sources B and C.****Compare these Sources as evidence for William I's relationship with the Papacy. [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 focus upon issues of William's relations with Rome, his power and authority and the views of Pope Gregory VII. In Source **B** William will not allow contacts with Rome without royal approval while in **C** the emphasis is more upon Papal concerns over some of William's actions, with a desire that Lanfranc mediate. **B** stresses royal control and command while **C** points up the Pope's worries over the consequences of this and suggests a desire for harmony but also, perhaps, acknowledgement of Papal authority. Source **B** is typical of William's attitude towards his authority while **C** is typical of the ambitions and indeed goals of the Pope. The tone of **B** is laudatory overall, emphasising a strong King, while that of **C** is more critical, though cautionary and hopeful ('some swollen pride', 'careful explanation', 'counsel him'). Although **B** was composed some time after William I's death, it reflects well the sense of achievements and power exerted while **C** has Papal pretensions. Both are reliable and useful here.

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 the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that William I's policies towards the Church were driven more by a desire for control than a genuine desire for reform. [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, 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** and part of **D** point to the desire for control. Sources **A** and **D** link William as an enthusiastic reformer and in his support of the work of Lanfranc to further reforms in the English Church. Own knowledge can support examples of Lanfranc's activities as of William's broad concerns with and support for reform. In **A** William promotes devout and zealous clerics; he consults. In **D** Lanfranc acts to improve the status and learning of the Church. **D** can be linked to Sources **B** and especially **C** in respect of the reference to relations with Rome. Sources **B** and **C** focus upon those relations and some of the issues involved. In Source **D** as elsewhere there is a sense of William's control and power over the church and so of its service to him. Source **B** also reflects William's control over the church and desire to be obeyed. Source **B** talks of 'new practices', in essence controlling measures, while Source **A** praises the King's zeal for reform. Source **D** sees a distinction between 'internal order of the Church' and 'ecclesiastical politics', with the King to the fore in the latter. Own knowledge can support the above and develop evaluation: Lanfranc's reforms (councils, movement of sees, improved monastic constitutions, furtherance of Latin, contacts with Europe); William's support (including the separation of secular and ecclesiastical courts); the role of churchmen in the political and military arenas; the unsuccessful attempts of Gregory VII to assert control over William in the years 1079-81. Lanfranc's position and power as Archbishop, his close relationship with William I, papal support for William in 1066 and immediately after; the introduction of Norman-French continental practices and indeed reforms, more so from the 1070's; the changes in attitude once Gregory VII became Pope and his apparent decision, ultimately, to avoid major confrontation with William I – all could be used. Links to Sources **B** and **C** can be made. William supported reforms in his close alliance with Lanfranc but refused to acknowledge Gregorian demands for fealty. Lanfranc pursued reforms, advanced new bishops and abbots, reconfigured Cathedrals and chapters, using Norman models, developed canon law and church courts, was ambivalent towards English customs and saints, perhaps encouraged Norman spoliation, encouraged liturgical practices and endowments and new foundations. Source **D** can be used here in conjunction with such knowledge while Source **A**, though featuring William I, has relevance to the work of Lanfranc also. The contemporary sources are ecclesiastical, one hostile (the Pope in **C**), one a balanced comment from an Anglo-Norman monk, and the third well-placed at Canterbury who is diplomatically non-committal but morally capable of concise judgment.

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

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

Compare these Sources as evidence for the solutions adopted by the Crusaders to overcome the problems encountered in capturing towns.

[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 feature methods and raise problems. In Source **A** military factors are important: siege methods; Byzantine factors. In Source **B** again military needs are prominent with siege techniques mentioned but also issues of food supply and consequent shortages. Both have much to say about the military arenas and the needs of sound siege techniques, courage and tenacity. Source **A** does mention the erratic nature of Byzantine support and is rather typical of crusader complaints and perceptions of that area while Source **B** focuses upon food and the logistical problems encountered. Comment on the tone of both, especially **A** (its critical stance towards the Byzantine Emperor), would be helpful. Both Sources, in their language, are typical of the pride evinced in crusader courage, military skills and determination, linked to religious zeal. Both Sources see the enemy as fierce opponents, a military problem, but **A** dwells on the problems created by the Byzantines while **B** focuses on food shortage and hardships. Both are typical and reliable being by the same author from the same book with only a year separating the sieges described.

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 the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the success of the First Crusade depended primarily upon the military skills of the crusaders. [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, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Sources **A** and **B** focus upon military skills, with some support from Source **D**. Fighting, tactics, sieges, courage, military leadership are all featured. Source **A** points up the weakness of Byzantine help (or lack of), a point that can be supported from own knowledge. Sources **C** and **D** feature non-military factors, embracing religious fervour and the strong sense of religious mission (especially in **C**) and the effects of the serious Muslim divisions in **D**. The latter Source also points up crusader military prowess. Sources **A**, **B** and areas of **D** point to strategic and tactical aspects while **C** brings out religious dimensions ('holy wars', 'vow', 'fired with eagerness') and **D** mentions how 'crude' methods were aided by 'hopelessly divided' and 'internal squabbling' Muslim forces. Own knowledge supports the above: Sources **A**, **B** and **C** can be linked to military factors and leadership (Bohemond, Raymond, Godfrey and others); the ability to adapt tactics (as in Source **D**), make good use of cavalry and bowmen, work off Muslim errors; the input of knights and ordinary soldiers; the effects of religious fervour (famously seen in the incident of the Holy Lance and the procession around Jerusalem); the logistics of the Crusade as a whole; the military errors of the Muslims and the effects of their serious divisions (Aleppo, Damascus, Turks and Egyptians, Sunni and Shi'ite, etc) linked to Source **D** here. Examples of success at Doryleum, Antioch and Jerusalem as well as in other battles and sieges could be adduced. Evaluation will be achieved by these links of Sources to knowledge and vice-versa. Two sources from a contemporary knight might be expected to focus on military skills whilst a contemporary history is likely to adopt a religious framework. The modern historians are balanced, perhaps more aware of Muslim division and the context of changing military tactics, to be expected from a military encyclopaedia.

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 1450-1485

The Development of conflict 1456-1461

1(a) Study Sources A and B.

Compare these Sources as evidence for the ambitions of Richard, Duke of York, in 1460.

[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 tell us that York claimed the crown. The differences lie chiefly in the tone and purpose of the two Sources. Source **A** is descriptive and largely factual. It gives a summary of the Accord of 1460, which is not mentioned by Source **B**. We are told that its author was well informed. He makes no direct comment on York's behaviour, though there is implicit comment in the remarks that Henry was moved 'against his will' and York behaved 'as if he were king'. Source **B**, however, is almost entirely a comment. This is not surprising, considering its provenance (Margaret) and its purpose (to rally support against the Yorkists). Thus it uses words such as 'extreme malice', 'falsely', 'cruelty', to describe York's actions. Thus Source **A** may be regarded as good evidence for what York actually did, though it tells us nothing about his motives, beyond his "rights", while Source **B** is evidence not so much for York's conduct as for Margaret's view of him. Evidence from before 1456, if relevant, may be credited but is not a requirement.

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

1(b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the development of conflict from 1456 to 1461 was mainly the consequence of Margaret of Anjou's influence over Henry VI. [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, 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 C clearly supports this view, openly attacking the very idea of a woman governing the country. This is, however, a Yorkist view in the form of a propaganda ballad. Nevertheless **Source D**, by a modern historian, confirms the idea that because she was a woman in a dominant position, this was a difficulty both for her and for the Lancastrian party. Indeed, it argues that, although she had become the 'focal point' of the court party in 1456, she tried to fulfil the role of peace-maker rather than party leader. Had she been able to sustain this role, her influence over Henry VI could have led to the reduction rather than the development of conflict. **Sources A and B** not only confirm **Source D**'s statement that after 1458 Margaret became a determined enemy of York, providing the leadership which led to York's defeat and death at Wakefield, but also suggest her motive: York's claim to the crown (**both Sources**) and the consequent threat to her son's succession (**Source B**). Although the language of **Source B** is clearly emotive its view of events is confirmed by the more objective and 'well-informed' **Source A**. These sources thus suggest an alternative explanation for the development of conflict, i.e. York's ambition, which forced Margaret, 'perhaps reluctantly' (**Source D**), to appeal to her supporters to take up arms in defence of the Lancastrian succession. A further explanation, which perhaps underlies both Margaret's and York's actions, is Henry's incapacity as king – referred to in **Source C** ('a king unwise and innocent'). Own knowledge of events such as the Loveday of 1458 and the Coventry Parliament of 1459 can be used to fill out this analysis.

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 A and B.**

Compare Sources A and B as evidence for the reasons for Luther's reaction to Tetzel and his sale of indulgences. [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. Points of difference include the support for Tetzel and indulgences in Source **A** with a striking contrast in Source **B**, which condemns Tetzel and indulgences. **A** argues that Luther's main reason for acting is envy of Tetzel and his own sense of "safety" whilst **B** stresses Tetzel's corruption, improper preaching and Luther's theological conviction. Luther is viewed differently in Source **A**, a hostile description, and in Source **B**, where Luther is judged to have been provoked. Cochlaeus is identified as a leading German Catholic whilst Melanchthon is described as Luther's close friend and leader of the German Reformation. However, both had lived through the events that they described (candidates are not expected to know that Melanchthon's link with Luther began soon after 1517) and the dates are similar. (Although they were published in 1549 and 1546 respectively, both are primary sources since both represent the views of men who had lived through the events that they describe.) The writers are using hindsight and their views might have been affected by later developments. They are typical of their respective views, Source **A** of orthodox Catholics and Source **B** of Lutheran supporters.

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 more responsible than the religious authorities for their quarrel in 1517-18.

[40]

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

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

Sources **A** and **D** support the claim in the question whilst Sources **B** and **C** contradict it. Source **A** points to Luther's envy of Tetzal and to his preference for his own judgment and the protection of a German prince rather than obedience to the Pope and Church authorities. Leo X is said to have followed precedents in issuing indulgences to pay for a worthy cause. In Source **D**, the Pope condemns Luther in extreme terms but it also shows that a German prince was possibly involved in protecting Luther. Source **B** is extremely critical of Tetzal but it does not directly criticise other religious authorities, except that Tetzal is said in Source **A** (and from candidates' own knowledge) to have acted on the authority of the Pope. Source **C** is largely anecdotal but refers to one example of Tetzal's misleading of the German people. It also mentions the Inquisition. This can be cross-referenced with the Inquisition in Source **A** although the interpretation of its influence is different. One can expect the most successful answers to group the sources. There might be particular explanation of the 95 Theses. What did they say? What was Luther's intention in publishing them? Feeling in Germany against the foreign influence of Rome can be discussed. A characteristic of the most successful answers is that they might include own knowledge that would mitigate the responsibility of the religious authorities. For example, the religious authorities were not responsible for the political divisions and princely power in Germany that helped to foster a feeling of unrest. Candidates should note that the question ends in 1517-18; it concerns the outbreak of the quarrel between Luther and the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. Conclusions might use knowledge of later developments which can be credited if used relevantly but this is not a requirement.

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 C.****Compare these sources as evidence for attempts to encourage religious unity [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 contemporary and delivered by the Supreme Head of the Church himself/herself (uncomfortable as Mary was with this title, she still retained it in August 1553); both acknowledge the existence of religious division prompted by the Reformation ('old views' and 'new opinions' in Source **A**, 'papist and heretic' in Source **C**), appeal for peace and unity, and threaten to punish those who stir up divisions. Beyond that, there are significant differences in target and context. Source **A** blames the preaching clergymen for promoting religious discord rather than peace. Source **C** does not mention the clergy by name but seems to be addressing the laity and clergy, and later identifies printers as troublemakers. Source **A** also expects the preaching clergy to fall into line with his instructions, while Source **C** concedes that a significant number of the Queen's subjects do not share her religion, promises not to persecute them for the time being, and explicitly demands only outward conformity. In other words, Source **C** acknowledges that religious divisions run deep (after the short but intense imposition of Protestantism under Edward VI) in a way that Source **A** clearly does not. Both seek to persuade and both threaten force should persuasion fail.

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 no ruler between 1540 and 1558 was successful in imposing their religious views. [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, 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.

‘Ruler’ can be taken to mean not just monarchs but, for Edward VI’s reign, Somerset and Northumberland as well. Sources **A**, **B** and **C** contain evidence to support the proposition: Henry VIII in Source **A** has unwittingly unleashed pulpit wars which he is trying to muzzle and has to resort to threats; in Source **B** people have evidently stayed away from church since the introduction of the First Book of Common Prayer, and again absentees (and dissenters from the Second Book of Common Prayer) are threatened with sanctions. Mary’s proclamation in Source **C** expresses the delicate religious situation that she has inherited, and urges outward peace and conformity, and once again warns that stirrers will be punished, and also tries to impose censorship on religious publications. Yet candidates may argue that Source **D** either supports or opposes this view, and that other evidence points to broad outward conformity to the various changes of religious policy in 1540-58. Candidates can be expected to draw on a wide body of other evidence to evaluate these rival positions, looking at the acceptance of, say, the suppression of the Chantries, the destruction of altars and images under Edward, and their reconstitution under Mary. Haigh’s distinction in Source **D** between ‘success’ and ‘total success’ can be usefully analysed: indeed it is hard to think of any regime in early modern England imposing their views with ‘total success’. But some candidates may argue that attempts became increasingly difficult once Protestantism was officially encouraged in Edward VI’s reign, and that Marian England was more religiously polarised and thus harder to regulate than late Henrician England.

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 B and C.****Compare these sources as evidence for the content and purpose of the Grand Remonstrance.****[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 **B** is a fairly partisan account written years after the event, while Source **C** is a contemporary source written by an eye-witness, and more neutral in tone. The Sources agree that the Remonstrance addressed the issue of counsel, and both see a connection with the Irish Rebellion, although **B** sees this as the immediate context for framing the Remonstrance, while Source **C** mentions it merely as a reason not to cause greater divisions at home by passing the Remonstrance. In other and more crucial respects they differ: Source **B** incorrectly talks of 'Parliament' rather than the House of Commons, sees it speaking with one voice, and acting fairly tactfully ('spared him as much as truth would allow'), while Source **C** reveals very deep divisions among MPs, reflected in the close voting figures, and the view of Hyde and others that it was an appeal to the people (the Remonstrance was of course presented to the King, but the fact that it was printed supports this allegation), and presented without the consent of the Lords (since that consent would have been withheld). Moreover, they disliked its 'many harsh expressions' which crosses Hutchinson's claim about its restraint. On the other hand, according to **C**, Pym and others refuted 'most' of these objections – so there is internal disagreement about its purpose. Source **B** sees 'Parliament' acting defensively; while Source **C**, in the view of Hyde, sees MPs such as Pym acting aggressively ('there was no precedent...').

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

4(b) Study all the sources.

Using all the sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that it was the King, not his opponents in Parliament, who provoked division and conflict in 1640-2. [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, 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.

‘Conflict’ here can be taken to mean political strife as well as its removal in the autumn of 1642 to military engagement and Civil War. The case for the King’s responsibility is set out in Sources **B** and **D**. In the first, his blocking of relief for Ireland pushed ‘Parliament’ into compiling the Grand Remonstrance, which, despite its carefully crafted language, angered the King. Source **D** lists a number of provocative actions by Charles, some of which candidates can be expected to unpack; but Source **D** also adds the crucial qualifier that in ‘all’ these cases Charles was responding to provocative actions by his opponents, a judgement that candidates may or not wish to challenge. Source **C**, from the perspective of Hyde and his allies, is a good example of provocation by his opponents: an unprecedented condemnation of royal government and an inflammatory appeal to the people. So candidates may well conclude that ‘it was a bit of both’ and that it takes two to tango, or rather fight. But Source **A** reminds us of the power of ideological issues – in this issue, religion – to create division and conflict. Clearly divisions were opening up not just as a result of actions by individuals but over disagreements on the future of the Church and its implications for the State (Source **A**) but also the involvement of Petitioners and ordinary people in parliamentary business (Sources **A** and **C**), Parliament’s role (or not) in the appointment of councillors (Source **C**) and so on.

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 B and D.**

Compare sources B and D as evidence for the nature of the advice given to Louis XIV by his ministers. [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 a clear contrast. Source **D** is extremely critical of the way in which Louis' ministers act. Their advice is distorted by their adulation of the King. Candidates can also use the references to the King because the last sentence shows that the writer holds the King indirectly responsible for the ways in which his ministers have acted and given their advice. . He has misused his responsibility, appointing unsuitable men. Source **B** shows a deferential minister but one who is willing to give Louis XIV an honest report. Colbert is not directly critical of the King but his report goes well beyond the flattering accounts that might have been expected. It was true that the King was often preoccupied by war and Colbert draws attention to the importance of finance. 'Important decisions must be made' is ominous advice. Source **B** is from the writings of an important minister; the candidates should know of Colbert. It was written when Louis XIV was reaching the height of his reputation. Candidates might not have heard of Fénelon but the introduction gives sufficient guidance. Candidates might note the difference in times of writing. Source **D** was written later than Source **B**. Candidates should be given credit if they point out that Colbert was dead by the time that Source **D** was written but this is not a necessary point for the highest mark. France's problems had increased and the quality of ministers had declined by the time that Fénelon was writing. Source **B** might be seen as a typical memo from a minister to Louis XIV but it does contain some implied and perhaps unexpected criticism; it is not mere flattery. Source **D** represented the view of a few who were willing to criticise Louis openly although there was more frequent criticism of ministers themselves.

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

5(b) Study all these sources.

Using all these sources and your own knowledge, assess the claim that, in domestic affairs from 1661 to 1693, Louis XIV depended entirely on his ministers. [40]

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

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

The Sources might be seen as falling into two groups. One can expect the most successful answers to group the Sources. The sequential discussion of Sources is not the best approach in answers to Question (b) in this Unit unless it coincides with 'grouping'. In this case, the sequence **A - D** might be the best approach but examiners should be open to alternative explanations. Sources **A** and **B** support the case for the importance of ministers to Louis XIV. Source **A** focuses on the link between Colbert and the propaganda that supported the King's *gloire*. This was an important element of the King's rule and contemporaries regarded it as evidence of Louis' success as a ruler. Source **B** pictures a hard-working and realistic minister who is willing to give a frank assessment to Louis XIV. There is a contrast in the importance that King and minister give to finance. The minister's responsibilities were very wide. Colbert's work in finance and the economy covered some of the most important aspects of government. On the other hand, Source **C** diminishes the work of ministers. Compared with the King, they occupy a minor role in affairs. La Bruyère's views might be seen to reflect the opinions of Louis about his relationship with his ministers. Source **D** also disagrees with the claim but from a different angle. Fénelon is critical of the ministers but he is also sharply critical of Louis XIV. Some candidates might spend more time explaining Louis' attitude to his ministers, especially after his assumption of full power in 1661. They might examine the change that happened after Colbert's death in 1683; none of his successors was as effective. There was also rivalry between ministers, for example between Colbert and Louvois. A valid alternative argument would be that Louis XIV did not owe his success in governing France mostly to his ministers but that it was a personal achievement. Louis XIV was very diligent in attending to business. He made policy and kept his ministers, including Colbert, within limits. Alternative cases can be made but candidates will still need to include a consideration of his ministers in their answers. It is important that examiners and candidates note that the Study Topic and the question end in 1693. Knowledge and understanding of the later years of Louis's reign are not required for any mark.

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 1774-92

1(a) Study Sources A and C.

Compare these Sources as evidence for Marie Antoinette's qualities as Queen of France.

[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 speaks of complaints about extravagance. **C** remembers affection – 10,000 swords of men of honour ready to protect her. The debts of **A** have no mention in **C**. The purchase of diamonds in **A** only serve in **C** to make her glitter even more, like the morning star. **C** sees criticisms as part of the modern era but **A** suggests they were present before the revolution and 'economists and cynics', referred to by Burke were making 'complaints and criticisms'. There is no mention of the losses caused to her courtiers (**A**) in **C** where the vision is rose-tinted 'life and splendour and joy'.

Similarities

The people were pleased that she had the Trianon in **A** and this accords with the implied popularity, with the Queen representing the glory of Europe in **C**.

Provenance

The unfavourable view comes from an aristocrat; the highly favourable view from a conservative commoner. The key is in the dates. The Austrians needed a stable France as an ally; the Queen's behaviour is disapproved of as likely to make her unpopular and with her the links with Austria. The source is likely to be candid; the Count is certainly not flattering to gain favour. For Burke the mindless young woman has been transmuted into a symbol of a lost world now that France seems to have turned against its monarchy, particularly after the events of October and the creation of a limited and somewhat imperilled monarchy living in the centre of Paris at the mercy of the mobs. So 'the age of chivalry' has gone; but **A**'s more realistic view of that age is less flattering to the Queen. There are clear points to make about bias and reliability here. Mercy knew the Queen well and was writing to someone who would have been well aware of possible foibles; Burke knew her only as a public figure. The purpose of the two sources is very different, too.

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

1(b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge assess the view that the problems faced by the French government between 1774 and 1788 stemmed mainly from the weaknesses of the King and Queen.

[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, 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 Louis was the prisoner of circumstances and how far his own limited abilities and the unpopularity of his Queen brought about the situation that led to revolution. The strongest defence is in **Source D** which indicated a deep-rooted financial deficit and a decline in the basic support for absolute monarchy. Though his decisions made the problems worse, there was little he could have done about the deeper causes. **Source B** would seem to support the claim in **Source D** that the decision to go to war with Britain over America was nevertheless significant and for more than merely financial reasons. This led to greater political awareness. But extravagance is a major theme here and in another foreign ambassador's report in **Source A**. Candidates may evaluate these sources in the light of their both being outsiders and dependent on limited sources of information. The longer term financial problems were all very well, but the immediate royal extravagance was a potent emotional issue, and not just, as Burke says in **Source C**, after the revolution. This source carries a lot of emotional ballast because Burke has knowledge of some of the extreme manifestations of popular unrest and the humiliation of the monarchy, so may be looking back romantically. The increased awareness of financial problems could be explained using own knowledge of Necker, Calonne, the decision to call the Assembly of Notables. The argument could be made that the King did his best to resolve the problems, or that his failure to give vital support to ministers showed that he was to blame. His own limited understanding and the over spending of the Queen may be seen as important symbols of the inability of the monarchy to cope with problems or may be seen as relatively insignificant in the longer term social, economic and intellectual developments which destroyed Burke's supposed 'age of chivalry'. Further knowledge of the Queen's supposed indiscretions may be helpful, but not at excessive length. The question is a wider one.

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

The Condition of England 1832-1853**2(a) Study Sources B and C.**

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes towards Public Health and the dangers of an outbreak of disease in 1849. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

There is a considerable difference in approach between these two sources. The context is important here. The 1848 Act did not cover London because of the power of the water and sewer companies like the one mentioned in **B**. 1849 also saw another huge cholera epidemic. The only recourse for the poor in **B** is to write to the Times, vaguely hoping it can champion their cause and protect them. The spur is clearly the cholera. This too is the motive in **C**, or is at least the means by which Welsby, clearly a sanitary reformer, is rousing his fellow ratepayers by playing on prejudiced fears of Irish lodging houses and Liverpool overflow. However, in contrast to **B**, whose semi literate tone is obvious, **C** knows exactly how to use the new Act. Already the Poor Law Union has a Sanitary Committee where activists like Welsby, wealthy and educated, move quickly to get the required number of signatures to back their petition. The object is clear – sewerage and a proper water supply, although better candidates might note that the 54 Londoners, probably poor, also realise what is necessary – privies, bins, water, drains and sewers. Although they cannot address themselves to the new General Board of Health they are published by the Times, no doubt to make a point about companies such as that of Soho Square.

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 dislike of Chadwick's methods and policy were the main reason for the slow progress of public health reform during the period from 1832 to 1853. [40]

Focus:

Sources **A** and especially **D** would suggest that Chadwick's bullying was the main reason for foot dragging on the issue of Public Health. Source **D**'s provenance is of note here. One might expect a Journal for Engineer and Officials to be pro Chadwick given that his prescriptions would employ thousands. Better candidates might spot the comment in the introduction to **C** that Chadwick favoured only certain types of engineer. The profession in general might feel excluded. **D**'s evidence is also based on exaggeration, deliberately so, yet own knowledge might cite further evidence of such an approach by Chadwick (his Sanitary Report, his poor-law reputation, his actions as Commissioner and the insistence on the correctness of his solutions). Sources **A** and **D** also reveal much about those solutions (glazed pipes, soap, water and new cemeteries) and of his determination to centralise within a profoundly local society that distrusted centralisation as despotically foreign. This was seen as an erosion of liberty, a fact eagerly pounced on by vested interests. Guy in **A** is seeking to promote and explain why centralisation was necessary, not especially successfully (he acknowledges the unpopularity of centralisation yet manages to insult inept local authorities whilst admitting higher costs and centrally appointed officials). Its very contradiction suggests the reliability of its evidence. Source **C** also betrays a Chadwickism approach, albeit a clear one that knows how to manipulate the Ormskirk ratepayers (there is a pride taken that 'unlike elsewhere' the 1848 Act is welcome – presumably because of the efficiency of Mr Welsby). **Yet** from these 3 sources one might well conclude that **other factors** could have been of more importance, the nature of **D** suggesting Chadwick was merely the scapegoat for more important delaying factors. The power of vested interest is very obvious in Source **B** where the Soho Company ignore the state of their own facilities. The 'rich and great' simply ignore the overcrowded poor and buy their way out of the problem. There is no reason to doubt the evidence of '**B**' and candidates could cite other examples where vested interests watered down health schemes, parliamentary proposals and the 1848 Act (permissive). Large cities would find the financial cost of water and sewerage a heavy one. Ratepayers would object, as Source **C** unwittingly informs us – 'unlike elsewhere'. Source **A** also refers to the need to 'authorise the higher cost'. As a Public Health reformer Guy admits to this at a time when Laissez Faire dictated a reduction of costs both locally and centrally. Candidates could also point to periods when epidemic disease lessened, to disagreements over the causes of disease, to government indifference and to the inadequacies of contractors, local authorities, and engineering (touched on by Source **A**). Three of the sources are pro Public Health Reform yet all freely admit the obstacles.

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 D.****Compare these Sources as evidence for Cavour's aims.****[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.

Some candidates may place greater emphasis on the similarities or the differences depending on their interpretation of the content of the sources. The sources appear to differ on more points than they agree. In both Cavour stresses the importance of gaining foreign support even if he is less specific about this in Source B than in Source D. The key point of difference is the scope or scale of the Italy envisaged by Cavour. In Source B he talks of Italy in loose terms but with the implication that he means the whole of the peninsula whereas in Source D his ambition is clearly limited to the formation of four states. The political arrangements he envisages are also different. In Source B he indicates a preference for the parliamentary government in place in Piedmont to be the model for the new Italy but in Source D he explicitly refers to a confederation. Also, his attitude to Austria is only mentioned in Source D where he expressly emphasises the need to eject her from Italy in a war of independence yet in Source B he does not reveal his views on Austria.

Comments on the provenance of the sources might sensibly focus on the timing of Cavour's remarks and the audiences to whom they were addressed. In his speech to the Parliament he is at pains to win their support which explains why his ambitions for the future shape of Italy are not made explicit hoping to attract politicians who held varying opinions on the issue including those mostly concerned with Piedmontese interests as well as Italian nationalists. It might also be argued that in 1855 Cavour was not prepared to commit himself to a particular vision of the future as he was as yet unsure of the foreign support he believed essential. The experience of 1848-9 might be mentioned to explain Cavour's belief that foreign help was needed. By contrast, in 1858 he had earned the respect of England and France due to the Crimean War and Orsini's bomb plot had prompted a firmer French commitment. Having agreed terms with Napoleon it is hardly surprising that his views on the future are more definite. Further, the terms make it clear that some compromise on the shape of the new Italy was necessary to secure French help. In addition, Cavour clearly wanted to win the approval of his king which the terms agreed at Plombieres would likely please.

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 Italian unification was dependent on the leadership of Piedmont. [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, 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 sources might be interpreted in more than one way. On balance, **Sources A** and **B** are more likely to be seen as supportive of the view whereas **Sources C** and **D** might be used to counter the view expressed in the question. As a result some candidates are likely to treat the sources in alphabetical order. Those that do this and show no linkage between **A** and **B**, on the one hand, and **C** and **D**, on the other hand, may be judged to be sequential answers but those that indicate awareness of the pairings should not be penalised as sequential. As the comments below indicate there is scope for a variety of structures to answer this question.

If anything, **Source B** seems to be the clearest in stating the importance of Piedmont to the national cause. Firstly, Cavour highlights the contribution Piedmont has already made by the implementation of parliamentary government. Here, candidates could refer to the Statuto. Candidates could comment further on the modernisation of Piedmont since 1848 by tapping into the reference to 'the last seven years'. Secondly, Cavour argues it was important for Piedmont to take the lead by engaging in Eastern Europe in anticipation of gaining foreign support for the Italian cause. There is scope here to refer to the Crimean War and the political implications of Piedmontese intervention. His language implies that he sees the Piedmontese as Italians whose duty was to Italy rather than Piedmont. **Source A** identifies Piedmont as the state to lead the Italian cause in the light of the failure of Rome (the Papacy) which might be explained by referring to events in 1848-49 (the Allocution, the restoration of the Pope following the defeat of the Roman Republic). The author is clear that war is the way to a united Italy and only Piedmont can provide the force required: again, Piedmont's record in the war against Austria in 1848-49 would be relevant. However, certain caveats are listed not least that the Piedmontese monarchy would have to adapt to the liberal politics of the age and to broaden its horizons beyond the limited interests of Piedmont itself. Some knowledge of Victor Emmanuel's politics might be appropriate here. However, some candidates may suggest that the author is prepared to concede that Piedmontese hegemony may be the price to pay for Italian unity. Nonetheless, the final sentence implies that Italian unity was not necessarily dependent on Piedmontese leadership. Rather, whilst both Piedmont and Italy would gain from Piedmont taking the lead the author implies the inevitability of unity from which Piedmont will lose if she does not provide the leadership.

To some extent this notion is the theme of **Source C**. Mazzini accepts that help from Piedmont would be welcome recognising that its forces would be useful in the military struggle he foresees with Austria, Naples and the Papacy. At this point candidates might sensibly explain Mazzini's belief that Italians should free themselves without foreign support: that 'Italia fara de se' was a constant principle of Young Italy. However, this source is evidently more definite on the issue of Piedmontese leadership. It is clear that Mazzini does not think Italian unity was dependent on Piedmontese leadership. In fact, he states clearly that the Piedmontese cannot initiate the struggle; rather, revolution was first necessary which would allow Piedmont the chance to intervene. In this sense, Piedmont was to play a supportive role only. Knowledge could be added here to highlight Mazzini's commitment to insurrection. Not only had he played a central part in the Roman Republic of 1849 but he was instrumental in failed attempts to unseat the Piedmontese monarchy in the 1830s. His republicanism could also be used to explain his suspicion of Piedmont and his reluctance to accept her leadership.

Candidates may divide in their interpretation of **Source D**. A case can be made to suggest it does not show Italian unity was dependent on Piedmontese leadership. Firstly, the very terms negotiated by Cavour seem designed to thwart Italian unity: instead of one state four are envisaged. Secondly, the priority for Cavour seems to be the aggrandisement of Piedmont and the power of his king. In addition, it could be argued that Cavour is conceding leadership to France on whose forces Italians were to rely in exchange for the loss of Nice and Savoy. Knowledge about Cavour's reluctance to merge the south with the north, the practical constraints of France occupying Rome and his main concern to liberate Italy from Austria rather than unify the whole could be discussed here. On the other hand it might be argued that the agreement at Plombiere indicates Cavour's leadership in bringing Napoleon to negotiations and actually striking an agreement. Some of the other points agreed, such as the cost of the war and a marriage between the two royal families, for instance, could be cited as evidence of Cavour's skill and leadership. Furthermore, the text makes it clear that France would only intervene if Piedmont first isolated Austria and candidates could explain how in 1859 Cavour manoeuvred Piedmontese forces to entice the Austrians to declare war and so provide the excuse for France to engage.

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 B and C.****Compare these Sources as evidence for Southern attitudes to the Compromise of 1850.****[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 Georgia and accept the Compromise but **Source B**'s approval is more conditional than **Source C**'s. **Source B** states bluntly that the convention does not wholly approve but it will abide by it. **Source C** on the other hand calls it a fair and honourable settlement. **Source B** goes on to threaten secession if the terms of the Compromise regarding slavery in New Mexico and Utah and the Fugitive Slave Bill are not observed. This suggests a more sceptical view than **Source C**. Howell Cobb does, however, mention Northern opposition to the Fugitive Slave Act, which shows why the convention thought it necessary to insist on its 'faithful execution'. Unlike **Source B**, Cobb notes Southern opposition to the Compromise, including the States Right party of Georgia. This indicates that both Sources represent moderate opinion in Georgia. Since **Source B** comes from a convention it may be taken to show that majority political opinion in Georgia in 1850 wished to preserve the Union, but not on any terms: the Compromise was acceptable but was not open to further modification. **Source C**, which may also be taken to represent the majority view in Georgia since it is written by an elected politician, takes broadly the same view. Together they suggest that majority opinion accepted the Compromise but with some scepticism as to whether it would stick.

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

4(b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Northern opposition to slavery was the main cause of increasing sectional tension from 1848 to 1854. [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, 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 and **Source D**, both of Northern provenance, express in strong and at times colourful language a determination to resist the extension of slavery to the territories – the key issue in these years. And they base this on hostility to the institution of slavery itself - ‘so great an evil’ (**Source A**), ‘Legalized Oppression and Systematized Oppression’ (**Source D**). Such views could not but arouse Southern fears for the very survival of the ‘peculiar institution’, especially since **Source A** came from a leading Northern politician and **Source D** was widely reprinted. On the other hand candidates may use own knowledge to question how typical these Sources are of Northern opinion. Undoubtedly Northern opinion was strongly against any extension of slavery to the territories and many were unhappy about the Fugitive Slave Law, as noted by **Source C**. But abolitionism, at any rate in this period, was not a majority view. Even in 1860 abolition was not Republican Party policy. Despite Seward’s opposition, Congress accepted the Compromise of 1850, including leaving the question of the introduction of slavery into New Mexico and Utah to their legislatures when they became states. **Source B** and **Source C**, both from Georgia, are more moderate in their tone and probably more typical of opinion in the South in 1850 than **Sources A and D** are of opinion in the North. In contrast to **Source A**, they accept the Compromise. But **Source B** also warns of the possibility of secession, and **Source C** reports (though with disapproval) a ‘spirit of opposition’ in the South: even in 1851 there were Southerners arguing for secession (and indeed this had seemed a real possibility in 1849-50 until Clay put forward the Compromise). So there is a case for regarding the South as equally or more responsible for the rising tension and this can be supported from own knowledge. The crisis leading up to the Compromise had its origins in the annexation of Texas, the Mexican War and the resulting territorial expansion. Northern opposition to the extension of slavery to the territories (e.g. highlighted by the Wilmot Proviso in 1846) was a reaction to Southern ambitions. Similarly, the views expressed in **Source D** can be seen as a response to Southern demands. So candidates can make a case either way and should have plenty of material to select from.

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 1877-93**5(a) Study Sources A and D.****Compare these Sources as evidence for opposition to Home Rule in 1886.****[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:

D does go further than **A** by mentioning an Irish Republic, and by references to the dangers of intrigue against England and danger that Ireland might join foreign enemies in war. **A** merely sees Ireland as 'disloyal'. **A** mentions measures that a future Dublin parliament might take – import duties and creating its own army, but does not explicitly refer to either Republic or joining foreign powers.

Similarities include:

Both imply surrender – **A** mentions it directly and **D** refers to Gladstone having been voted in to maintain union and by implication is now going against that. Both see the likely end of the Act of Union. **A** says that a Dublin parliament would oppose unity; **D** sees a future Dublin parliament working towards the Repeal of the Act of Union. Both see friction. **D** speaks of the hatred of the Irish for England and **A** sees 'constant friction' in a Dublin parliament.

Provenance

Bright is much closer to Gladstone than O' Neill and comes from a different political wing – a Liberal radical, It is interesting that he imports certain radical notions – free trade and dislike of the military into his fears. O'Neill goes further. He brings in the Ulster fear of the Irish masses and fear of foreign invasion that goes back to the French wars and even the Spanish Armada, reflecting Ulster protestant fear of catholic invasion. Both are MPs and have experience of the Home Rulers in parliament and have seen Parnell at work first hand. Both are writing in the heat of the moment in the aftershock of Gladstone's famous conversion. Candidates may be aware of the strength of feeling in Ulster which the English conservatives made so much of and may be aware of the divisions in the Liberal party in which the more radical elements, particularly Chamberlain and Bright opposed Home Rule.

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

5(b) Study all the Sources.

Using all these sources and your own knowledge assess the view that Gladstone was unwise to attempt to introduce Home Rule in 1886. [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, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The issue is whether the opposition arguments and the political dangers of advocating Home Rule outweighed the moral imperatives and practical arguments which Gladstone found for it.

Three of the **Sources (A, B, D)** offer reasons for opposition and one (**C**) a defence. Bright as an opponent within the Liberal movement of Home Rule is not an unbiased source and the others are deeply involved in the controversy. **B** is aiming to influence Catholic voters; **C** is trying to persuade his own party as well as the opposition and **D** is reflecting deep Ulster fears by overstressing their dangers. There are important issues not touched on.

C refers to the Agrarian crime which has been a long standing problem. Candidates may know that it worsened with the New Departure. There had been a succession of coercion acts and though Gladstone had worked with Parnell after the Kilmainham Treaty to reduce unrest, it was still a huge problem. Gladstone's analysis was that without more consent and a feeling that the Irish 'owned' their own law and order, and then law would be seen as an English imposition. This is an interesting argument, but somewhat 'academic' and the real problem may be seen in the need for more radical land legislation. The problem was that Home Rule alienated Ulster and was politically highly dangerous.

D reflects Ulster opinion and though Ulster and Protestantism are not referred to directly, they lay behind the criticisms. Politically the Conservatives were able to 'play the Orange Card' and use the disturbances in Ulster against Gladstone. Thus Home Rule may or may not have been wise, depending on one's view of Gladstone's views. It certainly divided his own party, as **A** shows – Chamberlain went further than Bright and broke away. To many it seemed that Gladstone was surrendering to the agrarian unrest which Parnell had unscrupulously used and to Parnell's disruption of parliament. Not all Irish opinion favoured Home Rule – as **B** shows. Parnell was, after all, a protestant, and some religious opinion feared a secular Irish state (oddly, the Ulster opposition was based on fears of a Catholic theocracy). Also, Parnell's links with more radical elements during the New Departure, and his radical utterances, for example in the USA, had not been forgotten by conservatives like Cullen. Whether this hornet's nest of opposition from all sides made it unwise or heroic of Gladstone to go for Home Rule is the point at issue. Some may see the wisdom being in Gladstone's attempt to offer a long term political solution; others may see it as the impulsive decision of an opinionated 'old man in a hurry'.

There is a lot of possible additional knowledge here, so it is important to regard the marking scheme as indicating possible content only.

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 B and C.**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the view that socialism was believed to be the only answer to poverty. [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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

Both Sources acknowledge that poverty is a serious problem. However, in Source **B**, Lloyd George wishes to stave off the threat of socialism through a Liberal Government programme of welfare reforms. Whereas in Source **C**, Keir Hardie believes that only socialism will solve the problems of poverty. The dates are significant. In 1906 (Source **B**), Lloyd George is looking ahead. The Liberals have just come to power with a huge majority. If the Liberals “tackle poverty”, then Liberalism will keep the support of the working classes and Labour will remain a minority interest. In 1912, Hardie (Source **C**) is looking back over six years of Liberal reform, and finding it wanting. Thus, in terms of content, Hardie is able to be more specific than Lloyd George. The latter (as a leading Liberal minister) has helped introduce pensions and national insurance. But (according to Hardie) there has been little (if any) improvement for the working classes. Authorship also explains some fundamental differences. Lloyd George (President of the Board of Trade; and then Chancellor of the Exchequer) was a leading proponent of New Liberalism. Ironically, many of his conservative opponents would accuse him of socialism. But Hardie (one of the first working class M.Ps, from a coal mining background, and the founder of the Labour party) would certainly not see Lloyd George as a socialist. In Source **C**, Keir Hardie is expressing disappointment with the progress made since 1906. For him, only a complete programme of socialism will do. It could be said that each of these sources (one a public political speech; the other a speech in the House of Commons) represents the attitude to welfare policy of each of the two political parties. But each speech also represents the personal feelings and beliefs of its author.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference. Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used. Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive sections. Band IV answers will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase. Band V answers will show only a basic understanding. Any comparison will be implicit. The Sources may be paraphrased.

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

6(b) Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Labour party had an important impact upon social reform in the period from 1900 to 1914. [40]

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

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

It is clear from Source **A** that, from the early days of its existence, the Labour party embraced a socialist and radical approach to welfare reform. The policies of the newly-formed LRC are clearly laid out in the Manifesto issued before the general election of 1900. Candidates (in evaluating Source **A**) might point out that these policies were highly idealistic, impractical even, and issued with the election in mind. At that stage, Labour was hardly in a position to achieve any of these ideals. However, within a few years, the Lib-Lab Pact of 1903, and the gaining of 29 seats in the 1906 general election, gave the Labour party increased influence with the reforming Liberal party. In Source **D**, a modern historian gives some initial support to this idea of Labour influence. Also, the Liberal minister, Lloyd George (Source **B**), clearly sees Labour and its social policies as a real threat to the power of the new Liberal Government. And later on, in the two general elections of 1910, Labour increased its seats to 42.

However, only 18 of the original 29 Labour M.Ps called themselves socialists; and in Source **D**, V. Brendon discusses the divisions within the party, the decline in its number of seats and the trends which led to a relative failure to achieve its goals. In Source **B**, Lloyd George suggests that the Liberals must answer the Labour (socialist) threat by introducing liberal social reforms. On the whole, this approach turned out to be successful, and, as Source **D** says, inevitably weakened Labour. Candidates might refer to Old Age Pensions (1908), National Insurance (1911) and so on, as examples of Liberal social reform. These reforms are clearly referred to in Keir Hardie's speech (Source **C**). According to Hardie (the founder of the Labour Party), the Liberal reforms have done little to improve the lives of the lower classes. Implicitly, Hardie is suggesting that the impact of Labour has been disappointing so far (1912). However, he does renew the call for socialism as being ultimately the only answer to poverty and exploitation. These are sentiments supported by other Labour socialists of the period, including Beatrice Webb and George Lansbury. Own knowledge might include references to progress (or lack of it) in the fight against poverty and inequality.

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 B.**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the attitudes of the German people towards the Jews. [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 of.' The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

There are obvious differences in the provenance of the two sources. Candidates should be expected to know that the Socialist Party [SPD] were political enemies of the Nazis and had been banned since 1933. The heading of **source A** states that the agent was working underground. His aim was to report on public opinion in Nazi Germany to his superiors in exile. Goebbels, in **B**, was of course a leading Nazi and instigator of Kristallnacht. His purpose was to present the night of violence as an outburst of anti Jewish feeling from among the ordinary people.

A is a secret report whilst **B** is a public propaganda statement.

Clearly, both sources indicate widespread anti Jewish feeling but the nature and extent of that feeling is different. **A** firmly states the rejection of violence against the Jews while **B**, acknowledging widespread violence, states that the government must act to curb this. There are some similarities in tone and use of language.

As regards reliability and typicality, the SPD agent gives a remarkably honest account of anti-Semitic feeling from a political enemy. However, he is referring specifically to one, notably anti-Semitic, region. Goebbels, by contrast, refers to the whole of the German people. Some comments might be made about the dates. By the time of Kristallnacht nearly three more years of increasingly radical anti Jewish indoctrination has been levelled at the population, which might help to explain the more extreme tone of **B**.

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

7(b) Study all the sources.

Using all these sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that most Germans actively supported increasingly extreme anti-Jewish measures between 1933 and 1939.

[40]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set 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.

Candidates may prefer to put the stress on most or on active/passive. Both should lead to the same outcome. Clearly the key difference is that between 'active' support and 'passive' tolerance and acceptance and good candidates should use the sources and own knowledge to focus on this. All four sources suggest anti Jewish feeling in varying degrees. **A** suggests active support for anti Jewish measures, even among some SPD members, and even amongst those who don't like the Nazis. Goebbels states active and violent participation in **B**, whereas Kershaw in **D**, whilst accepting widespread anti Jewish feeling, points out that apathy, indifference and passive acceptance was the norm. Much can be made of **C** in the light of the question. Does Maschmann's rationalisation of 'the Jew' suggest *active* support for persecution of the Jews or does it provide a classic example of the sort of attitudes expressed by Kershaw in **D**?

Own knowledge can be used to evaluate the sources. Comments can be made about the reliability of SOPADE reports like **A**, however, the evaluation of this source should go beyond the 'stock' observation that this was from an opponent. There is widespread evidence that the majority of the German people were in fact horrified by the violence of Kristallnacht, contrary to the impression given in **B** and despite over five years of increasingly violent indoctrination. Candidates should refer in a focused way to the context and circumstances of Kristallnacht - the SA should have their last fling etc. Maschmann in **C** was a leader of a Nazi organisation and a recipient of the increasingly virulent anti Jewish indoctrination. Candidates might know, or infer from the heading, that she spent much of her time after the war 'examining her conscience'. Candidates might refer to Germans ignoring the economic boycott of April 1933 and the fact that they continued to shop in Jewish shops [as stated in **A**]. There is much evidence to suggest toleration and acceptance of measures against the Jews, rather than active participation in or support for violence against the Jews. No set conclusion is expected either way although many candidates might reflect that the majority of German, particularly in rural areas, would not have come into contact with any of the 503,000 Jews living in Germany in the 1930s, and thus might well passively accept the demonisation of 'the Jew' without actually wishing Jews physical harm.

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 successfully did Edward the Confessor handle the Godwin family? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus : Assessment of the relationship between a late Anglo-Saxon king and an important noble family.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might differ in their assessments of Edward the Confessor's success in dealing with the Godwin family but answers in **Band I** are likely to consider both successes and failures. However, examiners will not look for equally balanced answers. The balance will depend on the argument and an extremely one-sided answer can merit a very high mark. Candidates might judge that the King was a success because he forced Earl Godwin to back down in a major crisis when Godwin had a grievance about influences around Edward. It might also be judged that Edward succeeded in his preference for Duke William as his successor. Against this, the Godwin family retained their importance. Edith, Godwin's daughter, was Queen. Godwin recovered from his setback and recovered his place at court. Edward was persuaded to dismiss some of his French associates. At the death of Edward, Harold Godwinson was the leading Anglo-Saxon earl and it might be argued that Edward mishandled the succession issue.

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 the English Church had more strengths than weaknesses on the eve of the Norman Conquest. [45]

Focus : Assessment of a claim about the condition of the Church in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The focus should be on the period before the Conquest but candidates might well use post-Conquest developments to provide a comparison or contrast and this will be valid if links are made. The Normans introduced changes. Their larger churches differed from the simpler Anglo-Saxon buildings. Lanfranc introduced reforms. Pro-Norman writers saw weaknesses in the Anglo-Saxon Church. However, a strong counter-argument can be made. Whilst small, Anglo-Saxon churches were numerous and this may be proof of popular piety. Relations with the papacy were good. Some Normans and others filled high office in the Church. William I did not see the need for immediate change. Stigand was condemned later but had earlier been on good terms with popes and was retained at the Conquest. Some candidates might refer to the Church's links with a lively artistic culture.

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) Assess the reasons why William of Normandy was more successful than Harold in winning the English throne in 1066. [45]

Focus : Assessment of the problems of a claimant to the throne.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The beginning of the Question is open. Candidates might focus narrowly on the Battle of Hastings. Others might take a longer view to consider the strengths of William of Normandy in the events leading to the battle and before the invasion. Both approaches will be valid although the second will still need a clear view of the decisive battle. It might be argued that Harold's powerful and effective army was weakened by the earlier engagement at Stamford Bridge. The Norman army, with its archers, foot soldiers and knights, was a more varied and adaptable force than the Anglo-Saxons. William's leadership might be seen as decisive. There might be different views of the reality of the 'feigned retreat'. William of Normandy made meticulous preparations for the invasion and had time to prepare his ground carefully. He was an experienced commander of hard campaigns although Harold's military ability should not be underestimated. Some might refer to the fact that William enjoyed papal approval although others might question the importance of this in his victory. On the other hand, Harold's force was limited not only by fatigue but also because he did not enjoy universal support. Yet his army stayed intact for most of the day. Some might base their arguments on luck: the good fortune that William enjoyed when Harold was distracted by a northern invasion and the good fortune that Harold was killed.

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

2(b) Assess the view that William I relied mainly on force to control England from his victory at Hastings to 1072. [45]

Focus : Assessment of a claim about the methods of a king in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should note that the Question is about the period immediately after the Conquest. It might be argued that force and repression can be seen in the way in which he marched on London, devastating the countryside to ensure obedience. Castles were built quickly in important places. Rebels were put down forcefully and widespread punishments were common. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle complained of the oppression of the people. On the other hand, it might be argued that this approach was necessary to establish William's rule and that it was moderated by his willingness to accept the service of Anglo-Saxon earls who would cooperate. He did not immediately overturn Anglo-Saxon laws and methods of administration. Nevertheless, foreign overlords soon took control. The most radical changes came after 1072 - outside the scope of the Question.

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) Did William I do more to change or continue Anglo-Saxon methods of government and administration? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of change and continuity in a king's methods of government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Historiography is not a required element of AS Level assessment. Candidates will be rewarded when they consider the extent of change and continuity in Norman government and administration but, although accurate historiographical references should be rewarded, they will not be expected for any mark. William I claimed to be the legal king and promised continuity. Anglo-Saxon England was governed effectively so that there was no immediate need for radical change to bring order to government. Continuity might be seen in the continued use of writs, an efficient means of conveying royal demands. Counties and hundreds, with their local officials, were still used. Earls and sheriffs continued, if under different nomenclatures, but they became more important as royal rather than local officials. The system of taxation was largely unchanged. Candidates might point to the Domesday Book as evidence of William's willingness to build on Anglo-Saxon models. On the other hand, William virtually replaced the Anglo-Saxon nobility, ruling through foreigners. His personal authority was greater and his methods of government generally reflected a greater emphasis on authoritarianism. It will be relevant to discuss feudalism as a method of government. Some might dismiss the concept as out-dated but most will accept the idea of feudalism as a means by which the King could exert greater control over England. However, others might argue that there were elements of 'feudalism' in England before the Conquest.

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 Anselm faced more problems as Archbishop of Canterbury than Lanfranc. [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for the relative problems of two important churchmen.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance between Anselm and Lanfranc but not necessarily an even balance. Because the Question is based on a comparison, answers that only discuss one and show no knowledge and understanding of the other will find it difficult to get beyond **Band V**. Answers that deal with Anselm and Lanfranc sequentially but which make valid points of comparison en route should not be undervalued. There were similarities in the backgrounds of Anselm and Lanfranc. Both were scholars and monks, abbots of Bec. Both apparently accepted their appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury with some reluctance. However, they differed in their views of the relationship between their offices as archbishop of Canterbury and the role of the Church on the one hand and secular power on the other. Anselm made clear that his first loyalty was to the Pope. He publicly denigrated the basis of kingly authority. Lanfranc enjoyed a largely harmonious relationship with William I. The King approved of his attempts to reform the Church, which included changes to the seats of bishoprics and supremacy over York. His promotion of foreigners to high office in the Church in England was also in line with William's attitude to secular appointments. Lanfranc had a different view of papal primacy. Candidates can compare their respective kings and their attitudes to Church matters to explain the clerics' problems.

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) How seriously did the Norman Conquest affect the Anglo-Saxon nobility to 1100?
Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus : Assessment of the effects of the Norman Conquest on an important social group.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. William I rewarded his followers for several reasons. Some followed him in the expectation of land. He needed to ensure their future loyalty whereas the Anglo-Saxon nobility was suspected, often with good reason. The Anglo-Saxon nobility was in a weakened position and could offer little resistance to their changed circumstance. The Anglo-Saxon nobility therefore largely lost their governmental, administrative and military leadership. At the end of William I's reign, only two Anglo-Saxons (Thurkill and Colswein) held land directly from the King. Some had been killed, some had gone into exile; the majority were dispossessed. On the other hand, the size of this last group was still large in comparison to the new foreigners and they probably retained a local importance.

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

4(b) 'A disaster for Anglo-Saxon architecture and the arts.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the effects of the Norman Conquest to 1100? Select one or more of ecclesiastical architecture, embroidery, illumination and metalwork in your answer. [45]

Focus : Assessment of a claim about the cultural effects of the Norman Conquest.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The mark that is awarded will not be affected by the number of artistic fields that are discussed. The Question makes clear that an answer that is limited to one can merit any mark. On the other hand, an answer that deals with several and uses a broad knowledge to make valid and linked general points should be rewarded for doing so. Most candidates are likely to discuss ecclesiastical architecture. The larger churches of the Normans supplanted the smaller Anglo-Saxon models. Many Anglo-Saxon churches survived in smaller villages but there was much rebuilding or new building in larger towns. Differences in size and decoration reflected the greater elaboration in services and the changes in the liturgy. Great cathedrals (e.g. Canterbury, York, Lincoln, Winchester) were re-modelled and imposing monasteries were built or re-built. Embroidery was one of the achievements of the Anglo-Saxons and there is evidence of its survival in the absence of continental competitors. It is possible that Anglo-Saxons were involved in the production of the Bayeux Tapestry. Continuity might also be seen in illumination where Normans and other foreigners became patrons but probably not craftsmen and their tastes did not essentially change. With the new emphasis on stone, metalwork seems to have decline. High credit should be given to candidates who can use examples to illustrate their arguments. A valid alternative approach might be to argue against a 'disaster' by pointing to local examples of beautiful Anglo-Saxon churches that survived intact.

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) ‘The main cause of unrest was an under-mighty king, not over-mighty subjects.’
How far do you agree with this judgement on Henry VI’s reign from 1450? [45]**

Focus : Assessment of a judgement of a problematic reign.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might agree or disagree with the claim in the question and examiners will not look for a particular balance; the balance in the answers will depend on the arguments. However, answers in **Band III** or higher should be able to deal at least adequately with both of the stated factors: ‘under-mighty king’ and ‘over-mighty subjects’. Candidates might spend considerable time discussing the nature of Henry VI’s incapacity but it is not necessary to do so. The reasons are less important than their effects because he was unable to exercise kingship at a crucial time. The personal effectiveness of a king was of paramount importance in the middle of the fifteenth century. Apart from Henry’s ‘madness’, candidates might refer to Cade’s revolt. Although it was suppressed, it did not reflect well on Henry VI as king. Henry was also believed to have given too much influence to Somerset. Somerset himself might be seen as an example of an over-mighty subject although his influence depended on the favour of the King. Candidates can certainly include Richard of York in this category. He was the wealthiest of the nobles and owned many estates and strongholds. Until the birth of a son to Henry and Margaret of Anjou, York was the King’s heir. The outcome of the Battle of St. Albans (1455) demonstrated the balance of power between Henry VI and York. It might be claimed that Yorkists were later handled badly, citing the influence of Margaret of Anjou. York’s setbacks were followed by his revival and the powerful alliance with Warwick. Answers do not have to narrate the events of the wars to 1461 but they can be interpreted to show the personal weakness of Henry VI (Margaret of Anjou was the de facto leader of the Lancastrians) and the ultimate triumph of Edward, York’s son. Candidates might develop their arguments more widely. For example, the Study Topic begins in 1450 and candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge and understanding of events in France before that date. However, some might consider the effects on Henry VI’s reign and reputation of the losses in France. The crown had financial problems which were not of Henry’s making. There were also rivalries between nobles that went beyond support for, or opposition to, Henry VI.

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

5(b) Assess the reasons why the Yorkists were successful in the war against the Lancastrians by 1461.

[45]

Focus : Assessment of the reasons for the outcome of a civil war in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might organise their answers either point-by-point or chronologically. Both might lead to very good answers. Chronological answers should not necessarily be regarded as low-level accounts because such answers might make valid points during their course. The Specification refers to 'Warfare 1455-61' but some candidates might begin before the Battle of St. Albans (1455) and discuss the beginning of York's insurrection in 1452. The question is not about the causes of warfare as such but it will be relevant to explain the importance of Henry VI's weakness and the unpopularity of Somerset, which affected the Lancastrians. The alliance between York and Warwick was significant. York possessed large and strategically important estates whilst Warwick was not only personally vigorous and ambitious but had been given charge of Calais by Henry VI. The treatment of York and his supporters by Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou, leading to York's flight and the punishment of his supporters at the Parliament of Devils (1459) were actually to strengthen York by gaining him popular support. York, Warwick and Edward (York's son) provided more effective leadership than the Lancastrian camp. York's death at Wakefield (1460) and Warwick's defeat in the second Battle of St. Albans (1461) were compensated by the growing unpopularity of Margaret of Anjou and her forces. London supported the Yorkists. The battle of Towton was vital, delivering victory to Edward and defeat to the Lancastrians. Not only did Edward prove himself an able commander - in contrast to Henry VI - but the Lancastrians suffered heavy losses.

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) How far did Edward IV strengthen the monarchy during his second reign, to 1483?
Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus : Assessment of a king's achievements in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question set. 'How far..?' invites candidates to consider aspects of Edward's success and failure; nobody would argue that he was completely successful or unsuccessful. However, examiners will not be looking for equally balanced answers because the balance will depend on the argument. Some candidates might approach the question as a means to compare Edward IV's second reign with his first and / or Henry VI's rule. This will be very relevant but will not be necessary for any mark. Others might consider only his second reign within the terms of the Study Topic which begins in 1471. It might be argued that Edward did much to strengthen the monarchy, for example through reform of the royal finances. He took more personal control of his income and expenditure. He had an imposing personality. On the other hand, he was still reliant on the support of powerful nobles such as Richard of Gloucester. There might be discussion of the extent of his control over them. There might also be discussion of the extent to which he introduced new men to his council. He did avoid the excesses of civil unrest and ended the danger from Clarence. On the other hand, he was weakened by his marriage to Elizabeth Woodville and left an uncertain succession.

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

6(b) How far was Richard III personally responsible for the loss of his throne to Henry Tudor? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus : Assessment of the reasons for the downfall of a king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question set. 'How far..?' invites candidates to consider what can be argued for and against the claim that Richard III was responsible for his fall. However, examiners will not be looking for equally balanced answers because the balance will depend on the argument. On the one hand, candidates can be expected to discuss the circumstances of his accession, which cast a shadow over his reign. He failed to win over some of the most important nobles, such as Buckingham and later the Stanleys. Rumours spread of his responsibility for the death of his wife and intention to marry Edward IV's daughter, Elizabeth. Some might believe that Richard made a mistake in relying on the support of northerners whilst others might see this criticism as exaggerated. On the other hand, it might be claimed that Buckingham's ambition was responsible for his death whilst the Lancastrians remained inveterate enemies, finally finding a formidable champion in Henry Tudor who was to bring about the end of Richard III's reign. Henry Tudor was also backed by France. Candidates might well argue that Richard cannot be seriously faulted for his leadership in the Battle of Bosworth.

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 completely successful in overcoming the threats to his government.

[45]

Focus : Assessment of a claim about a king.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might agree with the claim in the Question, basing their arguments on the defeat of the Pretenders. After the Battle of Stoke (1487), Lambert Simnel was captured by Henry VII and kept in safe confinement. Perkin Warbeck was hanged. It might be argued that, whatever dangers faced Henry from the time of his accession from the Pretenders and their supporters, he was safe by 1500 and could spend the rest of his reign consolidating his hold on the throne. A well-argued case taking this line might be worth **Band I** but answers that consider the continued danger to Henry VII might be more promising. Although there was little danger of direct invasion, Henry's relations with France and Spain were often troublesome. The marriage between Arthur and Catherine of Aragon failed to strengthen his throne when Arthur died and a new marriage alliance involving Prince Henry was not finalised. Ireland continued to be a problem. Poyning's had only a brief success and Kildare had to be restored to power. Marriage between Margaret and James IV of Scotland (1502) did heal relations for the rest of Henry's reign. Within England, he controlled the nobles by means that candidates can explain. Although he included some new men on his council, he continued to use members of the older nobility. On the other hand, he used devices such as benevolences and restrictions on retainers to curb noble power. He also travelled much throughout England to assert his personal power. Some candidates may also consider tax rebellions.

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

7(b) How successful was Henry VII in achieving his aims in foreign relations? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus : Assessment of the outcome of a king's foreign relations.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Credit will be given when candidates explicitly deal with Henry VII's aims in foreign policy and link them to particular developments. Within the overall aim of securing his throne, his major intentions were to deprive his Yorkist enemies of foreign support, safeguard his finances, improve the economy and ensure the future of the dynasty. His policies were mostly peaceful. He did not have ambitions of large-scale foreign conquests. French support for the Yorkists and designs on Brittany that might be dangerous to Henry led him to ally with Spain. (Treaty of Medina del Campo 1489). The invasion of France might seem to have been defensive rather than aggressive and the King's success might be judged in the Treaty of Etaples (1492). It brought about a financial reward for Henry. Burgundy was a problem with its support for the Yorkists but he made a trade treaty with the Burgundian Netherlands (Magnus Intercursus 1496). Relations with Scotland improved through the marriage of James IV and Margaret, his daughter. However, relations with Spain had worsened by the end of the reign and Henry died without influential allies although neither France nor Spain was hostile to England. For some time, securing of dynastic interests had seemed shaky. Elizabeth of York died in 1503 and Henry considered a second marriage. Arthur's death in 1502 ended the marriage agreement with Catherine of Aragon. Another marriage was arranged with Prince Henry requiring papal dispensation (but candidates are not expected to explain the future implications of this), and it was not formalised until after Henry VIII's accession.

nb Ireland is not foreign policy.

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 successful were the nobility in maintaining their social and economic importance during the period from 1450 to 1509? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus : Assessment of the socio-economic problems of an important social group.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Wars of the Roses had serious economic and therefore social effects. The nobility then had difficulty in dealing with the governments of Edward IV in his second reign and Henry VII. Some families lost land and income because they chose the wrong side and were impoverished by forfeitures and enforced sales. Henry VII in particular sought to reclaim alienated crown land. His policies to restrict the feudal rights and tendencies of the nobility removed their retainers but they still had to meet considerable expense in maintaining large households. Expense and generosity were expected of a nobleman. They lacked the resources and usually the willpower to engage in new trades that made the rising merchant class more prosperous and influential. Their contacts with the peasantry were loosened because of the growing demand for labour. Money wages, rather than service in kind, became more common. On the other hand, the social importance of the nobility remained largely unaffected. They were particularly influential in the provinces. Some candidates might move from social to political importance. This will not necessarily be irrelevant because the political influence of the nobility depended largely on their social status. However, candidates should restrain from using the question as a device to narrate political developments.

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

8(b) Assess the reasons why the wool trade was important to the English economy from 1450 to 1509. [45]

Focus : Assessment of the reasons for the importance of part of the economy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Wool had established itself as a staple industry well before the middle of the fifteenth century but this period was to see its importance enhanced. However, candidates might point out that reliance on one industry is always risky and there were periods of depression, usually resulting from the international situation on the continent. For the most part, more favourable trading conditions, especially from the later fifteenth century to 1509, encouraged international trade. Merchants took advantage of these conditions to increase their profits from wool and there was a change to the production of cloth in England, resulting in higher profits. Wool merchants became prosperous in their own right but also provided centres of prosperity to some local areas as they co-operated with local farmers. It will not be irrelevant to mention local gains from wool merchants such as the building or rebuilding of churches. Wool became a means of making money and gaining social status. Companies such as the Merchant Adventurers strengthened their hold. Henry VII took steps to protect English wool merchants. Foreigners were excluded from exporting English cloth; there were prohibitions of competing goods such as silk and a navigation act protected English shipping. His concern for trade, and particularly the wool trade, was a strong element of his relations with European countries.

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 did Henry VIII continue his father's policies during the period from 1509 to 1514? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of continuity of kings' policies in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question is based on the Key Issue that asks, 'How far did Henry VIII continue his father's work 1509-14? The legacy of Henry VII in 1509, Henry VIII's campaigns against Scotland and France, the rise of Wolsey.' Answers in **Band I** should consider evidence of change and continuity because there were signs of both. Continuity was seen in the presence of most of the councillors who had served Henry VII. However, the changes should also be noted, especially the brutal execution of Empson and Dudley to gain popularity. Henry VIII continued his father's search for a Spanish match by completing the marriage with Catherine of Aragon. As for change, although Henry VIII's personality is not strictly a policy, it will be relevant to consider his character because it underpinned policy. He was young and ambitious for glory, less careful than Henry VII in courting danger and more willing to spend money extravagantly. Reference might be made to a foreign policy that was immediately more aggressive, for example in the invasion of France. Although war with Scotland was not Henry VIII's intention, his policies on the continent allowed James IV to declare war. Flodden was a major English victory but not really Henry's although he took credit for it. At home, there were some changes in administration. The powers of the Council Learned in the Law were curbed and some changes were made to the Exchequer, none of which seem to have been for any reason other than to change his father's practices and to gain some popularity. Wolsey had a Church office under Henry VII but became important under the new King. By 1514, he had gained an eminent position. Based on his skill of managing foreign affairs, Wolsey also had power in domestic matters. The use of one leading minister can be seen as a different policy inasmuch as the King, whilst less interested in the details of government, could use Wolsey to maintain personal control. His father had been a more 'hands-on' governor.

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

9(b) Assess the claim that, from 1514 to 1529, Wolsey's main aim in foreign affairs was to remain an ally of the Papacy. [45]

Focus: assessment of the aims in foreign affairs of an important minister.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can offer different interpretations of Wolsey's aims in foreign policy. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. A case can be made out that he paid particular attention to the interests of the Papacy although there are differences about its importance as an aim in foreign policy. He was a churchman by training and recognised the political as well as the ecclesiastical importance of the papacy. Candidates might consider how seriously he considered himself a possibility for the papacy; most would probably agree that his claim was not strong. He did not visit the papacy. However, papal influence increased Wolsey's importance in England as legate. The papacy, although weak in some respects, was significant in international diplomacy. The role of the pope was certainly important when Wolsey was trying to negotiate Henry VIII's divorce. Other aims might include the importance of following the King's wishes. Wolsey rose to power largely because of his assistance to Henry in his early French campaign. The minister managed some of the King's triumphs such as the field of the Cloth of Gold. Carrying out Henry's wishes and helping the King to achieve his ambitions were vital to Wolsey's survival in office. Another aim might have been to act as a European diplomat who could balance the power of Spain and France. Reference might be made to the Treaty of London (1518). The problem was that some of these aims conflicted and England was isolated at the end of the 1520s. The question does not ask candidates to assess Wolsey's success in achieving his aims. The emphasis should be on the analysis and explanation of the aims themselves. However, a brief view of Wolsey's success would not be irrelevant as part of the assessment of his aims.

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 government and administration were reformed in the 1530s. (Do not discuss religion in your answer.) [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about change in government and administration in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The key issue is the extent and importance of changes. AS Level does not require knowledge of historiography but accurate references should be given credit. This topic is often taught through its historiography but candidates sometimes tend to rehearse arguments mechanically without considering evidence for and against various changes. The Elton thesis might now seem dated but the issues that it raised are still important. The Privy Council was reorganised and its functions were enlarged. Its membership was smaller and its efficiency improved. It had oversight over many aspects of state. There was a growing distinction between privy councillors and other councillors and advisers. However, the royal household continued to be important. Birth and kinship were still bases of importance and reference might be made to faction. Reference might be made to the growing centralisation of government and administration, for example through reforms in the Councils of the North and Wales and the Marches. The status of Wales changed with the Act of Union. Local offices survived, such as JPs and sheriffs but they were controlled more tightly. Candidates might see the question as an assessment of Thomas Cromwell's work. This will be valid although credit should be given to answers that consider the implications for, and involvement of, the crown. Candidates should note that religion is excluded, in order to avoid overlap with other questions and to reflect the nature of the Study Topic. Brief references to royal supremacy might be admissible in introductions or conclusions.

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

10(b) Assess the claim that Mary I was more effective in governing England than both Somerset and Northumberland. (Do not discuss religion in your answer.) [45]

Focus: assessment of comparative success in government and administration.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Religion is excluded from the question to reflect the thrust of the Study Topic. A brief mention in an introduction or conclusion would be admissible but religion should not be part of the main argument. Examiners will expect a reasonable balance but should also be flexible in their explications. Candidates can either give about the same attention to each of the three rulers or they might sustain a balance between the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I, giving less time to Somerset and Northumberland separately. It will be possible to merit **Band I** by constructing sequential answers that are well judged and supported by appropriate knowledge. However, whilst the question is not based on a direct comparison, one might normally expect some overarching comments for a mark at the top of **Band I**. On the other hand, examiners should see this as guidance and not as prescriptive. Answers that are limited to one ruler will find it difficult to reach **Band V** although this is more possible if only Mary is considered. Such answers will not really address an adequate range. A treatment of two might be worth up to **Band II** if well done. In favour of Mary I, it might be argued that her reforms helped to stabilise the financial and economic situation. The crown's income was increased. Her local administration seems to have worked quite efficiently. She also died a natural death and did not lose power to a rival. It might be claimed that each of the three rulers were ultimately failures. Somerset was brought down by his enemies and executed. Northumberland was executed because of his involvement in a plot against Mary Tudor. Mary did not produce an heir, left the succession to a Protestant and faced failure in her foreign policy. Somerset alienated most of his colleagues by his high-handed methods. His social policies, specially his attempt to limit enclosures, made him isolated among the more prosperous classes. His foreign policy was mostly a failure. Northumberland was also ruthless but ultimately a failure and his support for Lady Jane Grey showed a fatal lack of judgement. Mary I's marriage to Philip of Spain will be relevant. Although it had religious implications, it was also a political matter. It was widely unpopular and gave rise to Wyatt's rising. However, candidates might challenge the claim that they were all completely unsuccessful although it is difficult to make a positive case for Somerset's government. Northumberland began some reforms to improve the economy, with steps against debasement. Trade was encouraged. He ended Somerset's expensive wars.

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) 'The claim that the Church needed extensive reform is wrong.' How far do you agree with this judgement of the Church in 1529? [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the condition of the Church in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. AS Level does not require knowledge of historiography but accurate references should be given credit.

'Traditional' and 'revisionist' historians agree that the Church needed reform but differ over the extent of the Church's problems and weaknesses and the state of its reputation. The focus should be on 1529 as the end of the pre-Reformation Church. It will be relevant to explore the background, especially the situation earlier in the 1520s. However, candidates should avoid discussing the Reformation itself. A valid point might be made when candidates analyse support for, or opposition to, the Reformation in the 1530s, but this approach should be taken with great care to ensure relevance. Candidates might assess the importance of attacks on the Church made by such as Simon Fish ('A Supplication for the Beggars'). It was a serious attack on the clergy, especially on monks, but might not have had widespread support. Thomas More was a humanist who favoured reform but believed that Fish's views were dangerous. Other reformers such as Colet and the influence of Erasmus can be considered. Complaints against the clergy were not new but there is a view that they had not increased greatly in number and severity. There was a gap between the higher clergy and the lower, who were poorly educated. On other hand, the gap had existed in previous centuries. Complaints were made about the monasteries and these might have become more serious when made by more prosperous land gentry who envied monastic wealth and land. Church exactions were a grievance. Church courts were unpopular. Reference might be made to the case of Richard Hunne (1514). On the other hand, wills seem evidence that popular piety and devotion to the Church continued. Hunne's case caused outrage in London but probably not elsewhere. Pluralism and absenteeism were not new abuses. Lollardy was weak. However, anti-papalism was widespread but was based as much on nationalistic grounds as on spiritual and again was not a new phenomenon. There was some desire for reform, but little radicalism. A very pertinent point will be that Henry VIII gave full support to religious orthodoxy in 1529 whatever his feelings about the Pope and Wolsey.

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 Mary I was mainly successful in restoring England to Catholicism by 1558.

[45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a ruler's success in religion.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might argue against the claim in the question by claiming that England was mostly Catholic in 1553, making the issue of restoration less important. This will be valid if it is sustained by appropriate knowledge. The reforming legislation of Edward VI's reign was repealed. A Catholic Act of Uniformity was introduced. Catholic bishops were restored, Protestants were deprived and some were arrested. Cranmer, along with Hooper, Latimer and Ridley, became the most prominent of the martyrs. Cardinal Pole returned to England although his influence over Mary I can be exaggerated. Relations with Rome were resumed but were soured by the end of her reign. Catholic ornaments were restored in churches; this might point to some popular support for Mary I's religion because the restorations began in some places before orders to do so were issued. Protestant interests remained influential, preventing the restoration of monastic land other Church lands. The prolonged debate in Parliament over the act of uniformity, with some significant votes against the Queen's measures, showed that there were reservations about Mary I's policy in the House of Commons. Candidates will probably refer to the burning of heretics other than Cranmer and his colleagues. Most will see it as signs of popular resistance to the Catholic reaction. There are other views. About 300 were burned whilst others died in prison. This was a large number in about three years. On the other hand, there were regional differences. The large majority who were convicted were from London, the south-east and East Anglia. Regions that were traditionally more conservative, the north, the south-west and north-west, produced very few martyrs. Most were from the lower classes. It is very possible that wealthier Protestant sympathies concealed their beliefs to pursue their business or moved abroad. About 700 are known to have gone to Europe. Whilst the regime curbed Protestant publications, it did not seem to have realised the importance of printing and few pro-Catholic books and pamphlets appeared. Candidates might refer to Wyatt's rebellion as proof of the opposition to the Queen's policies but this was evidence of the unpopularity of her marriage rather than directly criticism of her religious policies in England. However, the marriage to Philip of Spain is relevant because it helped to discredit Mary's policies. It will be relevant to discuss the implications of the welcome for the accession of Elizabeth as the Protestant Princess.

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 successful were Tudor governments in tackling poverty during the period from 1509 to 1558? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of the extent of governments' success in dealing with an important social and economic problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question revolves around the degree of success of Tudor governments in dealing with poverty. Poverty became an increasing problem as inflation in particular worsened social conditions. There were other problems that caused poverty, such as bad harvests and plague, but their nature meant that it was virtually impossible for a Tudor government to deal with them. A reason for the lack of success was that efforts to deal with the poor were intermittent. Wolsey showed some sympathy for the poor, trying to use courts and anti-enclosure measures to improve their condition, but his efforts were limited by his other responsibilities and the lack of support that he enjoyed. Attempts were made to distinguish between able-bodied vagrants and those unable to work. Thomas Cromwell reformed the poor law (1536) but it had little impact. A reason for his problem, shared by other Tudor governments, was that he had to rely on local initiatives to implement measures and local officials were mostly reluctant to do so because they involved them and their associates in expense. Parishes were unable to sustain the system. During the reign of Edward VI a harsh vagrancy act was balanced by another measure to provide poor relief, but with no better results.

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

12(b) 'Inflation was the most serious problem facing towns during the period from 1509 to 1558.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [45]

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

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can offer different views of the problems of towns. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. The Specification refers to 'impact on towns of plague, famine, inflation, changing trade patterns.' Examiners will expect discussion of most but not necessarily all of these aspects for marks in **Band I**. The balance of the argument will depend on which factor is believed to be most important. Plague and famine resulting from poor harvests were intermittent but could have very serious effects when they occurred. Plague tended to be localised in this period but there was a serious outbreak of influenza at the end of the period that was more widespread than usual. There was also danger from smallpox, bubonic plague and 'the sweat'. Towns tended to be affected particularly by outbreaks of severe diseases because people lived closely together and sanitary conditions might have been worse than in the countryside but the effects also depended on good or bad luck. Poor harvests could affect towns in two ways: they had an impact on food supplies but they also attracted the most desperate from rural areas who sought sustenance. Trade patterns were important. Trade was particularly important to London, Norwich and Bristol but it was also important to many other towns. Changing trade conditions could therefore cause problems. Some small towns lagged behind competitors, partly because of the influence of local groups that were averse to change. Inflation was considerable in this period. Some candidates might argue that merchants and traders in towns did not suffer from much distress and might have prospered because of higher prices. However, the lower classes in towns suffered, unable to increase their incomes. They were largely dependent on buying food and other commodities whilst their buying power declined. There was more competition from those who moved from rural areas to urban centres.

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) Assess the claim that there was more popular support for the religious policies of Mary I than for those of Somerset and Northumberland. [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about the extent of support for two different religious systems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'more popular' implies an element of comparison but answers can be constructed sequentially with some broad comparative comments in introductions or conclusions. Some answers might be based on the extent of opposition to the religious policies of the rulers. This will be relevant; opposition indicates lack of support. However, one would normally expect something more positive for a mark in **Band I**. Examiners will take care in being too restrictive about interpretations of the term 'popular'. It will be very appropriate to include all groups in society, including those in government circles, rather than exclusively the populace. Somerset had open Protestant sympathies and his removal of the treason and heresy acts, as well as the repeal of the Six Articles, were received enthusiastically by some but more critically by others. There were still powerful conservative forces at court. Gardiner was sent to the Tower. There was support for Somerset's policies in London and from some gentry who had acquired Church lands and now chantry lands. The opposition to the new measures was pronounced in the west where rebels demanded a return to the old faith and its practices. Northumberland pushed further and faster towards a Protestant system. Bishops' wealth was appropriated, gaining some support from the beneficiaries. The second Prayer Book (1552) and Cranmer's Forty-Two Articles came too late for their effects on popular support to be assessed. Northumberland was not faced with an uprising such as had taken place in the west but this is not evidence for the general popularity of his policies. Mary I's accession was well received but this might have been as much because of support for her legal claim to the throne as for the religious policies that she seemed likely to favour. Her restoration of the main features of Catholicism was achieved quite easily but not with unanimous approval in Parliament. Her attempts to restore monastic and other Church lands were foiled. Some might interpret the burnings as evidence of her unpopularity; others might view them as less significant because they were mostly confined to London, the south-east and East Anglia. Foxe's 'Acts and Monuments' / 'Book of Martyrs' might be assessed. The overwhelming majority of the people conformed. The voluntary restoration of church ornaments might prove support for the Queen's policies. Wyatt's rising (1554) might be used by candidates to prove the unpopularity of Mary's religious policies. He came from Kent, a centre of Protestant support. But probably the unpopularity of the Queen's impending marriage to Philip of Spain was a more important factor, although this had religious connotations. As the reign progressed, especially with the unpopular war against France, support for Mary's religious policies declined as they were linked more closely to un-English tendencies in foreign relations.

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 most people supported the Church of England at the end of Elizabeth I's reign. [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for popular attitudes to the Church in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might base their arguments on negative factors, the failure of Catholicism and Puritanism to present a strong challenge to mainstream Anglicanism at the end of the reign. A good discussion that takes this line might be worth any mark but it is more likely that **Band I** will need something more positive on the strengths of the Church of England. The emphasis should be on the position at the end of the reign but the question allows candidates to deal with earlier developments as long as they are linked to the question. For example, the Elizabethan settlement was successful in its appeal to the majority of people; it allowed for a diversity of views and practices but not extremes. The Church continued to be a powerful institution with its courts as well as its spiritual functions. Whilst some bishops were only moderately effective (and sometimes not even that), the Church also had outstanding leaders such as Whitgift and Hooker, in his intellectual and spiritual defence of Anglicanism. Elizabeth I herself lent her full support to the Church and most people saw the Church as a guarantor of social and political order. The Church was linked with political and religious nationalism against the threat of Catholic Spain and pope. Candidates are not expected to have knowledge of developments after 1603, the end of the Study Topic and arguments that seem unaware of the revival of Puritanism under the early Stuarts should not be seen as weak. By the end of Elizabeth's reign, Puritanism was weakened by a combination of firm action from Whitgift (Court of High Commission and visitations) and internal divisions. The same factors weakened Catholicism but there was the added reason that Catholics lacked priests to maintain their faith. Official toleration allowed most Catholics to live quietly. There were evident problems within the Church of England. The general quality of the clergy remained low. There were insufficient funds to support clergy of high quality. Absenteeism was widespread. Nevertheless, there was not widespread dissatisfaction with the Church. It was more attractive than the more extreme alternatives.

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 avoiding the mistakes of Mary I was Elizabeth I's most important aim in foreign affairs when she became Queen in 1558.

[45]

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

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Study Topic begins in 1547 and candidates can be expected to have knowledge and understanding of Mary I's foreign policy. There were two linked mistakes: an unsuccessful war with France and a close alliance with Catholic Spain, of which marriage with Philip of Spain formed a part. Elizabeth had other problems that candidates can discuss. They can provide alternative explanations. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. Peace with France was concluded quickly (Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis) with the face-saving formula that France would retain Calais for eight years. It underlined her aims to avoid war if possible. In addition to her other reservations about the uncertainty of war, her finances were in a poor condition and her armed forces on land and sea were very weak. The Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis was also problematic for the Queen because it (apparently) ended Franco-Spanish rivalry that England might take advantage of. She also wished to avoid a close relationship with Spain but could not afford to be hostile. England was much weaker than Spain militarily and also depended on Spanish-controlled markets in the Netherlands for much trade. Marriage posed immediate problems but Elizabeth's aim in this, and in many aspects of policy, was to postpone a decision. Marriage with a foreign suitor might create as many problems as it solved. In terms of religion, Elizabeth favoured a Protestant settlement but not one that would alienate more powerful Catholic countries.

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

14(b) Assess the claim that trade was the most important reason for the deterioration in relations between England and Spain during the period from 1558 to 1585. [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for changes in foreign relations in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can offer different explanations for the changing relations, such as religion, the Dutch revolt or the influence of Mary Queen of Scots. However, to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on the stated factor. In 1558, at Elizabeth I's accession, England and Spain were allies, based on the marriage of Mary I and Philip of Spain. Elizabeth's accession did not change relations dramatically. Although the Queen avoided the close relationship of her sister's reign, she did not want to alienate Spain. Philip II also preferred to see England as an ally and had hopes of marriage with Elizabeth. Trade was important to England. In spite of the collapse of Antwerp as a centre of trade, the Netherlands were still a very significant market. However, the need to develop new markets led to incursions into Spain's sphere of influence in the New World. Efforts to develop alternative routes, for example a north-west and north-east passage to Asia, failed to achieve significant success. The Caribbean seemed more promising but the voyages of Hawkins and Drake set England at odds with Spain's claims to monopoly. Drake's voyage of 1577-80, followed by his knighthood symbolically on the Golden Hind, was a direct challenge to Spain in spite of Elizabeth's protestations of innocence. Religion became a factor in changing foreign relations but Philip II protected Elizabeth from the Pope's excommunication during the 1560s. The publication in 1570 of Pius V's bull (*Regnans in Excelsis*) was a significant turning point. Religion was then linked to the Dutch revolt and to succession to the English throne, with Mary, Queen of Scots in confinement in England. Philip's attitude to Mary was ambivalent. She was a Catholic queen but her French connections were a drawback to Spain. The issue was still not resolved by 1585. Elizabeth and some of her advisers were reluctant to intervene openly in the Dutch Revolt but the assassination of William of Orange (1584) seemed to threaten the survival of the Protestant cause in the Netherlands. The Treaty of Nonsuch (1585) did represent an open alliance with the Dutch rebels and was followed by a military expedition led by Leicester. Examiners will note that candidates are expected to understand Spanish policy only within the context of this English history paper.

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) How far did Elizabeth I control the House of Commons throughout her reign? [45]**

Focus: assessment of the relations between a ruler and an important political institution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. They might come to different conclusions, either that Elizabeth I remained in control except for some comparatively minor matters, or that she suffered some serious reverses in spite of generally good relations. Some would see problems as originating from the use of the Commons by privy councillors to push their views. Others might argue that the monopolies issue at the end of her reign demonstrated a weakening of control over ordinary MPs. The chronological range of the topic is wide and examiners will not expect references to every decade. More important will be the ability to consider a reasonable range of developments and issues and to show Elizabeth I's control or lack of control. The Specification refers to 'The significance of the issues of religion, the Queen's marriage, the succession, parliamentary privilege and monopolies.' The Key Issue does not include foreign policy as a factor between the Queen and Commons and answers that omit it should not be seen as incomplete, but credit will be given if valid points are made. Each of the factors mentioned in the Specification raises the question of royal control. Answers in **Band 1** can be expected to discuss a reasonable, but not necessarily a complete, range. This is a topic that is sometimes taught through the views of historians. However, AS Level does not require knowledge of historiography but accurate references should be given credit.

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

15(b) Assess the claim that, by 1603, Elizabeth I was an unpopular ruler.

[45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a ruler in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might present different arguments but the focus should be on the situation at the end of her reign. A brief comparison with Elizabeth I's popularity at the beginning of her reign can be relevant but the question does not call for a survey of the Queen's popularity throughout her reign. On the one hand, Elizabeth I remained in control; there was no realistic alternative. On the other hand, whilst Essex's rebellion was put down quite easily, it showed a gap between the monarch and some of the younger men at court. The death or retirement of her most trusted male and female associates left her isolated. But she was still the centre of the court that continued to be lively. Propaganda portrayed her as still young and vibrant and she was undoubtedly popular in the country at large. The period from 1588 was marked by serious problems at home and abroad but did not seem to impinge unduly on Elizabeth's personal popularity. The effect of her 'Golden Speech' to a deputation of the Commons (1601) showed that she could win over people. By 1603, many were waiting for her successor but not necessarily because the Queen herself was highly unpopular.

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 had the English economy by 1603 recovered from the collapse of the Antwerp cloth market? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment of economic developments in the second half of the sixteenth century.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Antwerp was an important market for the English wool and cloth trades, vital to the country's prosperity. The problems for Antwerp from the accession of Philip II, compounded by a Spanish embargo on English traders in the 1560s and the Spanish Fury (1576), therefore had a direct and serious impact on the English economy. Attempts were made to find new markets and develop new trade routes. These included enterprises to develop trade with the Baltic (Eastland Company), Muscovy (Muscovy Company) and the eastern Mediterranean (Levant Company), and the search for a passage to Asia by the north-east and north-west. At the end of the century, a charter was awarded to merchants to trade with India, the beginning of the East India Company. Reference might be made to the attempts to develop trade with the Americas, for example by Hawkins and Raleigh's Virginian settlement. The success of these ventures was limited. Some were poorly financed and organised. Some were impractical because of the nature of the geography. Selling English wool and cloth was difficult. Alternatives, such as the slave trade, failed by 1603. Spanish hostility was a serious barrier to trade with the more prosperous parts of the Americas.

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

**16(b) How far did industry and agriculture change during the period from 1547 to 1603?
Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: assessment of the extent of industrial and agricultural change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can write very negative answers and deserve high credit. A case can be made that changes in both industry and agriculture were of limited extent. On the other hand, they might judge that there were some significant changes. In industry, the Specification mentions mining and manufacture. Coal was more important especially to supply the needs of the fashion for building and re-building the houses of the wealthy. Metal manufactures increased as well as the production of more luxury goods. Such developments went alongside a loosening of the control of the older guilds. Joint-stock companies were formed. Manufacturing and mining were seen as means to combat the effects of inflation. In agriculture, there were changes as some new vegetables and fruits were grown, again to supply the wealthy. Some landowners who were anxious to maximise profits were willing to adopt new farming methods. Yet overall, the picture remained largely unchanged. Industry was very localised and did not have an impact on most of the population. The pattern of agriculture was mostly the same.

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 James I's peaceful foreign policy was unpopular. [45]**Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the reactions to a ruler's foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might be expected to discuss in particular James I's attitude to the Thirty Years' War and proposals for the marriage of Prince Charles. One would expect answers in **Band I** and probably **Band II** to look more widely. For example, the peace with Spain agreed in 1604 might be considered. With hindsight, it seems a sensible decision to end an unwinnable and expensive war but there was opposition to the peace at the time especially from merchants who were taking advantage of the war to trade with Spain possessions in the Americas. They would be excluded when peace was agreed. Raleigh's fate can be considered. A badly planned and executed expedition ended in failure but his death made James I unpopular. The influence of Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador, was thought excessive and against English interests. There was widespread sympathy for the Protestants at the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War for religious reasons and also because of the involvement of James I's daughter, Elizabeth. The King's attempt to be even-handed seemed indecisive to those who favoured active intervention and a clearer anti-Catholic / Habsburg policy. By the end of the reign Charles and Buckingham were probably more responsible for the abortive marriage negotiations with Spain but James's reputation was still affected. His late and reluctant agreement to intervene in the Thirty Years' War did little to restore his reputation in foreign affairs. However, candidates might argue that he was misjudged. His aims may well have been wiser than those who supported more vigorous intervention on behalf of the Protestant cause.

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

17(b) Assess the claim that James I and Charles I were mainly responsible for religious divisions in the country during the period from 1603 to 1629. [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for religious divisions in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might disagree and argue that other factors or people were more responsible than the early Stuarts for the religious divisions. This alternative approach will be valid but, however candidates tackle the Question, they will need to consider both sides for a mark in **Band I**. Criticism of James I and Charles I might include their insensitive handling of differing views. They tended to dismiss all of these as Presbyterian and hostile to Anglicanism. The ejection of Puritan clergy early in James I's reign was unpopular. Marriage negotiations involving Charles and successive Catholic princesses in Spain and France were badly judged because they were bound to arouse hostility. For James I, it might be argued that there were already religious divisions in England when he acceded to the throne. The Millenary Petition was evidence of this. Although the Hampton Court Conference (1604) failed to reconcile differences, assessments of the King's role vary. Some would argue that he jumped too quickly to condemn reformers whilst others believe that he went as far as he could. James I's controversial foreign policy was intended to achieve peace in Europe. From the beginning of his reign, Charles I was involved in controversy over religion. With the support of Charles I, Laud (Bishop of London) was a rising force especially with the suspension of the moderate Archbishop Abbot. One of the Three Resolutions (1629) concerned innovations in religion, specifying Arminianism and popery.

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) Assess the reasons why relations between Charles I and Parliament broke down during the period from 1640 to 1642. [45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for differences between King and Parliament in the period before a civil war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might give different weight to developments before 1640. Some might sum up the position in 1640 quickly to focus on 1640-42. Others might spend more time explaining how and why tensions built up from 1629, the beginning of the Study Topic. Both can be valid approaches. However, the temptation in the second approach is to provide broad surveys that explain generally why relations were poor between Charles I and the Long Parliament. Because of the dates in the Question and its slant, marks in **Bands I** and **II** will need evidence of a clear understanding of developments in the specified period. Many candidates might miss the significance of the Short Parliament. This will be a gap but not of sufficient importance to make a great difference in the mark. It might prevent an answer gaining a very high mark in **Band I** but otherwise might be ignored. Examiners will look for answers that consider the responsibility of both parties. An alternative approach might to allocate blame to one only but it will be difficult to frame an excellent answer on this basis. However, candidates are not required to provide an even balance; the balance of the answers will depend on the argument. A strongly pro-Parliament essay with some awareness of the King's role, or vice-versa, can merit any mark. For Charles I, it might be claimed that he faced a very difficult situation because the Short Parliament, and then the Long Parliament, denied him funds for an army to put down the Scottish invasion. He agreed to the abolition of major prerogative courts, such as High Commission and Star Chamber. He agreed not only to the dismissal but even to the execution of Strafford. His critics made increasingly unreasonable demands culminating in the Grand Remonstrance and there were fears that there might be proceedings against the Queen. He sought to defend Anglicanism, the religion of the majority, against those who were influenced by radical religious opinions. The leadership of the opposition became dominated by extremists whilst many moderate critics were ultimately to become supporters of Charles I. For Parliament, it might be argued that the King was untrustworthy. There were fears that he would withdraw his concessions if he were in a position to do so. His tendency to despotism was proved by his personal rule from 1629. His interpretation of Anglicanism was too Catholic and he was strongly influenced by his Catholic Queen. There were suspicions that he might use an army, ostensibly raised to restore order in Ireland, to put down dissent in England. The attempted arrest of the Five Members confirmed the worst suspicions of the King's despotic tendencies.

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

18(b) Assess the problems that faced Charles I in fighting the First Civil War. [45]

Focus: assessment of the problems of one of the participating groups in a civil war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can consider the strengths of the parliamentarians as a problem that faced the Charles I but answers will need some clear assessments of Charles I and the royalists themselves to reach **Band II**. Although he controlled much of England in 1642, his armies were divided. So were Parliament's forces but the royalists never achieved the cohesion of the New Model Army later in the war. At the beginning of the conflict, the royalists probably had the more effective generals, especially Prince Rupert, but Charles I was a poor strategist and he could not find men as able as Fairfax and Cromwell. The royalists became short of money. Charles I was forced to rely on short-term and unreliable expedients, whereas Parliament's resources proved greater, especially through Pym's expedients. The King did not have control of the navy and found it difficult to bring in supplies. He lacked allies. Ireland was a potential source of support but Irish troops would be unpopular whereas Parliament's alliance with the Scots (Solemn League and Covenant) threatened the King's previously strong position in the north and the Scots were not unpopular allies. High credit should be given to candidates who point out that Charles I's problems became more apparent later in the war. Earlier, his armies had a number of successes. They advanced from the north under Newcastle and were successful in the west until the siege of Gloucester. However, time was not on their side. The royalists were incapable of achieving the discipline that was to serve their enemies so well. Reference might be made to the key defeats at Marston Moor (1644) and Naseby (1645).

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 the Rump lost the support of the army from 1649 to 1653.****[45]**

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

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners might read different sorts of alternative approaches. One might be the argument that the Rump never enjoyed the support of the army. Cromwell and his fellow officers regarded it as a temporary measure that would put a priority on making a permanent settlement and then disappear. Some candidates might argue that the Rump was mostly responsible for its failure whilst another view might be that Cromwell and the army treated the Rump harshly. Immediately after the execution of Charles I, Cromwell and the army were occupied with Ireland and Scotland. This removed somewhat Cromwell's direct influence on the Rump. The army accused the Rump of being slow to introduce religious and governmental reforms. There was little sympathy between the army leaders and the Parliamentarians. Controversy developed over the issue of elections. Foreign policy, especially the war with the United Provinces, was controversial. There are differences of opinions about the Rump's intentions and attitude to perpetuation. Some might criticise the Rump for corruption but others might disagree. There are also differences over Cromwell's intentions, whether the dissolution of the Rump was a sudden or a considered decision. AS Level does not require knowledge of historiography but accurate references should be given credit.

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

19(b) 'Oliver Cromwell's failures were more important than his successes.' Assess this view of domestic policy during the Protectorate (1653-58). [45]

Focus: assessment of a claim about a ruler's problems.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Alternative approaches might be based on the primacy of success or failure but the Question excludes foreign policy. A brief reference to foreign policy as a comparison in an introduction or conclusion might be admissible but only domestic policy can be part of the main argument. Candidates might consider Cromwell's attempt to win widespread support for his republican government, his relations with Parliament and religion. The Specification does not refer to the economy and its omission should not affect the mark that is awarded. It might be claimed that Cromwell did not create a wide base of support. He did not reconcile royalists and increased the divisions among republicans, some of whom became disillusioned with his apparent betrayal of the 'Good Old Cause'. The Humble Petition and Advice satisfied few and alienated others; it did not win over supporters of Charles II. He did not work with any of his Parliaments in spite of (or partly because of?) interference with elections. There have been criticisms that he was a poor manager of Parliament. He was reliant on the army with consequent unpopularity, for example the period of rule through the Major Generals. There were problems over the settlement of religion and the extent of religious toleration. He did not leave a confident succession. On the other hand, Cromwell did not face very serious challenges to his power. The active royalists were kept in check and risings were suppressed quite easily (for example Penruddock). He went further than most of his contemporaries in extending toleration, accepting private worship by Anglicans and even Catholics. Jews were readmitted to England. The future was uncertain in 1658 but he still towered above his contemporaries. It might be argued in his favour that his achievements should be seen in the context of very considerable problems. There were challenges from royalist and republican factions whilst in religion it was probably impossible to reconcile very different opinions that were deeply held.

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) Why did London continue to be important during the period from 1603 to 1660?
Explain your answer.**

[45]

Focus: assessment of the reasons for London's importance in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Specification refers to 'Growth in the population and the spread of London: building, the Court, fashion, the seat of Parliament and the law, commercial and financial activity, a centre of conspicuous consumption.' Answers in **Band I** will not be expected to discuss all of these issues but should demonstrate a broad base of understanding. London was by far the largest town in England in the first half of the seventeenth century with perhaps a quarter of million inhabitants. Important towns of the second order such as Bristol and Norwich were far smaller. This gave it a social and economic importance. It was a magnet for English trade over a wide area. For example, there was a thriving coal trade from the north east. It was the base for the imports and exports of international merchants. It was also a centre of wealth even for the poorest, who saw opportunities for improvement there. The wealthiest kept town houses as well as their country estates. It was important in art and culture. London was the base of the Court and government. It can be argued that the most important political developments during the period took place in London or depended on London. For example, Parliament's grip on London was an important factor in the outcome of the First Civil War.

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

20(b) To what extent was religion the main reason for the witchcraze during the period from 1603 to 1660? [45]

Focus: assessment of reasons for a controversial development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might offer alternative explanations but should consider religion as a factor. Answers that plump for religion and ignore others (the Question asks 'How far...?') will find it difficult to get beyond **Band II**. Also to reach **Band I**, answers will need to include a sound paragraph on religion as the stated factor. As for religion, there might have been a link between belief in witchcraft and some Puritan areas. Prosecutions increased until the 1640s. It might have been a reaction against some of the more rational or scientific ideas that were spreading or a perverse reaction to the formalism that seemed to be pervading the Church. Social issues such as poverty might be examined. Those accused of witchcraft were usually from the poorer groups in rural society. Individuals were often isolated, especially single women. But this was not necessarily so and, whilst poverty was universal, witch hunts seem to have been limited to some regions such as East Anglia. It is not clear why other poor, even poorer, regions were comparatively free. Nor was belief in witchcraft confined to the lower orders. James I brought a belief in witches from Scotland and his first Parliament agreed to enforce stiffer anti-witchcraft measures that were enforced enthusiastically by some judges and magistrates.

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****1 The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783 – 1830****1(a) How serious a threat was posed by the Radicals to Pitt's governments during the period to 1801? Explain your answer.**

Focus: An evaluation of the seriousness of the radical threat to Pitt's governments.

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

Candidates will need to examine the government's perception of the threat, how dangerous radical methods could be and the extent of their support. Much might depend on developments in the French revolution. During peacetime (1789-92) this could be more serious if focused on Parliamentary reform and Whig pressure but once war was declared Pitt could rely on loyalty, propertied support and an identification of Jacobins with the Radicals. Radical threats could only be serious if a French invasion was likely (1799) or if naval mutiny (1797) had got out of hand. Candidates could also point to Pitt's anti radical legislation, which was clearly targeted to hinder radical methods, but if the focus is exclusively on Pitt's approach, the candidate might not be able to go beyond Band II. Government took the radical message of the Rights of Man (universal suffrage and an end to old corruption) very seriously, particularly its perceived spread to artisans and ordinary people. They especially feared the emergence of a national movement based on an urban, educated, artisan leadership via organisations like the London Corresponding Societies, whose meetings and pamphlets were curbed by legislation between 1793 and 1795. Radical leadership could be effective (Paine, Cartwright, Tooke and Jebb), their methods problematical for government (debate, pamphlets, a seditious press, correspondence and open-air protest in 1793 and 1795). They could attract potentially powerful allies (from Radical MPs in Parliament and London artisans to well connected and organised Dissenters and Unitarians) and on some issues attract a much wider audience (Parliamentary Reform, anti Slavery etc.). When this coincided with trading or harvest problems, as in 1794-5 the situation was serious. Yet candidates could also point to local elites using Church and King mobs to threaten Radicals and attack Meeting Houses, and to anti – French sentiments. Pitt's dominance of Parliament remained unthreatened, whilst Radical numbers remained relatively small. Once government targeted their literacy based methods Radicals found it difficult to develop new organisation and found themselves driven underground after 1795. Plotting proved a dead end and was very open to spies.

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

1(b) How liberal were the policies of Lord Liverpool, Huskisson and Peel in the Tory governments from 1822 to 1830? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An assessment of the policies of Liverpool, Huskisson and Peel 1822 – 30.

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

Candidates will need to address what could be defined as liberal at the time (moderate reform, a freer trade, catholic and dissenter emancipation and possibly some parliamentary reform). Another way of approaching this is to look at the influence of liberal thinkers – Ricardo and Smith on the economy, Malthus and Bentham on administrative and social issues. How influential were these on Liverpool, Peel and Huskisson? Effective candidates will produce a balanced response. It could be argued that Liverpool was the least liberal. He was in no hurry to rush emancipation, (kept an Open Question) opposed even moderate parliamentary reform (East Retford) and took little interest in legal issues or those involving labourers or artisans but he was prepared to consider liberalising the economy, reducing protection and took an intelligent view on finance and tax. He was prepared to promote other liberal Tories, notably Canning, Robinson and Peel. Peel was in some respects a hard-line Tory, especially on religious, constitutional and Irish questions. He was reluctant to follow liberal opinion on Catholic emancipation, although when appealed to by Wellington he saw it through. Yet candidates could point to his support of a liberal commercial policy and to his rationalisation of legal and administration affairs in a new Penal Code (done for liberal reasons or to gain more effective punishments?). Peel also introduced the Metropolitan Police, hardly seen as liberal at the time. Huskisson, it could be argued, was more liberal in his policies, being driven out of the Board of Trade by Wellington in 1828. Economically he can be credited with Tariff reductions, with allowing colonies to trade with other nations, a revised Corn Law in 1822 and with new schemes on finance and currency in 1827-28. As a Canningite his star waned after 1828 but candidates could stress that Huskisson was more of a Pittite Tory than a liberal. Better candidates will observe that all were more liberal on financial and economic issues than political and constitutional ones; all came from a non-noble background and had risen as part of an administrative elite at the beginning of the 19th century. They can be seen to be rational in either a Tory or a liberal sense.

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

2. War and Peace 1793 – 1841

2(a) To what extent were its financial strength and subsidies to allies the most important factors in Britain's eventual victory in the French Wars of 1793 – 1815? [45]

Focus: An evaluation of finance and subsidy as the key factor in Britain's victory 1793 – 1815.

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

Candidates will need to balance finance and subsidy against other strategies, naval, military, diplomat and trading although effective ones should point to the connections between these. The war lasted a long time, thus pointing to the relative strengths of the combatants. Economic resources played an important role for Britain and her government's ability to tap these conventionally (as opposed to Napoleonic looting and reparations) played an important role. Britain, relatively, possessed great trading wealth and could subsidise allies to stay in the fight. Her credit enabled loans to be raised more effectively than France and her allies. The war cost Britain an unprecedented £1,039 million but Pitt introduced Income Tax in 1798, and went off the gold standard to print money in 1797 without national finances collapsing. The final coalition that defeated Napoleon, 1813-15, was backed by a £26 million subsidy. Candidates could demonstrate its importance by stressing Napoleon's recognition of this in the Continental system, an attempt to destroy trade, the source of British wealth. Taxes fell on the wealthier classes in Britain and they paid both traditional and new taxes, raising three times as much as their enemy, France.

Yet candidates could play this down as, before 1813, British subsidies failed to keep allies in the field who became notorious for taking the money and then dealing with Napoleon. The Navy was often self financing in this period and, at least initially, had been run down. However once it achieved dominance after 1805 it could not achieve victory on the European mainland. Nonetheless its securing of trade did ensure that Napoleon could not easily disrupt British finance yet Britain could inflict economic damage on him. Military Britain's peninsular commitment after 1807 did pay dividends, providing an invasion base in 1813 and diplomatic clout. Here a focus on the final stages may help candidates focus on the most important factors. They may well conclude that military, naval, diplomatic and financial factors all needed to be applied to achieve final victory and even then more may be owed to Napoleon's own mistakes after 1812, than to British strategy.

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

2(b) How successful was Castlereagh in securing an effective peace for Britain during the period from 1814 to 1822? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of Castlereagh's success in securing an effective peace for Britain.

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

Candidates need to demonstrate an understanding of what an effective peace might mean and they could refer with profit to the extent of strategic security obtained, to trade, to naval power, and to the extent a balance of power had been achieved to prevent the necessity of more intervention and thus create the condition for secure trade. Note could also be made of progress in stamping out the slave trade, of particular concern to Castlereagh himself. These need to be directly related to Castlereagh's actions and their success evaluated. Candidates could include his role in creating the conditions to defeat Napoleon, especially the Treaty of Chaumont, but a particular focus is expected on the Vienna Settlement and the controversial Congress System. His creative diplomacy was effective but 'Vienna' and the Congress System (his own initiative) were criticised by many as being too generous to both France and Russia, overburdening Austria and over committing Britain to potential European commitment. Against this can be set the achievement of a lasting peace throughout the period and beyond. Yet he allowed the Holy Alliance to emerge, which threatened British interests in Europe and saw his Congress System hijacked by Russia. He was forced to effectively withdraw by 1819. Was he wise to insist on the restoration of the Bourbons in France or were they in fact the 'faithful servants of Britain' in the post war period? Was a united Netherlands or restoration Italy an effective barrier to France? Colonially did Britain gain the overseas monopoly she had pursued in the 18th century? In South America did Castlereagh let British interests drift by not recognising newly independent states? Was he muddled or sensible over emerging problems in Greece? Nonetheless, his guidelines at Vienna, and later in the 1820 State Paper, were followed by later foreign secretaries. Effective candidates will produce a balanced assessment of his ability to secure an effective peace.

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

3. The Age of Peel 1829 - 1846

3(a) How far would you agree that Peel's Irish policies failed during the period from 1829 to 1846? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: an evaluation of Peel's Irish policies 1829 – 1846

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

Peel was determined to maintain the 1800 Act of Union but faced revived discontent in Ireland that was able, under O'Connell's leadership, to organise effectively to campaign firstly for Catholic emancipation in 1829, then Irish reform under the Whigs and finally, via the National Repeal Association, for repeal itself in the 1840s. He faced religious, economic and political opposition within Ireland but was determined to stabilise Ireland, enforcing law and order. Candidates will need to point to his mixed record here. Challenging the assertion, they could point to the preservation of the Union, to a curbing of both the Catholic Association in 1829 and the NRA in 1843. Peel could be given credit for seeing the keys to Irish stability, the Catholic Church, the tenant farmer and the small Irish middle class and in trying to appeal to them. They could also stress his successful establishment of an Irish police force and to a reasonable and appropriate handling of the first stages of the Irish Famine in 1845 – 46. No one starved under Peel's administration and he provided for cheaper Indian maize to be imported and the Corn Laws to be repealed, more as a symbolic gesture in Ireland's case. However he failed to prevent Catholic emancipation in 1829 and indeed presided over the Act, almost ruining his future career in the process. From 'Orange Peel' he became the traitor to the Protestant Constitution in the eyes of many on the mainland. Arguably, it contributed to the break up of the Tories and more power for O'Connell in the 1830s. In the 1840s his attempts to defuse economic and religious tension in Ireland by wooing key groups failed. The Devon Commission's findings on Irish Land were put in a Bill but stood little chance in the Lords so the attempt to appease tenant farmers failed. The attempt to gain some influence over Catholic priests, seen as the key to O'Connell's Associations, in the Maynooth Bill was even more controversial. It was seen as subsidising Catholic education. The sums were too small to 'buy' influence whilst the political resentment caused within Toryism was counter productive. Similarly, the attempt to reform Irish Universities also failed. What remained was, arguably, more coercive and repressive (removing Irish freeholders from the electorate in 1829). Candidates may conclude either way on Peel's Irish record. Certainly many Tories considered his Irish policies dangerous failures but the Union survived and emancipation was conceded.

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

3(b) How far do you agree that the Anti-Corn Law League was the most important reason for the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846? Explain your answer. [45]

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

Candidates will need to consider a variety of reasons for Corn Law Repeal. Peel's own free trade economic policies, the food supply situation in the 1840s, Britain's urbanising and industrialising position, and the Irish famine. Nevertheless there needs to be a focus on the relative importance of the Anti Corn Law League in repeal and candidates may either emphasise or minimise its role. For the former they could point to Peel himself who acknowledged, in the Common's debate in 1846, that all was owed to Cobden. The League's focus on the one great objective of Repeal and its popularisation of the free trade arguments helped to convince propertied opinion in the towns. Urban businessmen were attracted by its efficiency and organisation. Its wealth was used effectively; its focus was on the corruption of aristocratic landed government. Its leaders (Cobden, Bright, Wilson and Potter) were effective in portraying the issue as a struggle between land and industry, using emotive references like 'Bread Tax' and building up a legitimate extra parliamentary pressure group. Its propaganda (the magazine the 'League', its lecturers and ambitious electoral strategy in putting forward candidates in high profile by-elections) made free trade the issue of the 1840s. However, this picture can be challenged by stressing that the number of MPs gained were few, that by focussing on class issues they firmly alienated Peel who was reluctant to take up Corn Law Repeal whilst the League remained high profile (1839 – 43). He waited until they were in decline, in 1845, before acting. Wheat prices had dropped from their 70 shilling a quarter peak in 1839 to 30 shillings in 1845, making it more difficult for League speakers to argue the laws were keeping corn prices artificially high. Most MPs were traditional and landed. Repeal was obtained through Peelite and Whig votes; the Lords gave in to a mixture of Wellington, the Whigs and royal influence. Peel acted to vindicate his own free trade belief and further cheapen costs. He was concerned with consular reports of European grain deficits and it is clear that repeal was done on his own terms, against Cabinet advice. He clearly paid the price for it. The League antagonised the Chartists, who feared their motive was lower wages and provoked the creation of the Anti League when the campaign was taken to the Counties. The issue of wage levels helped Peel delay the decision to 1845. As for the Irish famine, it was more likely just an excuse for acting. Certainly, no Irish were fed through repeal.

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

4. The Economy and Industrialisation 1780 – 1846

4(a) Assess the view that trade was the most important explanation for industrial growth during the period from 1780 to 1846. [45]

Focus: an assessment of the role of trade in explaining industrial growth.

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

Candidates will need to compare trade with other factors explaining industrial growth, such as demand, urbanisation, capital, mechanisation and transport developments. This is a wide ranging question so detailed or complete coverage is not expected, provided there are some comparisons made. Trade can be both domestic and overseas. Domestically population was expanding enormously, providing markets for coal, textiles (especially woollens and stockings) and iron. Overseas Britain had a commanding lead throughout the period. This was particularly the case in India, the Americas and in Europe where the middle-man role saw huge profit (the re-exporting of primary and secondary goods from the rest of the world to Europe). The French Wars of 1793 – 1815 reinforced this global advantage. Trade enabled raw materials, new markets and growing capital to generate industrial change. Certainly, in the 18th century Britain was known, primarily, as a trading and commercial nation, it's Companies (East and West) very much to the fore. Many candidates will conclude that it was the most important factor, at least until growing industrialisation from the 1820s, but they can point to the difficulty of demonstrating the links between trade and decisions on industrial production. In the 1780s the value of trade overseas fell, just when industrial growth quickened into 'take off'. Were the profits of trade channelled into industry or into the purchase of land and luxuries? Did transport and the industrial changes there (railways from the 1820s) reflect trade or become an industry in their own right? Better candidates will be aware of chronological and geographical nuances and the specific differences between particular industries (sugar and cotton for example, the former having less of an industrial impact than the latter). Some may conclude that demand was the key and all else merely served this, in which case they will need to look to rising incomes, urbanisation or even link them back to the profits of trade.

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 the popular response to economic change was mostly political during the period from 1780 to 1846.’ [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the popular response to economic change 1780 – 1846

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

Candidates may see the response as mostly political if their focus is on the activities of the radicals in the 1790s, 1810s and 1837-46. Artisan leaders had long focused on two key issues to tackle the growing economic problems – parliamentary reform and old corruption. This increased after 1800 when Parliament was seen as an arena of rich men who dismantled the Hanoverian welfare state (and its social obligations) replacing it with a New Poor Law, who removed worker protection by repealing the Statute of Artificers thus encouraging de-skilling and maintaining the legal repression of ‘combinations’ between 1795 and 1824 and who artificially protected land in the 1815 Corn Law at the expense of higher bread prices. The answer was to reform Parliament and widen the franchise via political meetings, petitions, campaigns etc. It was the focus of Paine in the 1790s, of Hunt in the 1810s and of the Chartist Leaders in the 1840s. The French Revolution merely added to an English ‘libertarian’ drive. Stephen’s ‘Knife and Fork’ economic issues were to have political solutions and expressions. However not all took a focussed political view of economic change or thought that Parliament was the key to addressing economic issues. Many popular responses took more direct forms or, as better candidates might indicate, adopted more direct economist strategies. The Luddites in 1812-13 took direct action against de-skilling machines; Enclosure riots like Captain Swing in 1830 took similar action against hedging. ‘Combinations’ had, as their focus, direct negotiation with factory owners over hours and conditions. Robert Owen, the Fieldens and others promoted improved factory environments, with Owen stressing a new Co-operative community at New Lanark that saw improved housing, education and the ending of the Truck Systems. Often direct action was taken against the new Workhouses in the North; over the call for 10 hours via the Short Time Committees. Educationally the Ragged Schools and others were set up to provide a distinctly working class education. Candidates can thus challenge the view that popular response was political. In many cases it was more economic and direct, despite the focus of many radical ‘leaders’.

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

Britain 1846 – 1906**5. Whigs and Liberals 1846 – 1874**

5(a) Assess the view that free trade was the most important reason for the emergence of the Liberal party during the period from 1846 to 1868. [45]

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for the emergence of the Liberal party to 1868.

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

Candidates will need to demonstrate the importance of Free Trade to the Liberal party in the period. It united all the component groups and proved problematic for many Tories who, at least until 1853, remained committed to various forms of protection. It united both Whigs (who had presided over key stages of it in the late 1840s) and Peelites (for whom it was a key article of faith, one of whose leaders, Gladstone, was a key exponent and architect of it in the budgets of 1853, 1860 and 1861). The Radicals were now more middle-class and had cut their teeth on this issue in the Anti Corn Law league. Cobden was used by Gladstone to forge a free-trade treaty with France in 1860. Electorally Free trade was highly successful – low taxation, expanding trade, retrenchment and low costs. It made Whig-Liberal groupings winners of all the elections to 1868. It appealed to key groups – upper working class artisans, Nonconformists, business, the larger town and cities. However whilst it is possible to see it as ‘the’ uniting issue it is possible to stress other factors as more important, especially as there was no ‘Free Trade’ reason why a specific liberal party should emerge in 1859. Free trade was not threatened at that point and existing coalition could easily continue. Here candidates might stress the Willis Room Meeting in 1859, the ostensible founding of the party. This was simply the result of a meeting of Liberals and Radicals to agree upon a set of tactics to bring down Derby’s minority government. Thus specific moments like this could be just as important. ‘Liberal’ could also be a term that enabled a wide group of people to act together appealing to a broader range of opinion than just the Whigs. Candidates could also cite foreign policy as a reason, especially for ‘1859’ when agreement over support for Italian Unification was in evidence. However this could equally be a source of contention and division (Gladstone and Bright v. Palmerston over issues like the Crimean War, China and defence). Ireland could be cited in the late 1860s as an issue uniting and consolidating the liberal Party, or at least Disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1868 – 69. However, by the early 1870s it divided more than it united. Some could also point to Disraeli and the Tories as the key to the emergence of a Liberal Party in that they polarised opinions. Others could see Gladstone or Palmerston as the key factor in creating a liberal Party from 1859. Better answers will compare the various points, aware that there was considerable breadth of opinion beneath the ‘party’ label.

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

5(b) 'Unpopular foreign policies, popular domestic policies.' How far do you agree with this view of Gladstone's government from 1868 to 1874? (Consider Ireland as a domestic issue in your answer.) [45]

Focus: an evaluation of Gladstone's first administration

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

Candidates are likely to agree with the assertion, at least with its view that foreign policy was unpopular, although better candidates could point to the difficulty of assessing this and to an over reliance on Disraeli's critique of it in 1872 and 1874. In 1870 Gladstone was criticised for inactivity over the Franco Prussian War, the Paris Commune and Russia's overthrow of the Black Sea clauses. It appeared Britain was of little account in European affairs, Gladstone preferring to involve a Concert of Europe and to arbitrate, a policy confirmed by the unpopular Alabama arbitration. On the Empire the government was criticised for withdrawing troops and abandoning Gambia but equally such actions were popular amongst radicals and nonconformists, whilst white self government for the new Dominions was cost effective. In the Ashanti War in 1873 the Empire was defended and extended. Domestic policies were more mixed and here candidates can point to areas of both popularity and unpopularity. The vast majority of the electorate regarded Irish disestablishment favourably but were indifferent or hostile to the Land Act and the discredited Universities Bill. Administratively and in relation to 'merit' Gladstone did much (the Army Reforms and the Civil Service) but such matters were rarely popular per se. Education proved a landmark for the working class but alienated Anglicans and Nonconformists. On Trade Unions the Reforms of 1871 stopped short of giving skilled workers the legal assurances they wanted on picketing but they remained integral parts of Gladstone's Liberalism. More unpopular was the Licensing Act of 1872 which failed to satisfy Nonconformist temperance groups and alienated ordinary workers who felt they were unfairly restricted in their drinking time. Free Trade and finance was popular with the limited electorate of the time, although some might point to the debacle over the Match Tax, whilst the Secret Ballot Act was genuinely popular with most in the urban areas. Candidates could also point out that, beyond administrative measures, little was done on health, housing and urban conditions. Whether this was popular or not was a moot point. Certainly 'interference' appeared to be resented in whatever form. Examiners are to expect a focus more on domestic policies but a failure to mention one or the other (foreign or domestic) will confine a candidate to a high Band III.

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

6. The Conservatives 1846 – 1880

6(a) ‘Popular pressure was the main reason for parliamentary reform in 1867.’ How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for parliamentary reform in 1867.

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

Popular pressure could be seen as the main reason especially that of the skilled upper working class in the New Model Union and the Reform League. Its pressure combined with the more moderate and northern middle class Reform Union, whose views had become more widespread even in Tory groups (a Bill had been proposed by the Derby government in 1858), may have encouraged Disraeli and Derby into adopting reform as a future strategy for consolidating and building Conservative strength. Both organisations were respectable and convinced many that the skilled artisans who fell below the £10 1832 line were no danger to the constitution. The Hyde Park Riots may well have triggered Tory reform but this had already been initiated by Russell’s Liberal government in 1866. Popular pressure could have been the spur to the inclusion of all householders and lodgers. Candidates could also cite the Sheffield Outrages as an example of popular pressure although the connection with parliamentary reform is difficult to demonstrate. Some candidates could well downplay popular pressure. British governments had a tradition of resisting popular demands and those of 1866 – 67 were not especially strong. The Hyde Park Riots caused comment because of poor crowd control and, like the Outrages and the Bank collapse, there is little to link them to decisions to introduce reform or make it more radical. Whilst the Reform Union was satisfied (the price of Radical support in the Commons) the Reform League was not. Working men remained Liberal and there is little evidence of Disraeli’s succumbing to bargains with workers. More weight might thus be put on Gladstone and Disraeli’s parliamentary and electoral manoeuvring (obtaining a majority for the Bill), hence the flexibility on clauses. Disraeli sought deals with all but Gladstone, who was forced into trying rent / rates as a means of dealing with the potential numbers involved in universal household suffrage. Other motives would be Gladstone’s desire to succeed to Russell and Disraeli’s to Derby and to the latter’s desire to secure Conservative rural influences (few changes here and little redistribution) from a would be liberal reform. The main reason was therefore the opportunity for both parties to redraw and reconfirm the political landscape in their respective interests, personal and political.

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

6(b) 'The domestic reforms of Disraeli's Second Ministry (1874 – 80) were limited in their impact.' How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: an assessment of the impact of Disraeli's domestic reforms 1874 – 1880

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

The domestic reforms have been controversial. On the one hand the largest instalment of social reform of any 19th century government but on the other limited in approach and impact. Those who wish to argue for extent can develop the initial point, stressing Disraeli's emphasis in his 1872 speeches on the health of the nation and the 'elevation of the condition of the people'. Cross, as Home Secretary, worked hard to produce the Artisan's Dwelling Act, the Public Health Act and the Sale of Food and Drugs Act. The former on Housing and the latter on Food were new departures. On Education the reinforcement of attendance at Board Schools made '1870' a reality. On Trade Unions the Employers' and Workmen's Act and the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act was a radical departure from existing practice, putting employers and employees on an equal legal footing and freeing trade unions from the threat of persecution if strike action was taken. In these areas the impact was considerable. Against that candidates could point to the limitations, especially in practice. Disraeli was long on rhetoric, short on practical detail. Little was done to increase the role of the State, whether administratively or by extended taxation. Disraeli's government remained wedded to *laissez-faire* and to the liberal principle of permissive legislation, which virtually guaranteed a piecemeal impact for the Dwelling's Act. Powers here were extensive but only 10 out of 87 local authorities chose to use them by 1881. The Public Health Act largely confirmed the administrative structures created by previous liberal governments. Local authorities could act if they wished but medical officers were skeletal in number, their tasks prodigious, whilst food analysts did not have to be appointed. They faced an anti-State working class who shared with governments the view that cleanliness was far too expensive and middle class local officials far too intrusive. In education attendance was tackled largely to ensure Anglican Schools could compete with Urban Board Schools and prevent the invasion of the latter into conservative counties. Plimsoll's Merchant Shipping had a limited effect whilst a River's Pollution Act was in practice a watered-down version of the original bill. After 1875 there was little domestic legislation.

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

7. Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846 – 1902

7(a) How similar for Britain were the issues involved in the Crimean War (1854 – 56) and the Balkan Crises (1875 – 78)? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: a comparison of the issues involved in the Crimean War and the Balkan Crises

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

Candidates are likely to see the key similarity in the concern to **check Russian power**. There was general agreement in the 1850s and 1870s that Russia should not be allowed to gain at the expense of a weakening Ottoman Empire. Such gain could be via influence at Constantinople, by Black Sea annexation or through Russian puppets (the 'Big' Bulgaria of San Stefano in 1878) or by the penetration of Russian naval power into the Eastern Mediterranean. This would upset the balance of power and threaten British Trade Routes, more especially so in the later 1870s (Suez Canal) than the 1850s. In this sense the issues involved in the Eastern Question did not change and nor did government division over how best to handle it. Some argued that the Ottomans should be backed and encouraged to reform, others that deals should be struck with Austria, Russia and France to secure stable succession states that would not be beholden to any particular great power. Candidates however could point to important **differences**. Britain was able to overcome previous suspicions in 1854 and sign an alliance with France to curb Russian expansion. This wartime alliance, later expanded to include Austria, Sweden and Piedmont – Sardinia, was crucial in 1854-6 but in the 1870s France had been defeated and Disraeli had to threaten Russia with war on his own. This occasioned the resignation of Derby for whom this was far too dangerous an act. The Balkan Crisis also involved new issues for Britain. The Crimean War was mainly about preserving the **balance of power** and preventing the Russian Navy entering the Mediterranean but by 1875 **moral and national** factors had emerged, especially in Bosnia, Bulgaria and Serbia. Candidates might identify a similarity in the **Christian issues** involved (the Holy Places in 1853 / 54) and the Turkish massacre of Bulgarian Christians in 1876 following the national rebellion of 1875. Turkish 'misbehaviour' towards its Christian subjects was much more of an issue in the 1870s, than in the 1850s. Gladstone's pamphlet posed the issue of Turkish misrule very starkly and made it difficult for Disraeli to continue to shore-up the Ottoman Empire. Thus British involvement became more complex, as Gladstone's policy implied a war against the Turks rather than the Russians and raised the issue of Christian Britain supporting nations struggling to be free. Unlike 1854 Britain avoided war, but like the Crimea other nations rallied to pressure Russia diplomatically into a settlement. Britain assumed more responsibility for defending the Ottomans (Cyprus and the Asian frontier) but unlike the Crimea Britain had failed to seal off the Dardenelles as a naval access route. Candidates could also comment on the respective roles of the **Concert of Europe in 1854** (which Britain supported) and the **Dreikaiserbund** (which she did not). Better candidates will be aware of the different political circumstances (Aberdeen and Palmerston; Disraeli, Derby and Salisbury). A focus just on the Crimea or Balkan crisis will limit a candidate to Band III at best.

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 humanitarian and missionary activity in creating a larger African Empire for Britain during the period from 1868 to 1902? [45]

Focus: an assessment of the factors creating an African Empire 1868 to 1902

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

Candidates will need to put humanitarian and missionary activity into perspective. It is likely that they will see other factors as being of greater importance, especially from the 1870s onwards when other European powers extended their interests and strategic and economic activity became of increasing importance. Throughout the period there were strong humanitarian and Christian influences at work. Social Darwinian beliefs stressed the duty to educate non-European peoples. The British Empire League encouraged this. Exploration of the 'Dark Continent' played a key role in central southern Africa. Imperialists at home were in no doubt of the White Man's burden and the need for missions to civilise and educate. Both Catholic and Protestant missions were very active in settling, converting and then expecting protection via the 'flag' (David Livingstone and David Stanley). On a medical front there was the use of inoculation and especially the use of quinine to combat malaria, allowing longer survival rates in tropical climates. However anti Slavery probably provided the major input and, in the case of Gordon and the Sudan, were very important in pushing a reluctant government forward. A case could also be made for East Africa (a centre of the Slave Trade) and for the occupation of Nyasaland as resulting from such factors. However candidates are likely to stress the protection of trade routes to India (Cape Town, East Africa and Egypt and the Sudan), economic motives (particularly in Southern Africa after the discovery of gold and diamonds post 1886) and the role of men as the spot with particular axes to grind (like Cecil Rhodes in South Africa and Rhodesia). Strategic issues could also be assessed (as with Egypt and Bechuanaland in 1885) alongside political issues at home (Chamberlain and the promotion of Empire as a solution to domestic problems).

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

8. Trade Union and Labour 1867 – 1906

8(a) Assess the main problems facing the development of a Labour Party during the period to 1906. [45]

Focus: an assessment of the problems facing Labour Party development to 1906.

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

Successful candidates will need to establish the relative importance of the problems that a labour party had to face before 1906. Of key importance was that the bulk of the working class, its key constituency, lacked the vote. Pre 1918 over 40% of adult males lacked the necessary qualifications and voting remained complex (there were over seven different types of qualification). A crucial obstacle for the mid and lower working class was their mobility. Residential qualifications hindered them. Unionisation found these groups difficult to organise so labour too found them difficult to mobilise. Arguably of similar importance was the lib-lab tradition. Skilled workers and those active, like Trade Union leaders, remained liberal before 1906. The liberals post 1900 stressed Progressivism which kept many on the Liberal side. Another rival for ordinary working class men, voters or not, was Slum Toryism, patriotic and imperial. Those who did favour a Labour party were often divided over tactics and the issue of socialism itself, as the feuding between the ILP, the SDF and the more middle class Fabians demonstrated. The latter opposed independent representation. None were particularly concerned to link with Trade Unions and their numbers as the way forward. In the later period the Liberal Party became more aware of the threat posed by a Labour Party emerging and, via the New Liberalism, sought to absorb labour, paying more attention to Union issues and moving, in 1903, to an electoral pact with labour that compromised its 'independence'. Candidates could also cite the problem of leadership. Each Labour organisation had a separate leadership and not all were especially capable (Hyndman of the SDF). Only Hardie pressed for complete independence. The creation of the LRC was more a reaction to an employer legal offensive than a leap of faith into independent socialism. Finance was also a problem for a working class party, especially when elections had to be fought, hence the need for Trade Unions who, before 1906, were reluctant to leave liberalism. The Tories and Liberals remained resilient.

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

8(b) Which party, Conservative or Liberal, was more successful in adapting to the challenge of organised labour during the period from 1867 to 1906? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: a comparison of the relative success of both traditional parties in adapting to the rise of organised labour.

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

Although a focus on the Liberal party is to be expected candidates need to compare both. Concentration just on one will confine a candidate to a **Band IV** at best. At the beginning of the period there was a desire to recognise the New Model Unions as respectable Victorian institutions promoting self help. Candidates could argue that Gladstone and the Liberals successfully adapted to this, idealising upper working class respectability and moving to grant them the vote in 1866. However Disraeli too saw the opportunity of appealing to the working class and in the 1867 Act went further than Gladstone had been prepared to. Yet the Liberals won the 1868 election and secured the allegiance of the TUC and lib-lab elements until at least 1900 and, in the case of many big Unions, right to 1906 and beyond. Both conservative and liberal governments continued to encourage and woo the self help aspect of skilled Unions in their governments of the 1870s, although Disraeli went further by condoning peaceful picketing. In the 1880s and 1890s it could be argued that both parties neglected organised labour. Chamberlain, who moved from Liberalism to Conservatism, was unusual in wanting to woo the Unions through his 'unauthorised programme' (although until 1886 Lord Randolph Churchill's Tory Democracy in the Conservatives played a similar role). Neither party approved of the New Unionism and backed employer backlashes after the Match Girls' Strike and the Dock Strikes in 1888-9, but such groups lacked the vote. 1900 was a turning point here. The indifference of both parties to Taff Vale led the TUC to join the LRC. Candidates are likely to argue that here conservatism definitely proved less successful than the liberals, although better candidates might point out that as an upper and middle class party it had less need to woo the working class. Nonetheless both parties could envisage a widening franchise and some attempt to woo organised labour, both Trade Unions and the LRC, could be profitable. Chamberlain's strategy within Conservatism of combining Imperialism with Social reform via Tariffs collapsed following the impact of the Boer War. His decision to launch a Tariff Reform campaign after 1903 failed and served only to weaken and divide the Conservatives. The Liberals were more responsive, reviving the attractive 19th century policies of 'cheap food' and Free Trade and moving to re-absorb 'labour' into Liberalism via the Electoral pact of 1903. The 1906 victory bore witness to both their success and awareness of labour and union issues- legal, moral (Chinese Slavery) and social (Lloyd George's New Liberalism). Better candidates will balance their conclusions throughout the period in question.

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

Britain 1899 – 1918**9. Liberals and Labour 1899 – 1918**

9(a) To what extent were the liberal social reforms limited in their success during the period from 1906 to 1914? [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the liberal social reforms to 1914

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

Candidates will need to establish criteria for success. Were the reforms politically successful, pre-empting the electoral appeal of labour and Socialism? How far did they tackle the social problems identified by contemporary commentators (poverty, old age, low wages, sickness, poor housing and education)? One view is to see their social reforms as the foundation of a welfare state, a new departure in social policy. Candidates could stress the financial structures (national insurance and a contributory system) as evidence of this given that all future developments were based on these 1911 Acts. They could also stress children, the unemployed and the sick and the elderly were all included and that the rhetoric of Lloyd George certainly raised the stakes. More was done than by any previous government. However the limitations also need to be examined. The liberal approach was not comprehensive or socialist (based on wealth redistribution via direct taxes). It was to make the existing system work more effectively and competitively. The Minority Report on the Poor Law was rejected. More legal protection was given to Trade Unions (1906 and 1913) but this did not prevent the industrial unrest of 1912 – 14. On the under employed and vulnerable in the sweated industries a Board was set up to establish minimum standards and wages but enforcement was very difficult and only certain trades were included (10 by 1914). It is also difficult to measure the impact of the Labour Exchanges in facilitating labour mobility but some relief was directed via these to avoid the workhouse. The independent elderly received OAPs but the limits were considerable (few survived to 70 and the pensions were far from generous). Those in work and ill and for some unemployed (temporarily it was assumed) national insurance provided but the contributory element was to retain Victorian self reliance and reduce costs. It was limited in time and initially only to a few skilled occupations. It did not cover dependants. The vast majority of unskilled workers remained covered only by the workhouse. Unemployment insurance was limited only to trades with seasonal unemployment. Socialists opposed the reforms on these grounds. Poorer workers would be unable to contribute. More was achieved with the health and legal protection of children (nursery schools, medical inspection and free school meals) between 1906 and 1909, encouraged by fears of race survival and the need to compete, industrially and militarily. However little was done about secondary education or about housing (a Housing and Towns Planning Act in 1909 set up slum clearance schemes but provided no support for new houses) or urban improvement. Lloyd George's later schemes turned to rural issues. Nonetheless, given what had come before these were major initiatives, although politically their success was varied.

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

9(b) How far do you agree that Irish issues were more dangerous to the Conservatives than the Liberals during the period from 1909 to 1916? [45]

Focus: a comparison of the impact of Irish issues on the two main political parties 1909 to 1916.

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

A focus on just one of these parties cannot beyond Band III. Candidates will need to understand how sectarian Irish parties became linked to mainland parties (Redmond's Home Rule party's association with the liberals and the Unionists with the Conservative party). Home Rule thus had the ability to wreck a political party, as the liberals knew all too well. Candidates could argue that Irish issues were more dangerous for the Conservatives. On the one hand well organised Unionists in Ulster (their Council, Volunteer force and the capable leadership of Carson) could be a considerable strength, especially as Ireland was electorally unpopular on the mainland. However it could become a very dangerous tail wagging the Conservative dog. After 1914, with the Conservatives Lord's veto gone and a Liberal Home Rule Bill proceeding inexorably, the Unionists would dictate the tactics on the ground, which included radical and armed resistance. Bonar law appeared to condone this in 1913 with his Blenheim Palace speech. Support for rebellion in Ireland via the UVF on the eve of international war would pose serious questions for the Conservatives if Home Rule went ahead. However, after 1914, candidates could argue that Ireland posed less of a problem for the Conservatives. The Easter Rising polarised issues to their advantage, especially with the eclipse of Redmond. However a good case could be made out for a greater danger being posed for the Liberals, given that their links with the Home Rulers involved a much greater number of MPs (80 plus). The Budget and Lords Crises in the 1910 elections led the Liberals back to Irish dependence (the so called 'corrupt bargain') and thus a Home Rule Bill that posed uncomfortable questions of enforcement (the army 'mutiny' at the Curragh exposing Seeley's incompetence at the War Office). Protracted negotiations on compromise damaged the Liberals, especially Asquith's vacillating policy of 'wait and see'. He could, arguably, have exploited Redmond's dependence on the Liberals far more decisively. The Liberals would be harmed by Sinn Fein's rise at Redmond's expense, although initially the Easter Rising strengthened the Liberals and all those who opposed radical change in Ireland. No set conclusion is expected.

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

10. Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918 – 1939

10(a) 'A stronger Conservative Party was the main reason for the fall of Lloyd George from power in 1922.' How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the reason for Lloyd George's fall from power in 1922.

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

Candidates will need to focus on the Conservative Party and its attitudes to Lloyd George but they will need to compare this with other factors – Lloyd George himself, the particular policies and domestic crises that eroded his government, the fear of a rising Labour Party and liberal attitudes. Candidates will need to be aware of Conservative strength throughout the period (382 MPs out of a total of 515, with only 133 Lloyd George Liberals, split from Asquith's official Liberals). They could usefully stress that Lloyd George's failure to rebuild the liberals and his erosion of the Coalition Liberals, whom he tried to merge into the Conservatives in an anti-socialist stance, helped to put him at the mercy of the Conservatives. The Conservatives felt they needed Lloyd George's ability to attract votes in 1918 (the 'Coupon' Election) and he had to convince them of his continued utility. This he very successfully managed to do until 1922. He exerted a certain magnetism over the Conservative leadership (initially Bonar Law, especially Austen Chamberlain, Balfour, Birkenhead and Curzon). Lloyd George's key failure was not to exert the same spell over the Conservative rank and file who felt their strength was being dissipated by the wiles of a former enemy who was increasingly corrupt and dismissive of core Tory values. They felt humiliated over Ireland, the economy (where protection was increasingly popular) and over housing and education ('waste' according to many). They also felt blocked promotionally by Lloyd George's derided 'stage army'. Growing back bench Conservative anger towards their own leaders found a champion in Baldwin. Their final revolt was more against Austen Chamberlain than Lloyd George. The latter had no power to ward off the Carlton Club rebellion. Candidates can thus argue that it was less a question of Conservative strength as such than when this would be finally deployed to depose Lloyd George's coalition. The reason for this lay with the relationships and policies of Chamberlain Birkenhead and Lloyd George, together with Stanley Baldwin as the assertor of Conservative strength and independence. The government might have survived if Chamberlain had agreed that LG would cease to be PM at the next election. The Newport by-election demonstrated a non coalition Conservative could defeat a Socialist. Better candidates could stress how all these factors are inter-related (Conservative strengths and fears, L.G's policy and character, his relationship with the Conservative leadership and their relationship with their own rank and file, plus post war circumstances)

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

10(b) How successful was Ramsay MacDonald as prime minister in the labour government of 1924 and 1929 – 31? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: an evaluation of Ramsay MacDonald as PM.

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

Some candidates might argue for success – that he set Labour up as a respectable and responsible party of government by pursuing moderate policies at home and abroad, avoiding Clause IV, ILP, socialism which would alienate all but a minority. He was helped in this by both governments being minority ones, dependent on liberal support. He backed Snowden's orthodox handling of economic and financial issues, ruling out Moseley's or even Liberal new approaches to unemployment. Candidates arguing for his success could also point to his statesmanship in the 1931 crisis, where he put the national interest and the pound before Labour party interests. However candidates could equally point to a lack of success. He came to power in 1924 through a non socialist defence of Free Trade. His socialist colleagues criticised him both for this and for failing to attempt socialist reform (only John Wheatley was of the labour 'left') and that he mishandled relations with the USSR over the Campbell case which led to defeat. He was unable to delegate. There was little done to tackle rising unemployment in 1929 and the government was buffeted by the ensuing crisis and Great Depression. In 1931 he failed to bring his Cabinet with him over budget cuts and Henderson led a successful rebellion. By heading a 'National government' he became the 'great betrayer' of the labour movement. Much will depend on how candidates approach the 1931 crisis as to whether they see MacDonald as successful or not. Should he have resigned with honour intact? Could he have prevented the crisis erupting in the first place?

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

11. Foreign Policy 1939 – 1963

11a) Assess which had the greater impact on British foreign policy, the USA or the USSR, during the period from 1941 to the Potsdam Conference of 1945. [45]

Focus: a comparison of the relative impact of the US and USSR on British foreign policy 1941 – 45.

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

In 1941 both were of equal importance to British foreign policy, the aim of which was to bring both the USSR and the US into the war. The USSR could take the strain of Nazi military power whilst Britain would benefit from Lend Lease and a US commitment to prioritise the war in Europe. Those arguing the US had the greater impact could point to the success in getting the US to focus on German defeat as the priority. The US alliance became closer, despite military and organisational friction. By 1944 – 45 however there was more concern over the US, with the fear that it saw Britain as of little future value and, when peace occurred, as a potential competitor. Churchill feared that Stalin, Roosevelt and Truman would act against British imperial interests (at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam). Alliances with the USSR went counter to Britain's traditional foreign policy and this, it could be argued, had the greater impact, as co-operation was now needed. Nonetheless Britain remained more cautious of the USSR, especially the potential price to be paid in any future peace settlement, hence the percentage agreement in Moscow in 1944. In turn the USSR remained suspicious of the Western delay in re-opening a Western Front (1944) to relieve pressures on them. Despite Arctic convoys, supplies and assistance, there was a Russian feeling that Britain was too much at arms length, hoping both dictators would destroy each other. The alliances with Stalin become of less importance. By 1944 – 45 British post war aims would be in conflict with the USSR over Poland and occupied Germany. The USSR was the new enemy and as such British foreign policy focussed here. Better candidates will appreciate the different impact that each had at particular points. Both proved difficult allies.

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 co-operation with America the most important reason for a cautious attitude towards European integration during the period from 1945 to 1963?

[45]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for caution towards European integration 1945 to 1963

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

Candidates will need to point to a variety of factors here – co-operation with the US, traditional reluctance to get involved in Europe, the imperial ‘pull’ and domestic attitudes. Those arguing for the preference for co-operation with the US could cite a variety of evidence. Europe was devastated in the late 1940s and Britain was already over-involved financially. It was difficult to see the potential in a British led Europe, even if this was possible. The wartime alliance with the US continued into peacetime and this Atlantic link was preferred by both Labour and Conservative governments, enabling them to compete at superpower level. Indeed Britain was suspicious of US encouragement to get more involved in Europe and worked to tie the US into Europe. The achievement of this via NATO was much preferred to the Plevan plan for a European Defence Union. On the economic front Britain saw the importance of US aid, securing the lion’s share of Marshall aid and being suspicious of early economic moves by France, West Germany and Italy (the Iron and Steel community). Britain preferred her own free trade organisation, EFTA. The Schumann Plan and the EEC were similarly mistrusted. Some candidates might consider these economic factors as more important than the Atlantic alliance in determining caution. There seemed no need to establish closer European ties in the late 1940s and 1950s. Only in the late 1950s, faced with declining world markets, did the European core seem more attractive. It is likely that Macmillan’s decision to apply for membership was economic rather than political or strategic. Nonetheless Britain, strategically and militarily, remained committed to the Atlantic alliance. Churchill, Bevan, Atlee and Eden were all sceptical of Europe, although there were British initiatives like the Council of Europe in 1949 and the Eden Plan of 1952. Much could also be made of the Empire. Remaining close to an anti-imperial US might help and at points much economic effort was put into Africa in the 1950s. British interests remained global and Europe was seen more in Cold War terms where it was vital to ensure US commitment. Better candidates will appreciate how the factors effecting European caution were linked and how circumstances changed in the period from 1959 to 63.

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

12. Post War Britain 1945 – 1964

12(a) How far did the social reforms of the Labour government of 1945–51 fulfil the expectations of the electorate in 1945? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the impact of the labour social reforms 1945 – 51

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

Candidates will need to examine the electorate's expectations for a better post-war world, crystallised by Beveridge's report, where five 'giants' needed removing – want, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness. Polls demonstrated 86% of Britain subscribed to this view so candidates need to assess how far Labour managed to do this. In terms of unemployment Labour's record was sound. Demobilisation was successfully achieved and the global economy picked up. Demand for labour was so great immigration was encouraged. On health it can also be argued that labour fulfilled expectations. Bevan's NHS was comprehensive, entitling all to free health care, but candidates could argue it was rapidly overwhelmed by demand and its costs soared, occasioning a breach in 1949 to a free service with the introduction of prescription charges. Griffith's Welfare State simplified existing provision, abolishing the hated 'means' test and introducing child focussed family allowance to tackle want and squalor. The principle of universality was accepted. Pensions and allowances were increased. However better candidates might note that with low unemployment this was not yet as costly as the NHS. On Housing in 1945 Labour had promised 5 million new houses to replace slums and war devastation and here candidates could point to relative failure. Both supply and organisation was limited, with much criticism of the bureaucracy involved (three separate Ministries of Health, Trade and Works). Squatting and Pre-Fabs were temporary compromises but with economic restraints only 1 million homes had been built by 1951, mostly state (Council) houses. Nonetheless this was a large number. Better design and quality were largely achieved. On Education, Wilkinson and Tomlinson considered a 'comprehensive' policy, preferring a socially divisive tripartite secondary division (Grammar, technical and secondary modern), but did raise the leaving age to 15 in 1947 and secured an extensive schools rebuilding programme. It is difficult to assess the electoral view on this. Some candidates might consider nationalisation as part of the social reform, on the grounds of employment and conditions. The record was mixed. It was seen as inevitable with local railways, electricity and gas but more controversial with iron and steel. Yet in practice little changed and candidates could criticise labour's lack of forward planning here. Candidates could also point to the unpopularity of rationing and bureaucracy to set against the fulfilling of expectation.

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

12(b) Assess the reasons why the Conservatives remained in power from 1951 to 1964.**[45]**

Focus: an assessment of the reasons the Conservatives were in power 1951 to 1964

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

Candidates will need to establish an argument on which were the more and less important reasons for the Conservatives remaining in power in the period. Some may see social change (the consolidation of the middle and lower middle class) and economic prosperity as the most important. Such affluence, increasing in the 1950s after an age of austerity, made labour's economic policies and disputes appear petty. The Conservatives played to this, dismantling rationing and the apparatus of authority, gaining the credit for trends already underway. Butler, Maudling, Powell and MacLeod managed the economy well. A 'property owning' democracy had more electoral appeal than Bevan's expanded public sector or Gaitskill's social democracy. Taxes were reduced whilst affluence enabled increased social expenditure, completing the promised 300,000 new homes ahead of schedule. Full employment spread the gain widely and key symbols of prosperity were now within reach (TV's, fridges, cars, holidays). Other important reasons were a reasonably effective leadership. Churchill, Eden and Macmillan were able and charismatic leaders. Eden's Suez blunders were not exposed to an electoral verdict (the election had been in 1955) and nor were Macmillan's Profumo mistakes. Macmillan especially was able to identify himself with the affluence of the period ('Supermac') and handled ministers ruthlessly (the resignation of the Treasury Team and later his Night of the Long Knives). The importance of leadership was demonstrated by the failures at the end of the period with Alec Douglas Home. Some candidates might consider the weaknesses of the labour opposition as a key factor, especially the division between the Bevanites and Gaitskillites, but this is unlikely to be a major reason. Harold Wilson's 1964 majority was very marginal. The Cold War also played into the hands of the Conservatives, Churchill and Macmillan exploiting their relationship with Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. Imperial challenges were weathered (Suez) or managed (Africa and the Winds of Change). Elections (1951, 1955, 1959) were fought on taxation and the economy, so candidates are likely to focus their arguments in those areas.

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

2585**European History 1046 – 1718****Period Studies – European History 1046-1718****Europe 1046-1250****The Reform of the Church 1046-1122**

1(a) Assess the reasons why attempts to reform the Papacy were made in the period from 1046 to 1073. [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of religious movement

Candidates need to keep within the dates defined by the Synod of Sutri (1046) and the accession of Gregory VII as pope (1073). A range of reasons needs to be assessed, though exhaustive coverage is not required even for the top bands. Good focus upon 'Assess the reasons' is likely also to be a feature of answers in those bands. Some reference to the context and to identified problems and weaknesses of papal power and position is to be expected. The leadership of popes such as Leo IX, Nicholas II and Alexander II could feature. The influence, too, of lay rulers, above all the Emperor Henry III, should be appreciated; the latter had a strong interest in reform. There was an upturn in the demands for strong, coherent, effective direction and leadership of the Church, allied to improved machinery, better clerical standards, delivery from Church councils and legates. There was a strong urge for focused papal leadership to combat simony, clerical marriage, lay investiture and to develop concomitant papal powers and claims to powers. In the process, ideas as to papal-enhanced authority and supremacy were developed. The development of a recognisable ideology of Papal power can be assessed and here the role of Hildebrand prior to his papal accession could be evaluated. The sense of an emergent papal reform programme should be a feature of stronger answers; so, too, the awareness of both ecclesiastical and lay support for papal headship of such a reform programme. Answers in the higher Bands will have a good, persistent focus upon 'Assess the reasons why ...' and the needs of the question.

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

1(b) Assess the reasons why the Cistercians were becoming more popular than the Cluniacs by 1122. [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of religious changes

An element of comparison is involved here and candidates need to assess and evaluate a range of reasons, rather than describe the two Orders. Good focus upon 'more popular' will be a feature of answers in Bands I and II. A sequential treatment of each Order will not merit much above Band IV or low Band III at best, according to quality. The sense of 'popular' may well be examined in relation to lay support, benefactions, lands, foundations. The wider religious-spiritual context (salvation, prayers, good works, the Benedictine Rule) will be a factor in evaluation, as will such issues as attitudes to austerity and asceticism, land holding and use, Episcopal and Papal authority, community ideas, the location of sites, connections to powerful local families, lay involvement. Cluniac monasticism will need some assessment, even if the thrust of the answer is an evaluation of the appeal of Cistercianism. Likely aspects to be covered include the Cistercians' determination to return to 'pure' Benedictinism, so rejecting what they saw as 'contaminated' Cluniacs; their austerity and militancy, in an age of militant Christianity, opposing 'comfortable' Cluniac monastic life; their determined removal to remote sites, again in contrast to the Cluniacs; their willing acceptance of poor lands; the high reputation of St Bernard as against a perceived lacklustre Cluniac leadership. Answers may well point out, of course, that the Cistercian take-off really came after 1122 but the basis for the subsequent rapid growth was being laid beforehand.

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) How important were superior resources in Philip Augustus' success over the Angevins? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation in context

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Resources included: taxes, wealth from lands, church gifts, loans, the accretion of resources from prior territorial gains. Undoubtedly, Philip possessed strong and growing financial assets, in part inherited, in part built up from successful policies from 1180. Royal income at least doubled, if not more, and there were other gains, not least via his skilful exploitation of his position as feudal suzerain. That said, there was more to his success than simple financial strength. Philip was a decent military commander and an astute diplomat. He used his power as feudal suzerain to the full and exploited the errors and weaknesses of King John, as well as the latter's uneasy relationship with the Norman baronage. The Angevins had their own problems and were probably not as strong in exploitable and available resources. Philip could also make use of a developed and efficient system of administration. Focus will be especially upon 1199-1204 or 1206 though some reference ahead to 1214 and the major victory then at the Battle of Bouvines might be expected. Answers in the higher bands will have a good focus on 'How important ...' and assess such as against other factors, including military and diplomatic skills, personal leadership, Angevin weaknesses.

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

2(b) To what extent did Frederick II weaken the German monarchy?**[45]**

Focus: Assessment of change and outcome in a major territory

Candidates will need a good focus upon 'To what extent ...' and will need to argue and assess the outcomes of Frederick II's rulership in Germany to achieve reward in the higher Bands. Some references to Frederick's other spheres of activity and influence, Italy and Sicily, the Holy Land, will be in order but the core of the answer must be events inside Germany. A contrast between his position in 1212 and 1250 would be useful. Initially, Frederick had Papal protection and was on good terms with the Papacy but, increasingly, he fell out, differing on a range of major political and religious matters. This affected his position. Also, frequent absences created strains, empowering princes and nobles and the Church, debilitating imperial authority. The early Golden Bull of Eger (1213) weakened his position inside Germany, no matter the imperial coronation of 1220. He left his elder son, Henry, King of Germany, to rule from 1220 to 1233-4, when rebellion by Henry led to intervention and imprisonment of his son. Frederick's reorganisation of government in 1234, favoured the princes even more than the earlier Golden Bull. They supported the new King, Conrad IV, even defying papal attempts to set up an anti-King in 1245-6. But Frederick's preoccupations elsewhere and long absences led to greater princely and nobly power and the 'feudalisation of Germany'. It is likely that candidates will conclude that brief personal presences reflected strength but long absences weakened imperial authority and power even more- a trend essentially confirmed in 1213.

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) Assess the reasons why the First Crusade was launched.****[45]**Focus: Assessment of importance of factors in major Crusading event

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. A quest to recover the Holy Places and Holy Land. Other factors need to be considered as well. These could include: a desire to stop fighting inside Europe; possible desire to ease over-crowding and land hunger; action to prevent Muslims seizing Christian lands, killing Christians and destroying churches; fear of Muslim advances into Europe; care for fellow Christians' suffering and seeking help; aid for the Byzantine Emperor and possible benefit to East-West religious tensions; a desire to assert strong Papal leadership and so enhance Papal headship of Western Christendom amidst the continuing Investiture Contest. Answers in the higher Bands will need to have a good focus upon 'Assess ..' and assess, for example, religious factors as against other factors, including martial valour, social and economic pressures in the West, feudal-lordship ties, providing a sense of ordering and prioritising. N.B. The question is not about motivation per se; it is not asking why people went on crusade.

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

3(b) How serious were the problems facing the Crusader States in the period 1147 to 1185? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of problems in core area of Crusading activity

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 address and assess (seriousness, etc.) a range of problems, though focus upon and development of several alone can lead to Bands II and I if done well. Note should be taken of the dates. Likely areas of consideration may include: the numerical deficiencies in colonists and immigrants, not least knights and landholding peasants; the lack of response from the West to appeals for support and immigrants; the growing disunity between the Crusader States; geographical vulnerability; weak connections with the West; long-standing problems with the Byzantine Empire; under-developed resources, including revenue levels; internal factional squabbles amongst the nobility; the need to remain on the defensive; importantly, the growing strengths of their Muslim opponents in leadership (e.g. Saladin), unity and strategy. Reference to specific examples (e.g. Jerusalem and its factional disputes) will strengthen answers. Higher Band answers will have a good focus upon ‘How serious’ and probably suggest some sense of prioritised factors.

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 growth of towns and trade the most important economic development of the twelfth century? [45]

Focus: Assessment of economic change in context

Candidates will need to set coverage of towns and trade in a wider context and will need to assess against other possibly more important economic developments to achieve the higher Bands here. The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Towns and cities grew in scale and size in the period, one of general economic growth attendant upon population growth, expanding trade routes and activities and somewhat better stability conditions. Developments in trade, trade volumes, wealth, taxable capacity, urban functions in government, religion, banking, strategic controls, were factors. Manufacturing and exports, markets and fairs, colonisation, shifts from the countryside to towns, specialisation of production, agrarian and commercial were all important too. Area examples would be useful and candidates can draw from English and continental examples (e.g. Northern Italy, Flanders, Paris, Bruges, London, Florence, Pisa, Genoa, Milan). The significance of lay and ecclesiastical needs, and their demands within the urban context, could also be noted.

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

4(b) Assess the reason for the appeal of the Albigensian heresy during the twelfth century.

[45]

Focus: Assessment of content of major heretical movement

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to say something about the nature and content of the Albigensian heresy, though the main area of evaluation will be the linkage of appeal to social groups and geographical area, to be tested against the religious appeal. Found in Southern France, named after the town of Albi, even if they originated to the north, in Toulouse, the Albigensians were members of the larger Cathar movement. A small movement but it was influential. Much of what we know about the movement comes, of course, from the writings of its opponents. Mention might be made of opposition to the priesthood (because of a belief that clergymen were more interested in politics and wealth than in religion) and opposition to the Eucharist, baptism and the sign of the cross (a belief that it was wrong to adore or hold sacred the instrument of Jesus' death). They favoured an ascetic life and formed communities of their own, attracting a range of society in support, from southern noblemen and minor nobles to ordinary clergy, professionals, men and women. Candidates might address the wider Cathar movement and its appeal; then, within, the Albigensians. Candidates might also locate the Albigensians within the wider heretical movement strong at the time, though the focus needs to be on Southern France and activity there. The social appeal could be linked to protests, a sense of independence, hierarchical obedience (following powerful local noblemen), defiance of ecclesiastical and political authority, perhaps in the context of the recent unification of France under Philip Augustus. Then again, the depth and sincerity of religious beliefs might be cited as the key factor. 'Assess ...' will require an ordering and sense of prioritising of reasons.

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 reasons for the importance of Florence to the Renaissance. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the importance of a given area to a key development

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

Issues which might be included:- Wealth from trade, industry and particularly banking. Associated issues of usury as spur to patronage, importance of trade guilds, their competitiveness and responsibility for monuments, trade routes as routes for ideas, manuscripts etc. Political issues such as Baron thesis on importance of Republicanism and exclusion of nobles from government. Effects of Humanism. All issues should be explained and supported with examples. Issues should be specific to Florence. Some relative importance of factors is required to gain the highest grades.

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

5(b) Assess the impact of Humanism on the Renaissance.**[45]**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of a key aspect on a major development

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

Government issues likely to focus on the promotion of civic values of Romans and Greeks through a study of classical texts, the promotion of *negotium* over *otium* (candidates do not need to know the terms), civic pride expressing itself through artistic competition. Examples in Florence of Salutati and Bruni as Chancellors.

Cultural issues might include changing ideas, values and outlooks, role in education e.g. the 'Platonic Academy' of Lorenzo Medici, style of art.

Better answers might show awareness that Humanism was varied and changeable and therefore likely to affect government and societies differently, depending on time and place. Some comparisons might be drawn between Florence and/or Rome and Venice.

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

Spain 1469 – 1520

6(a) How successful were Ferdinand and Isabella's attempts to improve the economy and administration of Spain? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of key aspects of the monarchs' reign

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

In terms of the economy there was an imbalance between pastoral and arable farming which the monarchs did nothing to help – even increasing the problem by confirming the privileges of the Mesta. Whilst they did make some attempt to improve the economy by passing Navigation laws and re-organising trade fairs, they did not encourage investment in industry – taxation policies were also a disincentive. This created great problems in the future. For administration, candidates might focus on Royal Council, monarchs' work in the judicial department, increased use of *letrados* and royal secretaries. Candidates may reach a different conclusion on different aspects but are likely to conclude that success was more dependent on Ferdinand and Isabella themselves, rather than on any structural improvement.

There is also likely to be some comment on the disparate nature of the two kingdoms of Aragon and Castile.

Candidates can reach top bands without equal treatment of the two factors, but there must be substantial consideration of both.

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 Ferdinand and Isabella deserve the title of ‘Catholic Monarchs?’
[45]

Focus: Evaluation of a key aspect of the monarchs’ reign

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

Answers are likely to comment on the greater piety of Isabella and may cite church reforms and the work of Cisneros in support. However, even here there are other issues of wealth and control. For Ferdinand, candidates might comment on the greater importance of economic issues in refusing to expel the Moors from Aragon. On the plus side, candidates could look at the ending of *convivencia* and the promotion of *limpieza de sangre*, through the institution of the Inquisition and the war against Granada, though they might want to explore other motives here too. A balanced discussion is required before reaching 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.

The Ottoman Empire 1451-1529

7(a) How important were economic factors in the development of the Ottoman Empire from 1451 to 1529? Explain your answer. [45]

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

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

Issues: - The importance of a buoyant economy in supporting army and navy and in maintaining colonies. Importance of capture of Constantinople in this respect e.g. trade and basis of naval developments. Feudal economy and its links with the military needs of the state through the Timar system. May be set against other issues such as military, structure of government and religion – but must give substantial consideration to economic factors.

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

7(b) To what extent was Suleiman able to build on the policies of Selim to 1529? [45]

Focus: An assessment of the links between the policies of two rulers

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

Requires knowledge and understanding of both Suleiman's and Selim's achievements. Selim's expansion mainly eastwards, creating leadership of Sunni Muslim world and key to holy places. Limited ability of Suleiman to expand further here; in conflict with Portuguese Empire and revolts in Syria and Egypt, leading to a policy of reform and local control. Need to maintain position as successful Ghazi ruler therefore turning attention to Europe; conquests in Belgrade, at Battle of Mohacs and advance to gates of Vienna could be seen in this light. Evaluation of extent needed for highest grades.

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) Compare the reasons why Spain and Portugal embarked on overseas exploration and empire-building from 1450 to 1530. [45]

Focus: A comparison of motives in two countries over a significant development

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

Some factors were common to both countries, such as the desire for spices and gold, though they sought them in different areas. Religion was also a common factor but with a slightly different emphasis – Portugal attempting to link up with the legendary Christian empire of Prester John whilst Spain put greater emphasis on proselytising e.g. Cortes' conversion of Mexicans building on from their success in Granada. Portugal with a small population of 1 million had a much greater need of labour than Spain ultimately importing large numbers of slaves (10% population in Lisbon by the end of the 15th century) for use both at home and in Madeira and the Canaries. Spain's emphasis was more on land gain and colonisation particularly Mexico and later Peru. For the highest grades there needs to be some real attempt at comparison well-supported by examples, rather than just a list of factors.

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

8(b) How important were changes in ship design to the success of exploration and discovery from 1450 to 1530? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of factors leading to successful exploration and discovery

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

If the candidate had a detailed knowledge of ship design and could support with details to show its significance they could answer the question within its own terms. However, they are more likely to set the issue of ship design against other factors to assess its relative importance. Discussion of ship design is likely to include caravels and carracks, hybrid structures using elements of Arabic, Mediterranean and North European such as triangular and square sails to best-suit their purposes. Other factors for consideration might include advances in fields such as map-making and navigation with the use of astrolabes, tables of latitude and magnetic needles, development of powder weapons, finance and patronage, determination of individuals driven by specific motives, experience as sea-faring nations etc.

Candidates must ultimately reach a conclusion on the importance of ship design and deal with it substantially to reach the highest bands.

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

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

9(a) How successfully did Charles V deal with the problems created by the Protestant Reformation in the Holy Roman Empire? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: A key development

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 drawn from Key Issue two which requires candidates to consider the divisions within Germany and the attempts to deal with them, however they may also draw on material from Key Issue one as the religious divisions did create political problems for Charles. Weaker answers will describe Charles' response to the Protestant Reformation, but better answers will identify the problems created by the Protestant Reformation and establish a set of criteria against which to judge success. This is an important issue as it dominated German politics and disrupted imperial plans, it opened up old rivalries, encouraged new arguments and divided the Emperor from many princes and divided the princes. It also saw the establishment of an armed force, the Schmalkaldic League, within Germany that could not be completely defeated despite Muhlberg. Candidates may consider some of the following: the position of Luther within Germany and the failure to have him arrested, the various compromises reached and whether they solved the problems, the influence of foreign problems on the religious question, the problem of enforcing edicts, such as Worms, and the fear from the princes of Imperial plans, the lack of papal support, political developments within Germany and the growth of princely power 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 reasons why Charles V was at war for so much of his reign as Holy Roman Emperor. [45]

Focus:

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 almost directly from Key Issue four. Candidates are required to assess the reasons and not simply give a list of reasons why Charles was at war for so much of his reign. Better answers will evaluate the relative importance of a range of factors, whilst weaker answers will list reasons and at a lower level candidates will describe the wars. There are a range of factors that candidates might consider, but it is likely that his belief in preserving intact the ‘monarchia’, or his dynastic or family inheritance (the Burgundian issue), will feature heavily in many answers. However, other factors that might be considered include: the fear that his inheritance created among other powers, particularly France, and the danger it presented to the balance of power, Charles’ desire to recover ancestral lands, his desire to wage war against the Turks as part of his duty, the personal rivalry between Charles and Francis, French interference in Germany and their encouragement to the Turks.

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

Spain 1504-1556

10(a) Assess the reasons for unrest in Spain in the period from 1516 (the accession of Charles I) to 1521 (the Revolt of the Comuneros). [45]

Focus: A key developments

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 key issue one on Spain 1516-1521. At the higher levels candidates should evaluate a range of causes and not simply list or describe the reasons for the unrest. There are a large number of reasons for the unrest and candidates should not be expected to cover them, what matters is the quality of their explanation and evaluation. Among the issues that candidates might consider are: Charles as a non-Spaniard, his failure to use Spanish advisors, his delay in arriving in Spain, the bad advice he received from his Burgundian councilors, the attitudes of the Aragonese and Castilian nobility, the availability of Joanna as a successor, Charles' decision to contest the Imperial election, its implications and financial consequences. Candidates may focus on the demands of the Germania or Comuneros revolt and this should not prevent access to the higher bands provided some of the wider issues indicated above are considered.

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

10(b) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Spanish monarchy by 1556. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the development of an institution.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. This is a wide ranging question which allows candidates to draw from all the key issues, although the focus should be on the position of the monarchy at the end of the period. There is a great deal of information that could be used and the key to the better answers is likely to be the criteria used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses. Candidates may examine issues such as the strength of royal government and Charles' use of the conciliar system; there is debate about its effectiveness and this may be considered. This may also be balanced against the traditions of the various kingdoms. The issue of taxation also presents an opportunity for discussion, as does the question of the justicia. Some answers might point to the difference in royal power between Aragon and Castile. Candidates might also question whether Charles' absences strengthened or weakened royal authority. It is likely that some answers will suggest that religious uniformity aided royal strength. There may also be some consideration of the economic situation, but ensure this is linked to the Spanish monarchy and not just Spain. The issue of foreign policy may also be used as success/failure could be linked to the prestige of the monarchy.

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 why the nobility posed a threat to the crown in the period from 1515 to 1559. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the role of a key group within French society.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question requires candidates to evaluate the reasons that they identify and try and prioritise their importance, this will be a characteristic of the higher bands, whereas some answers will simply give a list of reasons, whilst at the lower end candidates will describe what the nobility did during the period. The question is taken from key issue one which focuses on the political problems facing the French monarchy. Candidates should be aware of the importance of the nobility to the crown in ruling France and this is likely to provide the basis for many answers. Some answers may show an awareness that much of France had to be governed as noble fiefdoms and that the feudal independence of the nobility remained strong, this may lead to a discussion of their power to raise armies and lead revolts, drawing on the Bourbon revolt of 1523, although some may use this to show that the nobility were not a threat as Bourbon failed to bring in their support.

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

11(b) Assess the extent of the absolutism of Francis I.**[45]**

Focus: Evaluation of a key development.

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 drawn from Key Issue two ‘How absolute was Francis I?’ The question asks candidates to assess the extent of his absolutism and this should not preclude discussion of areas where there was little limit to his power. The question requires candidates to assess and this should lead to better answers weighing up and evaluating a variety of areas that affected the absolutism of Francis. This is an area of historiographical debate and some candidates may simply describe the views of different historians and this approach should have a ceiling of Band IV. There are many issues that candidates might consider and what is important is the quality of assessment. Candidates may consider some of the following: the continued expansion of French territory, the territorial anomalies that saw large areas still governed as noble fiefdoms, the independence or otherwise of the nobility, the power of parlements and estates, the development of the bureaucracy, the use of propaganda and powers of taxation.

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 armies grow in the period from 1499 to 1560?****[45]**

Focus: A 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. The question is drawn from Key Issue three. This assumes that there was a growth in the size of armies during the period, but there is now considerable debate about ‘how far’ and better answers should address this issue. Some answers may just describe the debate and these should have a ceiling of Band IV. There are a wide range of views about the growth and examiners should reward according to the quality of analysis and supporting material, do not expect any particular line to be taken. Candidates may explain why the growth was so great with reference to developments such as *trace italienne* and its links with the growth of garrisons. However some answers may argue that the reality in the growth of the size of armies was limited, suggesting that the statistics may not be accurate due to disease, desertion or corruption. Some may argue that the growth was limited, others may be aware of the argument that the growth took place after Pavia with the rise in infantry and the growing importance of artillery. There may also be mention of the use of the mercenaries and discussion about the impact of their cost on numbers. Some answers may even place the size of the armies of this period in the context of medieval forces, this is not to be expected, but do reward if it is used to argue how far.

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

12(b) Assess the view that there was a 'military revolution' in the period from 1499 to 1560. [45]

Focus: A key historical debate.

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 directly from Key Issue four. There is considerable historical debate and many answers may be aware of this, however do not reward highly answers that simply describe the views of historians, rather than assess the view. Candidates are likely to consider the issue of changes in tactics and organization and better answers will assess whether the changes in these areas were sufficiently great to warrant the use of the term 'revolution'. Weaker answers are likely to describe the changes. Issues that may be considered include: the changes in types of weapons and fortifications, the changes in the ways battles were fought, the increase in the size of armies and the impact of the wars. Better answers may assess how far each of the above occurred, some answers may also suggest that there was a military revolution, but it started much earlier than the date in question, reward candidates who take this approach, but do not expect this approach as the dates fall outside the scope of the specification.

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) To what extent was there a need for a Catholic Reformation from 1545 to c. 1600?****[45]**Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for a major historical development

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

Candidates may well concentrate on the known abuses of the church, calls for reform from figures within the church such as Erasmus, and the worldliness of the Popes. They might also point out that some measures were already in place to combat this with the development of new orders and/or that the situation was no worse than it had been for centuries. They are likely to see Luther as an accelerating factor in the need for reform and may concentrate on the issues that he raised, such as indulgences, to underline the existing abuses. Candidates should deal with need rather than solutions and reach some conclusion on the extent of the problem in line with the question.

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

13(b) How important were new religious orders in bringing about Catholic recovery by c. 1600? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the importance of a given factor on a key historical development

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

Issues – Early orders e.g. Oratory of Divine Love, Theatines, Ursulines projecting more spiritual and hands-on image, with papal approval – reflected glory. More important Jesuits 1540 – widespread – important as representatives at Trent, missionary work e.g. Peter Canisius in Germany, advisers to rich and powerful. Rigorous education promoted through colleges e.g. Spain, Italy, Germany. Candidates might demonstrate their importance within their own terms or set alongside other issues to show their comparative importance.

Other issues – part played by reformed Papacy – leadership from the ‘top’- calling of the Council of Trent, Tridentine decrees and their effects. Index and Inquisition.

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) To what extent did the effects of civil war cause problems for Henry IV from 1589 to 1598? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the links between a given event and policies of a monarch

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

Almost all problems can be related to the civil wars – weakness of royal authority with failure of King's writ to run throughout the kingdom, initially from minority government and regency of Catherine de Medici. Overmighty subjects thus gained power, particularly Provincial governors with private armies. Finance was problematic with cost of war, difficulty of collecting taxes given lack of power. Dislocation of industry and social hardships for peasants – therefore discontent. Religious divisions – legacy of bitterness and opposing factions, links of Catholic league with Spain, Spanish troops in France. Candidates should support with examples and reach a conclusion on the importance of the civil war to Henry's problems.

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 Henry IV leave a settled and prosperous kingdom in 1610? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the legacy of a monarch

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

Pro – Nobles largely controlled with reduction of power of overmighty subjects e.g. firm but fair treatment of nobles such as Biron and Bouillon; no succession issue. Religious issues largely settled (no recurrence of war) through embracing Catholicism and Edict of Nantes. Peace internationally, related to settlement of religious situation. Finances put on firm footing by work of Sully e.g. raised income from *gabelle* and *paulette* – also links with political stability and lack of war.

Con – Financial position only sound during peace; no structural reform, economic developments limited e.g. failure of development of luxury industries. Some issues with Edict of Nantes i.e. military and political power, Bouillon still able to raise opposition as late as 1604, many attempts on Henry's life – final one successful.

Candidates should use this information to reach a conclusion on the nature of the kingdom inherited by Louis XIII.

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) To what extent were the centralisation policies of Philip II responsible for the Dutch Revolt? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the effect of policies of a monarch on a key event

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

Centralising policies of Philip II should be seen in context of separatist approach of the Dutch e.g. presence of Spanish garrison, rule of Margaret of Parma and Granvelle, neglect of Council and Golden Fleece, treatment of Egmont and Hoorn. Religious policies of Philip II which might be mentioned are anti-heresy laws, Inquisition, re-organisation of Bishoprics, application of Tridentine Decrees. Candidates may point out links between religious and centralising policies. Candidates will need to set this issue against other factors such as failure of harvests in 1565, widespread unemployment and discontent exploited by hedge preachers. Problems for merchants with English embargo on cloth trade and closing of Baltic. Candidates should reach a conclusion on the relative importance of the factor given in the question, and must give it substantial treatment even if they reject it as a prime cause of revolt.

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

15(b) Assess the importance of William of Orange to the success of the Northern Provinces in the Dutch Revolt by 1609.

[45]

Focus: Assessment of the importance of the impact of a given individual on a key event

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

Could assess within its own terms or compare to other factors e.g. Spanish policies, economic factors such as the growth of Amsterdam, geographical factors, and/or military achievements of Maurice of Nassau.

For the importance of William himself:

Con: Early failures in attack from Germany in 1572. Absence from centre of affairs. Inability to maintain co-operation of all states after Pacification of Ghent. Failure to gain full support of foreign powers; presence of Duke of Anjou backfiring. Assassination in 1584.

Pro: Adoption of Calvinism as centralising force. Keeping hopes alive with separation of Holland and Zeeland – strategic use of defences. Some financial support from foreign powers; their crucial involvement although after his death largely due to his persistence.

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) To what extent were Philip II's policies motivated by his religious beliefs? [45]**Focus: Evaluation of the effects of religion on a monarch's policies

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

Pro: Personal piety, implementation of Counter Reformation through Tridentine decrees, dissolution of decayed monasteries, strengthening authority of clergy, use of Inquisition. Attitude to Moriscos, policies towards Dutch i.e. anti-heresy, English – Protestantism and treatment of Mary, Queen of Scots, France and religious wars.

Con.- Religious policies also elements of control; power struggles with Pope; restrictions on Tridentine decrees; control of bishoprics; suppression of Moriscos. Other issues with Dutch; quashing rebellion in his territories, economic rivalry with English, traditional geographical power struggle with French.

Other issues clearly not linked to religion at all e.g. economy, finance, administration, though could argue that conscientious pursuit of latter born out of Christian duty. Candidates should reach a conclusion on extent to gain highest bands and should cover a range of issues but coverage of all aspects of Philip's policies is not required.

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

16(b) 'Success outweighed failure'. How far do you agree with this view of Philip II's reign? [45]

Focus: An assessment of the successes and failures of a monarch's reign

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

Candidates could make some distinction within period, with position increasingly declining after 1585.

Pro: apparent and some real prosperity in parts e.g. Seville, bullion imported, overseas conquests. Defeat of Turks at Lepanto, acquisition of Portugal in 1580, Spanish army dominating Europe. Reform of judicial system, assertion of royal power, little internal strife, religious peace through promotion of Counter Reformation, artistic developments (though not part of specification.)

Con: outbreak of Dutch Revolt 1566, revolt of Moriscos 1568-70. Increasing pace of decline in 1580's with war against England and France, deteriorating financial and economic position, bankruptcies and revolt in Aragon.

For highest bands, candidates will need to reach some conclusion in line 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.

Europe 1598 - 1661**Richelieu and Mazarin 1622 – 1661****17(a) How far did Richelieu achieve his aims in his religious policies?****[45]**Focus: Assessment of Richelieu's success in achieving his aims in religion.

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

Examiners will look for an explanation of Richelieu's aims in religion. Answers in Band I and Band II might be expected to include explicit references to aims whereas more moderate answers might do so implicitly. It will be relevant to put his aims in a political context; Richelieu saw the need to subordinate all religious groups, including Huguenots and Catholic Dévots, to royal control. Religion should not be a distraction from the enhancement of French glory, for example by interfering in the waging of war. It might cause internal conflict. In dealing with the Huguenots, Richelieu saw them as 'a state within a state'. He used a judicious combination of force and compromise. Reference might be made to the crushing of the revolt at La Rochelle and the sensible terms of the Grace of Alais (1629). Catholic Dévots were suspected of close links to Spain and to the papacy. In the short term, Richelieu was highly successful. The Huguenots were curbed at the price of political concessions, military bases and religious toleration within limits. However, some candidates might argue that this represented limited success at the time. Although Huguenots became quiescent, for example they were not involved in the Frondes, many orthodox Catholics continued to favour further restrictions. Candidates are not expected to have knowledge of developments beyond 1661, the end of the Study Topic. Reference to the withdrawal of privileges in 1685 (Revocation of the Edict of Nantes) will be relevant but not expected.

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

**17(b) How far was France a stronger international power in 1661 than it had been in 1622?
[45]**

Focus: Assessment of France's comparative international importance.

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

Candidates might approach the Question in two ways. They might attempt a narrow comparison of the international positions of France in 1622 and 1661. This will be very relevant. Alternatively, they might put the comparison in a wider context that will include developments between these dates. This will also be valid although it might lead to some evaluations that do not focus on the key issue. However, answers should not go beyond 1661; this will not be an acceptable alternative approach.

In 1622, France was still in a state of partial recovery from the civil wars. Spain was in economic decline but was still a powerful international force. The Austrian Habsburgs also seemed to exercise considerable influence. They threatened French interests in the south-east and in Italy. French borders were not secure. Most will see the considerable strength of France in 1661, benefiting from the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) and from the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). Spain and the Austrian Habsburgs were in decline. On the other hand, Louis XIV was just assuming power and it can be argued that France's predominance was potential rather than actual. England's military and naval power was growing but was not a significant factor in 1661. The Dutch had economic power and a strong navy but also did not seriously affect France in 1661.

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) Assess the reasons for Spain's economic and financial problems during the period from 1598 to 1659. [45]

Focus: Assessment of Spain's economic and financial problems.

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

The Question does not ask candidates to assess how serious were Spain's problems in the first half of the seventeenth century but it will be relevant to consider this as long as the focus is on the analysis and assessment of reasons. Candidates might discuss the legacy from Philip II, in particular general economic malaise and bankruptcies. It proved difficult to introduce reforms in the economic and financial systems because they alienated entrenched interests. Provinces defended their privileges vigorously, as did some social classes. There was little investment. Olivares failed to change the situation and maybe even worsened it, partly because of the extreme measures that he wished to introduce. War during much of the period was a major expense. The chance for economic and financial improvement offered by peace with the Dutch in 1609 was ended by the (unnecessary?) resumption of war in 1621, continuing to 1648. Spain was also involved in other wars, for example with France and England. The value and problems of the American empire can be assessed. Whilst the decline in bullion imports can be exaggerated, treasure from the New World was insufficient to ameliorate Spain's problems and was used to repay debts and to finance wars.

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

18(b) To what extent had Spain maintained its international importance by 1659? [45]

Focus: Assessment of changes in Spain's international importance.

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

The word 'maintained' allows candidates to compare the situation in 1659 with earlier periods but the focus should be on 1659. Candidates should be able to identify 1659 as the date of the Treaty of the Pyrenees. Spain had already been weakened by the outcome of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648 but actually the Treaty of Münster), which represented a defeat in the war against the United Provinces. The Treaty of the Pyrenees conceded Roussillon and Cerdagne to France, weakening Spain's influence in the Pyrenees region. Its army and navy had suffered defeats. The marriage of the Infanta Maria Theresa and Louis XIV might be seen either as a means to secure Spain's interests or an alliance with a dangerously growing power. This can be contrasted with earlier periods where Spain was undoubtedly a (possibly the) most imposing international power. On the other hand, Spain's weakness in 1659 should not be exaggerated. Economic weakness was not considered to be as important as diplomatic and military importance. Spain and its empire were still largely intact.

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 success in the Thirty Years' War to 1629 due to the weaknesses of its opponents? [45]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the early success of the Habsburgs in a major war.

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

Habsburg successes to 1629 were significant but relatively short-lived. 1629 and the Edict of Restitution saw the Habsburgs in a powerful position. The Bohemians had been crushed. Frederick, their ally and potential saviour, had been driven out of the Palatine. Effective generals such as Wallenstein and Tilly proved very successful. The Danes were defeated. Ferdinand II seemed on the threshold of establishing a Baltic empire. Weakness is comparative and a good study of Habsburg strength can be the basis of a very successful answer. However, answers reaching Band I or Band II should provide an adequate discussion of the weaknesses of Habsburg opponents. The Bohemians were disorganised and divided; they soon quarrelled with Frederick of the Palatinate. The Danes were ambitious but lacked clear aims and sufficient military strength.

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

19(b) To what extent was the Peace of Westphalia (1648) a defeat for the Habsburgs in the Thirty Years' War? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a treaty that ended a major war.

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

Although there are alternative arguments and approaches, the key issue is the significance of Westphalia, and good answers will need to show a sound knowledge and understanding of the Treaty. France gained control of Metz, Toul and Verdun, Philippsburgh and Breisach, and Pinerolo. France strengthened its position in Alsace. Hence, the Habsburgs lost leverage in these frontier areas. The Hapsburgs lost Western Pomerania, Wismar, Mecklenburg, Bremen and Verden to Sweden. German principedoms such as Saxony and Bavaria gained, and perhaps most important so did Brandenburg. The Edict of Restitution was withdrawn. Calvinists were given the same toleration as Lutherans. (At AS, candidates can be excused for believing that the recognition of Dutch independence was part of the Westphalia settlement rather than being agreed at Münster). The outcome of the Thirty Years' War was a political and religious defeat for the Hapsburgs, as well as a military setback. However, it can be argued that most of the Austrian empire remained intact.

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) Assess the reasons for the increase in witch hunts in this period.****[45]**

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

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

The early part of the period saw witch hunts in various parts of Europe, although they were localised rather than general. In some places, the ferocity of the witch hunts was considerable. 900+ were burned in Wurzburg in the 1620s and 600+ in Bamberg. A common factor was that both places were ecclesiastical states and a revival of Catholicism might have been a factor. However, it was not exclusively in Catholic regions. There were witch hunts in Geneva. It might be more accurate to see the phenomenon as a result of fervent religious feeling in a general sense. Another issue that might be discussed is that witch hunts happened against a background of social and economic disturbance. Candidates might consider the view that belief in witchcraft was characteristic of male-dominated societies. Most suspected witches were women. Again, there are limits to which this argument can be pushed. Some men were prosecuted. It might well have been that witch hunts were more likely to take place in remote regions where superstition persisted. But again, this cannot be applied as a universal rule. Examiners will look for reasons when awarding Band I or Band II. Answers in other bands might spend most time on descriptions of witchcraft and persecutions.

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

20(b) Assess the economic development in France during the first half of the seventeenth century. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the economic development of a major country.

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

France was sufficiently large and fertile to supply most of its own needs; the variety in agricultural produce was considerable and there was opportunity to trade. However, internal barriers did not allow for the easy exchange of produce and goods. There was a lack of interest in investment (when compared with England the United Provinces). Paris and Lyons were very large but most towns were small and encouraged only local trade. War incurred costs that limited economic development. Rural society was headed by a landowning nobility that depended on rents. The buying of offices and *rentes* were more attractive to the middle classes. Peasants could not promote economic development. The reforms of Sully might be examined but later ministers had limited success. Richelieu favoured the creation of a larger navy and launched trading companies, for example to trade with Canada, but with little success, partly because of his rigid ideas about the conduct of trade and partly because of the lack of interest in France.

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) To what extent was royal absolutism completed during the reigns of Charles XI and Charles XII? [45]

Focus: Assessment of royal absolutism in Sweden.

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

Examiners will not look for evenly balanced answers; the majority of the discussions can be expected to concentrate on Charles XI, and justifiably so when his reign saw the most important developments in Swedish absolutism. An adequate paragraph on Charles XII with a sound discussion of Charles XI can merit any mark. Charles XI (1660-1697) sought to enhance his absolute rule, reforming administration and centralising power. However, the period from 1660 to 1672 saw Sweden ruled by a Regency Council which limited absolute rule. When he ruled personally, the King aimed to regain the losses to the nobility. The resumption of crown land (*Reduktion*) was a key policy and was a very considerable success. The resulting financial gains gave Charles XI more power. Institutionally, he limited the power of the nobles' Council (*Rad*). Promotion of the nobles was brought under the Table of Ranks, emphasising service to the state. Charles XII's rule (1697-1718) also had to survive a period of Regency rule but it was briefer and did less damage to royal power. His adventurous foreign policy will not be relevant to the Question unless a link is made with his absolutism. He continued to be popular.

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

21(b) How successfully did Sweden maintain its international position after 1660? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the success of Sweden in international affairs.

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

By 1660, Sweden's empire was widespread but resented by its neighbours. Sweden was rarely comfortable in its hegemony. Either singly or often in combination, states such as Denmark, Poland, Brandenburg-Prussia, Saxony, Hanover and most importantly Russia under Peter the Great, challenged Sweden's international position. By 1718, Sweden's international primacy had been destroyed. Sweden's economic and demographic resources were insufficient to maintain its position as a great power. Copper, its one major mineral resource, was running out. It did not dominate Baltic trade. The population was comparatively small. The bulk of the army was tied to the land and more suitable for defence than for aggression. Charles XII's responsibility might be assessed.

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 the European balance of power favourable to France in 1661?****[45]**

Focus: Assessment of the balance of power at a specific date.

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

France was becoming stronger in international terms in 1661 whilst its rivals were weaker, or not stronger. The Study Topic begins in 1661 but candidates might be expected to be aware of the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659). The Austro-Spanish Habsburg axis had been broken, although there were signs of a revival against Louis XIV's aggressive policies later. England's military and naval power had grown under the Cromwellian republic but the restoration of Charles II saw some decline and England saw the Dutch, rather than France, as the more threatening enemy in 1661. However, although the Dutch had considerable naval power, they had a weak army and continental powers tended to weigh their international importance by their armies in the middle of the seventeenth century. The focus needs to be on 1661, or at least on the early years of Louis XIV's reign. Some moderate or weak candidates might use the Question as a device to ask how powerful France was. This might be worth up to Band III but the higher bands will need an adequate view of the wider implications of the balance of power although, as always, examiners will give primacy to the quality of the argument.

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

22(b) 'Louis XIV's foreign policy was mainly defensive.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period 1661 to 1715? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about foreign policy.

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

'To what extent?' invites candidates to consider the strengths and limits of the claim in the quotation. 'Mainly' means that candidates should come to a clear conclusion, although an acceptable alternative argument might be that Louis XIV was always aggressive (less likely that he was always defensive). The period from 1661 to 1715 is long and examiners will not expect answers to discuss all of the diplomacy, campaigns and wars (e.g. War of Devolution 1667-68, Franco-Dutch War 1672-79, Reunions 1679-84, War of the League of Augsburg 1689-97, War of Spanish Succession 1702-13). However, answers in Band I and Band II might be expected to deal with most of these and certainly Band I answers should show an awareness of developments over a long period. It might be argued that Louis XIV wished to defend his boundaries and his just rights in international disputes, for example in the Reunions issue and in the dispute over the Spanish succession. On the other hand, candidates might claim that he sought to enhance his glory and to extend his influence over neighbouring states, for example in his determination to defeat the Dutch. Some might interpret his reign in terms of changing priorities, defence followed by aggression, ending in defence.

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) Assess the weaknesses of Brandenburg-Prussia in the middle of the seventeenth century. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the condition of a state.

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

Candidates might devote much time to an explanation of Frederick William, the Great Elector (1640-88) but answers in Band I and Band II will normally have to go beyond a personal assessment of him. The phrase 'middle of the seventeenth century' does not have precise parameters but it will not be appropriate to go beyond 1660. On the other hand, those who take a narrow view that the Question revolves around the period of Westphalia (1648) can merit any mark. The Great Elector governed with energy, determination and ruthlessness. He tackled the weaknesses that saw his territories described as the 'sandbox of Europe'. The natural resources of Brandenburg-Prussia were very limited. His provinces were widely scattered with no natural common features of history or administration. The army was weak and relied on mercenaries (who were often very unreliable). Administration was weak and Frederick William could not rely on effective institutions. The Junkers were a powerful force and could obstruct the ruler. An Elector's constitutional powers were limited.

On the other hand, the strengths might be seen in the Great Elector's achievements. Brandenburg-Prussia occupied an important strategic position during the Thirty Years' War, which he exploited. He distanced himself from the Habsburgs and won gains at Westphalia (East Pomerania, Stettin, Halberstadt, Minden and Magdeburg). Championing the Calvinists saw Frederick recognised as a major German Protestant leader. By 1660, Brandenburg-Prussia's control over East Prussia was recognised. He used the army as a strong weapon to improve the administration and to enhance his political power. The *Recess* of 1653 gave concessions to the Junkers (he was not strong enough to destroy their power and sensibly worked with them) but, more important, it also increased his authority and his income. Other reforms, including centralising control over distant provinces came later in the reign and are outside the scope of this Question.

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 Frederick I continue the policies of Frederick William, the Great Elector? [45]

Focus: Assessment of continuity during two reigns.

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

The Question is based on a comparison and examiners will look for a reasonable balance. However, the award of all marks will depend as always on the quality of the argument. Band V will depend on an adequate understanding and knowledge of one ruler, probably the Great Elector. Continuity is indicated by Frederick I's spending on, and enlargement of, the army. Toleration of religious refugees continued. Foreign policy was conducted through alliances where the main principle was the interests of Brandenburg-Prussia. Differences might be seen in the personal activity of the rulers. Frederick I was more ambitious to be surrounded with the dignity of a ruler. He allowed ministers more latitude than the Great Elector.

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 practised by governments in Europe during the second half of the seventeenth century? Refer to any two of France, Holland and Brandenburg-Prussia to support your answer. [45]

Focus: Assessment of the extent of religious toleration.

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

The Question does not require a comparison but examiners will normally expect some comparative comments for a mark in Band I. Answers should be reasonably balanced. However, the award of all marks will depend as always on the quality of the argument. Band V will depend on an adequate understanding and knowledge of religious toleration in one country. On the other hand, marks will not depend on whether answers refer to two or three of the specified countries, but examiners will not expect as much detail if three are discussed than if the focus is on two. France can be seen as the epitome of intolerance. One might expect the most successful answers to go beyond the treatment of the Huguenots to include policies towards Jansenists and Ultramontanes (those who promoted papal power) but this is not a prerequisite for Band I. Holland might be used as examples of toleration. The Dutch admitted not only foreign Protestants but also Moriscos and Jews. The Great Elector pursued a policy of toleration. However, excellent candidates might consider the limits of toleration. It was based more on an appreciation of religious immigrants' economic value than on idealism. There were also demographic issues in Brandenburg-Prussia. Immigrants were welcomed when they could contribute positively to the states.

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

24(b) To what extent was Newton's work the only evidence of a 'scientific revolution' during the second half of the seventeenth century? [45]

Focus: Assessment of a claim about changes in science.

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

Newton is the only scientist identified in the Specification. Therefore, candidates can reach any mark without mentioning any other scientist by name. Most candidates can be expected to argue for the importance of Newton's work whether or not they agree with the idea of a wider scientific revolution. The Specification does mention 'The new scientific methods'. Newton's work was unparalleled. Using observation experiment and mathematics, he changed scientists' views of planetary and terrestrial motion with his theory of gravity. His laws of motion became fundamental to scientific beliefs in the future. (Some candidates might argue that his ideas are now outdated but this does not limit his importance at the time.) Reference might be made to scientists and scientific thinkers such as Boyle, Huygens, Leeuwenhoek and Leibniz but, as noted above, this will not be necessary. However, candidates can be expected to have an understanding of the direction of change in varied fields of science, including astronomy, biology, chemistry and physics. A common factor, which has led some to discern a 'scientific revolution', was the methodology that emphasised rational approach and interpretation. On the other hand, it might be claimed that, within the specified period, the 'scientific revolution' had an impact on very few people.

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

Period Studies – European and World History 1789-1989

The French Revolution 1789-1795

1(a) To what extent was Louis XVI's overthrow in 1792 the result of war? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of Louis XVI's overthrow

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

Key points: Role of war must be dealt with – candidates will deal with the impact of war from April 1792 and some may also deal with the role of the threat of war, the suspicions about court involvement in encouraging foreign and émigré opposition, and the events leading up to the declaration of war as well as the political and military crisis that ensued. Candidates may balance such considerations against other factors such as: Louis – indecision, reluctance to embrace change, issue of veto, misjudgement; failure of Flight to Varennes etc.– political factions and growth of republicanism; economic crisis; divisions over Church etc.

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

1(b) Assess the reasons why Revolutionary France survived the threats it faced in the period from 1792 to 1795. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for survival of revolution

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

Key points: Candidates may identify the following threats (but list is not definitive and candidates may not be explicit): War and foreign invasion; Counter Revolution; Economic crisis; internal rivalries and divisions. Reasons for survival may include: revolutionary fervour/ determination (people of Paris, sans culottes, Jacobins etc.); leadership (Danton, Robespierre etc.); emergency measures (especially those associated with the Terror), propaganda and repression; divisions and weaknesses amongst opponents; levée en masse and revolutionary armies and so forth.

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) 'Napoleon's main aim in domestic policy was to win the support of the middle classes.' How far do you agree with this view of the Consulate (1799-1804)? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of aims of domestic policy

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

Key points: Broad interpretations of the term 'middle classes' are acceptable – some may refer strictly to the 'bourgeoisie' and perhaps distinguish the group from the nobles or identify them as part of the 'notables'. Others may see the term as a euphemism for the term 'notables'. What matters is the way the candidate applies what he or she knows in relation to the question focus. In favour of the focus candidates may refer to: Constitutional and administrative reforms gave prominence to notables/middle classes locally and nationally as mayors, prefects, legislators and tribunes etc. Education reforms favoured able sons of notables/middle classes. Legal reforms and Concordat guaranteed notables in possession of lands acquired during revolution (*biens nationaux*) and property rights generally, emphasis on order welcomed by notables/ middle classes, economic policy brought stability, careers open to talents etc.

To balance this, candidates may point to other aims: priority was Napoleon and security in power, if that meant appeasing notables/middle classes he would do so, but not to extent of allowing freedom of press or speech or effective middle class democracy (constitutions). Notables/middle classes preferred private education to the indoctrination involved in the *Lycées*.

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

2(b) How far do you agree that Napoleon was a military genius?

[45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of Napoleon's generalship

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

Key points: This will be a familiar issue to candidates. The precise definition of genius does not need to be addressed directly, but answers should focus on the relative strengths and weaknesses of Napoleon's military leadership. Issues candidates may discuss are:

Yes: brilliant campaign strategist and battle tactician – number of glittering victories (Ulm, Austerlitz, Jena, Friedland etc), knew how to motivate men, capacity for detail, etc.

No: later battles, campaign mistakes and defeats (but 1814 defence of France), strength of French army he inherited, relative weaknesses and failings of his enemies, unity of command/resources of France, dependence on able subordinates (Desaix, Murat, Davout etc.)

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 the reign of Louis XVIII a success?****[45]**Focus: assessment/evaluation of reign of Louis XVIII

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

Key points: Success may be assessed against aims, context, outcomes.

E.g. on the **Yes** side: Survived and Louis XVIII passed on throne to legitimate successor, some success abroad (e.g. paid off war debt by 1818), Charter and 'moderate' policies of Decazes (1816-20 = success?)

On the **No** side: Insufficient reform, lack of 'gloire', assassination of Berry, move to right (Villèle) and succession of ultra Artois, beneficiary of war tiredness and apathy 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 was lack of reform the main reason for the overthrow of Louis Philippe in 1848?

[45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of Louis Philippe's overthrow

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

Key points: Yes: Little evidence of any significant reform. L-P appointed Guizot, party of movement in opposition, policy of '*enriches-vous*' and impact. Lack of reform stimulated support for reform: no reforms to help working class provoked riots and growth of socialism/republicanism; lack of parliamentary reform provoked opposition in middle classes and crisis of 1848 brought in by decision to ban reform banquets.

No: Louis Philippe narrow basis of support from start – a compromise candidate after 1830 Revolution, repression alienated workers, lack of dynamic foreign policy, conservative ministers, onset of economic crisis, lack of will

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) To what extent was nationalism the main cause of the revolutions in the Austrian Empire in 1848-49? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of revolutions

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

Keypoints: Nationalism must be dealt with as a cause. Candidates may point to development of nationalist movements from 1815 in Bohemia and Hungary especially (and also Germany and Italy) and, despite repression, increasing influence in 1840s. Connection between liberalism and nationalism may be dealt with. Other causes discussed may include economic crisis, impact of French Revolution, fall of Metternich, other revolutions etc.

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

4(b) 'The revolutions in the German Confederation in 1848-49 failed because they lacked mass support.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for failure

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

Keypoints: Yes: mass unrest helped revolutions occur but mass of population did not actively support revolution and as soon as economic crisis weakened the masses were docile. Masses not interested in the issues of nationalism/liberalism which excited the student and middle classes.

No: failed for other reasons – Prussian army remained loyal, revolutionaries divided in aims and against each other (e.g. Klein v. Gross Deutschland), economic recovery, lack of an army, recovery of Austria 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 reasons why revolutions failed in Italy in 1848-49.****[45]**Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for failure

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

Key points: Among the factors candidates may discuss are: the uncertain policy of King 'Wobble', the failure to take the chance to defeat the Austrian army before it retreated to the 'quadrilateral', the divided nature of Italian nationalism, the impact of the papal Allocution and withdrawal of papal and Neapolitan forces, Charles Albert's suspicion of Garibaldi and others, the recovery of Austria, Radetsky, divisions in aims, lack of foreign support and lack of mass support, French intervention.

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

5(b) 'There was no real unity mainly because Italy was Piedmont expanded rather than Italy united.' How far do you agree with this view of the Kingdom of Italy to 1870? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of Italian unity

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

Key points: Candidates will need to deal with the issue raised and its impact – they may discuss Cavour's role in unification and how he ensured that the kingdom that emerged accepted the monarchy of Victor Emmanuel and how the system of government and administration was that of Piedmont. Such discussion may be balanced against the other factors making effective unity unlikely in the short term – linguistic divide, the North:South divide, lack of national consciousness, the attitude of the pope, absence of Rome, limited franchise, 'brigands' war etc.

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) To what extent was the power of the Prussian army the main reason for the unification of Germany?

[45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for German unification

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

Key points: In relation to the given factor candidates may refer to the development of the Prussian army under Moltke and von Roon, and the crucial role played by the army in the events by which Germany was united – especially the three wars of the period. Such analysis needs to be balanced against other factors such as Bismarck's diplomacy, the growth of Prussian economic power and dominance, the relative weakness of Austria, the favourable international situation, the desire of nationalists for unification and so on.

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 isolation of France the main aim of Bismarck's foreign policy from 1871-1890? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of aims of foreign policy

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

Key points: It is possible for candidates to argue that isolation of France was a guiding principle of Bismarck's foreign policy. They may refer to the war scare of 1875 and the alleged threat from France in 1887, and may seek to argue that the desire to isolate France was a key motive behind his 'alliance system' with Russia and Austria. Others may argue that the key aim of Bismarck's policy was German security and the avoidance of war which led him down the path of seeking to be one of three in a Europe of five great powers. Some candidates may also see the French scare of 1875 as an attempt to unite Germany behind the Kaiser. Some may argue that the desire for stability and peace after the upheavals of the 1860s dominated and cite, for example, Bismarck's brokering of an agreement over the Bulgarian crisis in 1878 as evidence. Security was at the heart of Bismarck's foreign policy and he pursued this aim with a mixture of alliances, secret diplomacy, military strength and occasional scaremongering.

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

France 1848-1875

7(a) How far did the way Napoleon III ruled France change during the period from 1852 to 1870? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of change and continuity

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

Key points: The argument for change will probably centre around a contrast between the apparently dictatorial regime of the 1850s [with the limitations placed under the constitution on the Assembly and the accountability of government to it, the degree of censorship and the attempts to repress opposition] and the growing liberalisation of the regime from the late 50s to the late 60s [relaxation of censorship, political amnesties, more accountable government, the liberal constitution of 1869]. However, some may argue that in essence the nature of Napoleonic rule changed little – Napoleon wanted security in power and was always conscious of the need for popular support – changes in constitution and government practice thereby represented different attempts to win public support.

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

7(b) 'More successes than failures.' How far do you agree with this view of Napoleon III's foreign policy from 1852 to 1870? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of success of foreign policy

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

Key points: Expect treatment of the key elements of Napoleon III's foreign policy, for example, Crimea, Italy, Mexico, Germany, Spain, perhaps also reference to Free Trade treaties. Lines of argument may agree, or, perhaps more likely, argue that the failures outweigh the successes. Whilst involvement in the Crimea may be deemed successful, involvement in Italy, whilst successfully moving Italy towards unification and gaining France Nice and Savoy, cost France dearly, and alienated support at home. The Mexican affair was a disaster and the attempts to win gains for France from the tensions between Austria and Prussia failed, whilst in 1870 France was provoked into a disastrous war that sealed the fate of the second Empire.

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

Russia 1825-1881

8(a) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the opposition to the rule of Nicholas I and Alexander II. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of opposition

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

Key points: Opposition included that of westernisers and liberals, narodniks, anarchists and nihilists. There may also be mention of nationalist opposition (especially Poles). Weaknesses include opposition was divided, haphazard and relatively small-scale, largely contained by repressive measures. Even mass revolts like those of the Poles were contained and repressed without effective concessions. Strengths may involve discussion of the influence of opposition/critics in helping to persuade the tsars of the need for reform, the fact that opposition survived throughout the period, the fear inspired by acts of terror – not least the assassination of Alexander II – and the failure of the authorities to contain opposition totally despite its repressive measures.

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

8(b) 'Alexander II's main aim was to preserve the loyalty of the aristocracy.' How far do you agree with this view of Alexander's reforms? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of aims of reforms

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

Key points: Candidates may examine Alexander's reforms of serfdom and local government, for example, to demonstrate how the interests of the nobility were prominent if not paramount – serfs had to buy their land, nobles were to be dominant in the Zemstva. However, candidates may argue that the maintenance of autocracy was the key concern (which implied in part preserving the loyalty of the aristocracy). Where reforms could threaten autocracy they were modified – the right to trial by jury was taken away from political suspects, for example. The tsar retained police powers – they were not given to the Zemstva and the government interfered in local elections. Concessions to the Poles were revoked after the rebellion of 1863. Press freedoms were eroded. Candidates may argue that whilst Alexander may have wanted some modernisation of Russia, his priority was maintenance of stability and autocracy.

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) Compare the strengths and weaknesses of the Union and Confederacy at the start of the Civil War (1861). [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of relative position of two sides in war

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

Key points: Candidates may discuss some of the following issues in relation to both sides in the conflict: resources, communications, manpower, levels of readiness, morale, availability of trained officers and troops, political leadership and government, the international situation, clarity of aims, strategic positions and so on. They may well argue that the Union had strengths in resources, communications and potential manpower, but that the Confederacy had the initial advantage in morale and may even have had a realistic chance of securing international support. Lincoln may well be compared favourably with Davis.

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

9(b) 'Not until after Lee's defeat at Gettysburg (1863) was it clear that the North would win.' 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: In relation to Gettysburg candidates may point to the significance Lee attached to the battle, and the impact the battle had – casualties, Lee's loss of the aura of invincibility, encouragement to Lincoln and the Union (especially coupled with Union victories such as Vicksburg). Such discussion needs to be balanced against possible arguments for long term likelihood of Southern defeat/Union victory because, for example, of the level of resources, the impact of the Emancipation proclamation, Lincoln's re-election as president, the role of Grant and Sherman, the fact that the war continued for well over a year after Gettysburg and so on.

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) To what extent was American foreign policy more imperialist than isolationist in the period from 1896 to 1918? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of foreign policy

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

Key points: The question requires consideration of the broad sweep of American foreign policy from interventions in Cuba, Panama, Nicaragua, the Philippines through to intervention in WW1. The general desire for non-intervention needs to be balanced against specific action by American presidents which broke the general rule – in the Caribbean, S.E. Asia and eventually the Great War. Candidates may discuss Roosevelt's 'big stick', Taft's 'dollar diplomacy' and Wilson's idealism.

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

10(b) How successful was Theodore Roosevelt's domestic policy? Explain your answer.
[45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of success of domestic policy

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

Key points: Roosevelt espoused the progressive agenda and candidates may well seek to assess the degree to which Roosevelt succeeded in achieving progressive aims by consideration of the legislation passed and actions taken by him in relation to trusts, food, drugs/medicines, regulation of railroads and land reclamation. They may also discuss his aims in relation to income tax, the eight hour day and supervision of the Stock Market. In assessing success candidates may refer to aims, results and take into account opposition and context.

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) How important were developments in mining and agriculture in opening up the West? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of importance of a factor in explaining a development

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

Key points: The main issue is the impact of developments in mining and agriculture – candidates may evaluate what developments did and did not do, or may seek to balance the impact of developments in mining and agriculture against other factors (push factors, communications, Federal encouragement etc.) to address ‘how important?’. Candidates may seek to demonstrate the impact of particular developments for example in terms of mineral discoveries (California gold, Dakota etc.) or cattle ranching and driving, and explore the relationship with transport and communications – railheads and railways especially.

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

11(b) Assess the impact of the policies of Federal governments on westward expansion in the period from 1846 to 1900. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of the impact of policy

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

Key points: In relation to transport and communications, the issues of telegraph and railroad promotion may be discussed. In relation to land, the effectiveness of such legislation as the Homestead Act may be discussed. Issues of local government are not directly covered by the specification, but we can reward candidates who discuss the establishment of territories and states. Law and order was largely a local issue but there may be discussion of the relative absence of federal policy. In relation to Native Americans, candidates may consider attempts at peaceful solutions and treaties, policing the frontier, Indian Wars, reservations and Americanisation.

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) Assess the reasons why there was little improvement in the position of Blacks in the period from 1863 to 1877. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for limited change

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

Key points: Candidates may argue that although Blacks were given formal political rights that these meant little in practice. Candidates may point to several reasons: entrenched white opposition in the South, lack of resources for institutions like the Freedman's Bureau, the economic and social realities in the South, Blacks lack of educational opportunity, the degree of determination by the Federal government to defend Black rights, the Black Codes and so on.

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

12(b) 'Blacks were no better off in 1912 than they had been in 1877.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of change/continuity

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

Key points: Candidates may point to the erosion of civil rights during this period to suggest that in many ways the position of Blacks had got no better and had perhaps deteriorated since 1877 – Jim Crow Laws, re-emergence of white vigilante organisations, erosion of voting rights and so on. On the other hand, candidates may also point to the efforts of many Blacks to improve their lot, pointing to the work of leaders like Booker T. Washington and his drive to improve the education and social and economic lot of African Americans by their own efforts. However the contrasting views of du Bois and the Niagara Movement might suggest Washington's efforts had negligible impact when Blacks were faced with segregation, discrimination and lynchings.

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) Assess the success of the economic and social policies of Witte and Stolypin during the period from 1894 to 1914.

[45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of success of policies

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

Key points: This is not a comparison question per se, although candidates may draw out assessment of success by comparison. There is likely to be fuller treatment of Witte than Stolypin and examiners should not expect balance – however, both men's policies should be examined to access the higher bands. Candidates are likely to discuss Witte's policies to encourage the modernisation of Russia (and industry in particular) and Stolypin's efforts to reform Russian agriculture/peasant land ownership. Success may be tested against aims, outcomes and context.

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

13(b) To what extent was the impact of the First World War the main reason for the overthrow of the Tsar in the February Revolution (1917)? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of Tsar's overthrow

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

Key points: Candidates will need to assess the impact of the war on the Tsar's position and may well discuss issues such as the gap between initial optimism and the reality of constant defeats, the economic and social problems caused or exacerbated by the war, the impact of the Tsar's decision to take personal command and so forth. However, to do well candidates must balance this evaluation against the role of other factors, such as the role of opposition, the impact of Rasputin, longer term problems in Russia (here links with the war can be made – i.e. candidates may well argue the war exacerbated or brought to the fore problems in Russia and with autocracy that had been revealed as early as 1905.)

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) Assess the impact of the First World War on Britain in the years from 1914 to 1920.
[45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of impact of war

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

Key points: Candidates may deal with the increase in government power. There may be discussion of DORA, and its ramifications, especially in terms of transport, industry, food supply etc. Candidates may also deal with the impact of losses, conscription, the impact on the economy, the role of women, the 1918 election, post-war problems and so on. Indeed as the time span goes on to 1920 we can expect many candidates to consider the immediate post-war impacts of economic dislocation and returning soldiers.

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

14(b) 'The main motive behind the Treaty of Versailles was to prevent another war.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of motives behind peace treaty

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

Key points: Candidates may forcefully argue that this indeed was the main motive and point to the aims of Wilson in particular. They might also argue that France and Britain too wanted to prevent the possibility of another war by focussing their attention on preventing a possible future threat from Germany to their interests – by, for example, arms limitations, economic punishment, territorial demilitarisation. However, candidates may also argue that other motives were involved and may have dominated – greed, the desire for revenge, the claims of reparation, the desire to give nationalities self-determination and so on.

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

Italy 1919-1945

15(a) Assess the reasons why Mussolini was able to consolidate his hold on power in the 1920s after his appointment as Prime Minister in 1922. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of reasons for Mussolini's consolidation of power

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

Keypoints: Candidates may point to the circumstances of Mussolini's appointment to demonstrate that powerful interests saw him as a bulwark against anarchy at a time when liberal politics had failed. They may refer to the influence and power of fascist propaganda in promoting and spinning events to the benefit of the party and more particularly the personal leadership of Mussolini. In addition there may well be discussion of the role of fascist violence and intimidation, the Acerbo Law, the defeat of the socialists as a result of the Matteoti affair and the 'Aventine Secession', the unwillingness of the King to act against Mussolini and the later limitation of his powers and after 1925 the consolidation of the fascist dictatorship and the willingness of the Church to do a deal with Mussolini.

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

15(b) How successful were Mussolini's domestic policies from 1922 to 1940? [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of success of policies

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

Key points: Candidates may range over the breadth of 'domestic policy' and include treatment of political, religious, social and economic policy. Others may focus more on social and economic policy. This is fine, but what will determine the level of reward will be the quality of knowledge and understanding and the evaluation of success – in relation to aims, outcomes or context. There may be an assessment of the various 'battles' – grain, lira, births etc. – and contrast the claims made and the actual impact. Candidates may also discuss political control, education, corporatism, religion, the military and so forth.

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 failed to survive the effects of the Great Depression (1929-33). [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of causes of Weimar collapse

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

Key points: Candidates need to focus on the issue of why the Weimar Republic failed to survive, rather than focus directly on the rise of Hitler. Candidates should seek to show a good knowledge and understanding of the economic, social and political effects of the great Depression. Among the reasons that candidates may evaluate are: long term reasons like the Treaty of Versailles and the failings of the Weimar Constitution – however, to be truly effective discussion of these should be linked to the collapse of the Weimar Republic in the years after 1929; short term reasons like the break up of the Grand coalition; the resort to rule by decree; the failure to take decisive action to mitigate the economic and social consequences of the Depression; the rise in the appeal of extremism of both left (communism) and right (nazism); the failings and scheming of established politicians, especially in the endgame of the Weimar Republic (1932-33); the role of Hindenburg; Hitler's aim to destroy democracy

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

16(b) Assess the impact of propaganda and indoctrination on Nazi Germany from 1933 to 1939. [45]

Focus: assessment/evaluation of degree of change

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

Key points: Candidates may set their answers in the context of Nazi aims in relation to propaganda and indoctrination – in relation to race, the 1000 year *Reich*, the role of men and women, the enemies of the Nazi Vision and so on. We may get evaluation of social change by reference to policies followed with respect to workers (German Labour Front, Strength through Joy, employment), women (*Kinder, Kirche, Kuche*, and exclusion from professions, role of motherhood etc.), children (education, youth policies). There may be evaluation of the impact of anti-semitic propaganda/indoctrination (e.g. the initial limited impact of the attempted boycott of Jewish shops in 1933). Candidates may also address the type and extent of opposition to evaluate the impact of propaganda and indoctrination and set against the backdrop of terror and economic upturn/foreign policy success.

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**International Relations 1919-1941**

17(a) Assess the view that the Locarno Treaties were the main reason why there were no major international disputes in the 1920s. [45]

Focus: Impact of the Locarno treaties

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

Good answers will need to demonstrate a clear understanding of how the Treaty impacted on Germany and her neighbours during the 1920s. Main issues to be considered include: attempts to resolve territorial disputes (East and West boundaries and German speaking minorities), importance of personal diplomacy of Briand, Chamberlain and Stresemann; rehabilitation of Germany in international community (joining League). There was still no final resolution of reparations, war guilt or disarmament issues. Other factors which contributed to a lack of major disputes could include the success of the League, war weariness and economic difficulty. Wider perspectives on what led up to and resulted from the treaties would add to a strong answer.

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

17(b) Assess the reasons why the League of Nations failed to prevent Japanese and Italian aggression in the 1930s. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the failure of the League of Nations

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

Answers will attempt to focus on the evidence of the League's increasing inability to deal with the deteriorating international situation of the 1930s. A main emphasis might well be on the two crises of the 1930s, over Manchuria and Abyssinia, as examples of the dilemmas faced by the League and how these incidents influenced the growing challenges provided by Japan and Italy. The origins of aggressive nationalism in both countries, arising out of their failure to gain significantly from World War I and the economic depression of the 1930s, could form a basis for considering the responses of the League. Early, small scale successes of the League were not sufficient to enable it to deal effectively with the much larger challenges of the 1930s. The condoning of Japanese and Italian actions by Britain and France also provide important explanation as to why the League eventually proved so ineffective.

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

The USSR 1924-1953**18(a) Assess the reasons why Stalin ended the New Economic Policy.****[45]**Focus: Evaluation of reasons

Answers should discuss the implications of Stalin's policies for industry and agriculture. The contrast in policy and the needs of the country between Lenin and Stalin can be emphasised. Consideration of why this was deemed necessary and the ensuing debates within the Party could be focused on. Particular evaluation can be made by considering the political and social as well as economic reasons for, and objectives of, the change of policy.

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

18(b) 'The post-war settlement was the main reason why the USSR was able to expand control over Eastern Europe'. How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the extent of the USSR's control of Eastern Europe

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

Answers should concentrate on Soviet attempts to control Eastern Europe from 1945. They could include evaluation of the effectiveness of economic, political and social constraints; Stalin's divide and rule tactics on recently liberated states and the imposition of Moscow's own brand of communism. Perspectives looking back from 1953 will enable strong evaluation of Stalin's success in exploiting his opportunities and thwarting the challenge from the West.

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

The Cold War in Europe

19(a) Assess the view that the USSR's attempt to dominate Eastern Europe was the main cause of the Cold War. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of relative importance of the causes of the Cold War in Europe

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

Answers will need to show clear understanding of both Yalta and Potsdam meetings, with particular attention given to the evidence of disagreement between the wartime allies. Other factors for the development of the Cold War will need to be considered: ideological differences, the impact of victory, the policies of the USA and USSR, the atomic bomb. The Berlin Blockade could provide a main focus to evaluate the policy followed by Stalin and the West's response. Perspectives back from this will enable answers to demonstrate their understanding of how these issues inter-relate.

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

19(b) Assess the view that Gorbachev was mainly responsible for ending the Cold War in Europe by 1989. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the ending of the Cold War

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

Particular focus will need to be on Gorbachev's role in the USSR, though the USA's policies should also be considered. Internal pressures for the USSR, particularly Gorbachev's modernisation (policies of *perestroika* and *glasnost*) and the difficulty of maintaining satellites were compounded by the continued military spending of the USA. Both internal and external factors could be considered, with the best answers emphasising how Gorbachev tried to manage these for the USSR.

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

The Cold War in Asia and the Americas 1949-1975

20(a) Assess the reasons why there was so much rivalry outside Europe between the USA and USSR in the 1950s. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the development of the USA's and USSR's policies during the 1950s

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

A range of different factors can be considered which put pressure on the USA and USSR: containment, the arms race, the Korean War, Dulles, Iran and Baghdad pact, decolonisation in SE Asia, Cuba. The contexts of ideological, political, military and economic rivalries could all be considered. Stalin's death and the new direction of Khrushchev had major implications for the policies of the USSR. In the USA McCarthyism, support for Republicans and support for increased spending on arms were all important.

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

20(b) Assess the reasons why the USA was involved in the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962). [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the USA's involvement in the Cuban Missile Crisis.

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

Answers will need to consider the causes and course of the Crisis in order to fully evaluate issues. USA and USSR's involvement in Cuba, military, economic and political considerations should be evaluated, along with the importance of the immediate circumstances of military escalation, ultimatums and communication between the two super powers. Kennedy and Khrushchev's political and policy outlooks will underpin sound answers.

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 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the attitudes of the nobility were the main cause of examples of poor government in Charlemagne's reign after 800. [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 know from their own knowledge that the later reign of Charlemagne is often regarded as a period of weakness and unrest. The legislation of the late reign rails time and again against abuses by the great. This is often attributed to the end of Carolingian expansion – nobles were exploiting official positions to gain income and status no longer available from the profits of war. Contemporaries were painfully aware of abuses, as Passage **A** by Alcuin indicates. Alcuin was a highly influential figure, but as a cleric he took a moral view, but he does suggest that malpractice was on a vast scale. Interestingly, he is writing in 802 and such abuses may likely have a much longer history than merely the 'late reign' defined as 800-814. In Passage **B** Ganshof argues that the empire had 'a totally inadequate administrative and judicial apparatus', but in passage **C** McKitterick points out that sweeping conclusions of this kind are not possible. She suggests that while there is ample evidence that counts did abuse their positions, we cannot say how often this happened for lack of evidence. In passage **D** Innes suggests a totally different process was at work. Once expansion ceased, Charlemagne was attempting to reform the whole governmental system, to bind the nobles into a much closer relationship with the centre of power, and that this created problems. Candidates should also know from their own knowledge that it has been suggested that all these abuses had a long history before 800 and they should connect this with the arguments in the passages.

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 Charlemagne's main problem in conquering Saxony was the difficulty of raising sufficient military forces. [45]

Focus: The nature of the difficulties in the conquest of Saxony

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 has been considerable discussion of how Charlemagne raised troops for his conquests in recent years, and candidates need to set out some clear indication as to how the ideas advanced may have influenced the course of the conquest. On the other hand many other factors influenced the rate of conquest. Candidates should demonstrate a clear knowledge of the sequence of Charlemagne's campaigns and be able to cast this into an analytic structure. Charlemagne was clearly distracted on occasion by events elsewhere - Italy in 772 or Spain in 778, and there are plenty of other examples. But the question asks about the main problem, so that the full range of factors needs to be considered. Problems of climate, geography and distance need to be explored. The nature of the Saxon polity must be discussed, and their military capacity for resistance evaluated. However, the candidates should always retain a focus on the issue of troops. Good candidates may point to the stresses and strains imposed on the Carolingian structure – the plots in the 780s are germane in this connection. What is required is a full discussion of all these factors.

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's high reputation rests primarily on his military successes. [45]

Focus: The debate about Charlemagne's reputation

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.

Charlemagne was a great conqueror – of that there can be little doubt. He did not always lead his armies in person but his was the impulse which created, supported and directed them, and this has not been disputed by any historian. If he had not conquered he would not have had the prestige and support to become an effective king. Candidates should establish this, assessing the evidence upon which it is based. But historians have praised him for other reasons. It has been suggested that his interest in learning was the main reason for the 'Carolingian Renaissance'. Candidates need to evaluate the evidence, noting the role of other (and particularly the court) scholars. How far was he interested in church reform implemented at a number of great councils? He has also been seen as the great ruler, doing justice for all his people – this view needs to be evaluated. There has been considerable controversy over the value of the title of 'Emperor' to him. It has, after all, been suggested that he was no more than a 'Warrior Chieftan' and this may be discussed. Was the notion of empire meaningful to him or not? Candidates should be able to scrutinise the foundations of his reputation and evaluate them, focusing on military achievements but balancing them against other things.

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

King John

4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that it was King John's taxation of England which provoked the rebellion which led to *Magna Carta*. [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** the extent of King John's financial exactions upon England is very amply set out, and candidates should know enough about the ordinary revenue of the crown to understand what the significance of these huge sums was. They should be able to show clearly that they know why John was doing this – its essence is remarked upon in Passage **D** 'recovering his lost continental possessions'. In passage **C**, a consequence of that objective, the rebellion of Wales, is also noted and candidates are likely to recognise that this increased the pressure on John (as did relations with Scotland and Ireland as some may say). In addition, Passage **A** suggests that John perverted the whole structure of English government to produce a despotism to which the barons objected. This is contested to a degree by passage **D** which suggests that to some extent John ruled like his predecessors, but argues that John faced bigger problems than they, was confined to the British Isles and assumed much more personal responsibility than they had done for the measures he took. However, matters other than finance were at work. There is evidence, noted in **C** that John's promiscuity took forms which were obnoxious to the English baronage. Candidates may also suggest other personality traits of John which influenced the situation, in particular his cruelty, exhibited in the affair of de Braose, and his undependability. The result was a baronage prepared to scheme with his enemies, as is said in **C**. But they should note the comment in **C** that such matters 'were a major factor in the rebellion which led up to it', but not its fundamental cause. Candidates may well relate these causes of discontent to clauses in *Magna Carta*, and while this has some relevance, they are asked about the causes of the rebellion and that must be the main thrust of their analysis.

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

5 To what extent was King John responsible for the conflict with Innocent III? [45]

Focus: The reasons for the outbreak of conflict over the appointment of the archbishop of Canterbury.

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 show that they are aware of the complex situation which arose on the death of archbishop Hubert Walter on 13 July 1205. The monks of Canterbury were the electors, but the English bishops felt they should have some say. Most importantly, the archbishop was traditionally a servant of the King – Hubert Walter had been John's Justiciar. Moreover, contemporary practice accepted that the crown should have a strong say in all elections to bishops and this was notably the case in England. John almost certainly had in mind the election of John de Gray when, shortly after the archbishop's death, he persuaded all parties to postpone an election and lay the matter before the pope. He probably hoped that in the traditional way he could then persuade Innocent III to accept this nomination. But the Canterbury monks secretly proceeded to an election, sending their choice, Reginald, to Rome for confirmation. This was unprecedented and it can be argued that it was no fault of John's.

However, new developments in the European Church were, it has been suggested, at work. Innocent III, it has been suggested, wanted ecclesiastical elections to be genuinely free and took the dispute as an opportunity to assert this. This analysis suggests that John was not responsible for the outbreak or its course. However, his coercion of the monks of Canterbury, forcing them to elect John de Gray, was provocative, while it is possible that Innocent was looking for a way out. He certainly quashed the election of de Gray, but he also did the same to Reginald, and eventually consecrated Stephen Langton in July 1207 who, it has been suggested, may have seemed like a compromise candidate, being English. But John was disturbed by Langton's long residence in France and refused to accept a trampling on his rights and the dispute sharpened, but both sides continued to negotiate, with a settlement seeming almost reached in 1209. However John became more extreme in his pressure on the English church, profiting from the support of the barons and the apparent indifference of the mass of the population to the Interdict. It was only after the excommunication of November 1209 that John really began to plunder the Church – and then faced the international ramifications which led to his submission. It is perfectly possible to argue either way on this evidence.

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

6 Assess the reasons why civil war broke out in England after the agreement of Magna Carta?

[45]

Focus: The reasons for the breakdown of the peace established by *Magna Carta*

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.

Magna Carta is today best known as the 'foundation of English liberties', but at the time it was intended as a solution to the dispute between the king and many of his barons. Many of its provisions are clearly designed as responses to the situation between king and barons as it had evolved in 1214-15. Candidates need to show that they understand this situation fully, but must focus on the issue of breakdown.

The peace broke down, and this happened for a number of reasons: John was reluctant and forced into it – he saw it as a means to re-establish his power. He felt particularly aggrieved by the enforcement articles. The barons were divided. Some of them, especially the group usually identified as the 'Northerners', were bitterly hostile to John and had absented themselves from the ceremonies. Others agreed the document, most notably a kind of middle party formed around Langton. Some of the barons were deeply hostile to the whole thing and supported John strongly. It is suggestive of the tensions amongst the barons that no member of the baronage in any way friendly to John was placed on the executive committee which was established to oversee the implementation of the Charter.

By submitting to the Pope, John was in a position to have the whole thing annulled as the ultimate sovereign of England. It can be argued that John made efforts to make the Charter work, and it is possible that he applied for annulment only as a hedge in the event of a breakdown. However this was hardly a sign of confidence in the Charter. Despite the loss of London John was in quite a strong position across the country and he could hope to improve this.

The focus should be on *Magna Carta* as a peace and not excessive discussion of its wider historical importance. Overall there were deep divisions amongst the English baronage and a real distrust of John and this caused the peace to break down.

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 Philip II's role in causing revolt in the Netherlands to 1572. [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.

There is debate on whether Philip, the Grandees and nobility, or the Netherlands Calvinists bear most responsibility for the outbreak of revolt in 1566 as reflected in the Passages. As for the 1572 Revolt, the Passages reflect Alva's part as well as Philip's absence as contributory factors, but there are also other reasons mentioned here, such as foreign intervention and the leadership of William of Orange. Passages **B** and **D** agree that Philip was determined to deal with rebels to maintain his Netherlands inheritance, but **B** sees him as learning from his concessions since 1561 and adopting a firm policy, whereas **D** suggests he wished Alva to proceed carefully, and that Alva himself bore the blame for a repressive policy. Extraneous knowledge might include references to the bishoprics plan, Granvelle, ambiguous messages on the heresy laws, Margaret of Parma's Moderation, Egmont's mission and the Segovia Woods Letters.

Passage **B** also mentions Philip's earlier withdrawal of troops, and his need to govern from Spain to defend his broader monarchy. Evidence used might include Philip's distractions, the Turks and Moriscos. Passage **D** makes a reference to the part played by William of Orange, which might be linked with the activities of the Netherlands grandees mentioned in Passage **A**. This Passage places the blame for the outbreak of the 1566 revolt squarely on the shoulders of the Netherlands grandees who fomented Calvinist revolt in an attempt to recover privileges lost to Philip's Castilianisation policy. Passage **C** agrees that Philip had ridden roughshod over local privileges but sees also the view that the Netherlands nobility had a duty to obey their ruler, as stated also at the start of Passage **B**. He was an absentee monarch.

Own knowledge here might include Philip's micromanagement from Madrid with attendant 'time-space' problems, suspension of the States General, Alva's Council of Troubles, infringement of the Order of the Golden Fleece, executions of Egmont and Hornes, billeting and collection of the Tenth Penny. In Passage **C**, blame is equally attributed, without mention of foreign interference which is a strong theme in Passage **A**. This theme might be developed by reference to the Dutch grandees' family links in France and Germany and the activities of Huguenot hedge preachers. Here there may also be reference to Elizabeth's expulsion of the Sea Beggars in 1572. Philip's personal 'dereliction of duty' in failing to go to the Netherlands is the main thrust of **D**, leaving Alva a free hand to provoke further revolt. There may be a discussion of William of Orange's failed 1568 invasion.

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

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

Focus: The impact of Philip II's religious policy on 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.

Traditionally, Philip II's religious policy has been linked to the Black Legend of his absolutist tyranny, expansive foreign policy and oppressive use of the Inquisition to impose orthodoxy. This suggests that his control over Spain strengthened, so weakening Spain itself and leading to its decline in the seventeenth century. Revisionists portray him either as the 'Prudent King' defending his subjects from heresy, or as a bureaucrat bogged down in paperwork, weak and unable to impose his authority on local religion, which remained superstitious and unreformed. The debate sets his positive achievements against the negative ones. On the positive side, he took control of the Catholic Church in the whole Iberian peninsula by annexing Portugal; used the Inquisition to educate his people in personal morality and upheld the Tridentine decrees, perhaps 'revolutionising Spanish Catholicism by reform of the Spanish Church and eradication of heretical sects. On the other hand, his reforms are seen by some historians as ineffective, so weakening Spain. He taxed the Church heavily, he used the Inquisition to instil fear and, on occasion, as a political tool, causing a negative impact on Spanish culture and society and helping to provoke revolts in the Alpujarras and Aragon. The weakening of local privileges might be linked to Inquisitorial action in Aragon. Criteria may be established to judge whether religious policy strengthened or weakened Spain's national church, society, culture, finances and system of government. Defence of his lands from foreign religious threats such as the Ottomans was also part of his religious policy. Foreign policy may be used relevantly in argument, if focused on its impact on the strength of Spain. His poor relations with successive Popes, undermining Spain's reputation abroad, might be linked to the Black Legend.

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

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

Focus: Relative significance of events as turning points in Philip II's foreign policy.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached

The debate centres on the consistency of Philip II's strategies in foreign policy and the impact of events on these. The significance of the battle of Lepanto is the subject of debate among historians, many of whom now reject the traditional view that it saw the end of the Ottoman threat in the Mediterranean and stress the swift recovery of the Turkish fleet. It is likely, however, to be seen as the key event in ending Philip's concentration on the Mediterranean, and shifting his attention to northern Europe after 1580. However, other turning points should be evaluated for comparison, to fulfil the requirement to discuss 'main'. Among these may be the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis 1559 ending the Habsburg-Valois wars, the acquisition of Portugal in 1580, the outbreak of war against England in 1585 and against the Triple Alliance in 1596. Their relative significance to Philip's strategies should be balanced, focusing on how his strategies 'turned' as a result.

The nature of the 'turning-point' might be discussed. Historians who have stressed the consistency of his religious motivation, in fighting the Turks in the Mediterranean until 1578, acquiring Portugal in 1580 and waging war against the English and French heretics in the late 1580s and 1590s, dismiss the idea of a turning-point in his religious aims. However, those who have emphasised his political and imperialist ambitions, see a shift from defensive to offensive strategies after the truce with the Turks in 1578, citing his acquisition of Portugal and its empire, his attempts to dominate England by sending the Armadas, and to absorb France, continuing war with Henry IV after 1593 despite Rome's recognition of his Catholicism.

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

Elizabeth I

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

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The Passages suggest a number of different methods of controlling parliament. **A** and **D** focus on government management of parliaments, with the use of Councillors to control the passage of legislation through the Houses. **A** also refers to the role of the Speaker, while **D** acknowledges Elizabeth's role in making speeches at the opening and closing of sessions, but downplays the importance of her role during sessions. On the other hand, **B** and **C** stress the role of the Queen in managing the Commons in particular. **B** argues that Elizabeth's approach was key to the management of Parliament, citing her use of personality in the firm and tactful way she dealt with contentious issues. **C** implies that while the Queen took an active role in communicating with the MPs, control was hardly needed as the MPs were uninterested in political issues and like Elizabeth were keen for sessions to be as short as possible.

Candidates may exemplify any of the methods referred to in the Passages, for example citing the Golden Speech, or the influence of councillors on men such as Thomas Norton. Candidates may argue the importance of other methods of controlling Parliament, such as the use of the royal veto. They may cite a number of specific examples of parliamentary management to illustrate their argument: the challenge to Elizabeth to name a successor and/or to marry; attempts to alter the Church Settlement; requests for greater freedom of speech. Candidates may also use examples of the successful passage of legislation through parliament, such as the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity and subsidy bills. Candidates may refer to occasions when control was not so clear to illustrate the importance of particular management tactics, for example the concessions on monopolies in the last Parliament of the reign.

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

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

Focus: Evaluation of the debate on the marriage question.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Historians have proposed a number of reasons for Elizabeth remaining single, including psychohistory (the psychological scarring caused by her mother's and her stepmother's executions and her alleged relationship with Lord Admiral Thomas Seymour) which may be criticised on the grounds that psychoanalysis of a dead person is not possible; Elizabeth's alleged sterility so there was nothing to be gained from marriage (no direct heir was possible), which may be challenged on the grounds that her doctors found no evidence for this; that she was a 'career woman' who would have resented the interference of a husband and the need for career breaks to raise children, an argument that may be challenged on the grounds that contemporaries were able to reconcile the idea of her having a husband yet remaining in charge, and that the concept of a 'career woman' is anachronistic. Historians have also examined the pros and cons of individual suitors as seen by Elizabeth and her councillors. Her Council failed to agree on any one candidate as a consort, yet there can still be debate over whether this was what Elizabeth wanted or if she would have preferred to marry. Candidates may consider what can be deduced about Elizabeth's own preferences, and the extent to which she was allowed or able to exert any influence over the matter. Her statements to parliament as well as her apparent enthusiasm for Leicester and Alençon as suitors may be set against her procrastination and responsiveness to criticism of her courtships from councillors and the public.

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

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

Focus: The extent of Puritan influence on the Church of England, 1559-1603.

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 balance their answers between different possible areas of influence, that is, the Church Settlement, the clergy and the laity, doctrine, structure and practices. The Queen's insistence that the Church remain broad, with discussion and decisions about doctrine and practice confined to the Church hierarchy could be set against the difficulties experienced in enforcing this view. Candidates may refer to the role of Marian exiles in the 1559 Parliament, but should be wary of over-emphasis on the passing of the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy as it is accepted there were few extreme Protestants in the 1559 Parliament. Candidates may consider the differing influence of Puritans during the reign, setting the most critical moments of Puritan activity, especially in 1563-5 (the Vestiarian controversy and the 39 Articles), 1571-2 (promotion of leading reformers to bishoprics, Thomas Cartwright's spring lectures, attempts to change the Prayer Book), 1584-7 (Classical Movement, 1584 and 1586 Parliaments – Turner and Cope), against those of lesser or reduced influence, such as the 1590s after the deaths of leading religious and political leaders of Puritan persuasion such as Field and Leicester and when Separatists were severely persecuted. Influence on lay piety, apparent by the end of the reign, as well as the development and demise of separatism, could be set against the strong defence of the structure and doctrine of the Church by bishops in the later years.

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 was a man of little significance before the outbreak of Civil War in 1642. [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.

A and **B** put forward the view that Cromwell was already an established politician by 1640, while **C** and **D** argue that his standing was far less secure. Whereas **B** stresses Cromwell's experience and connections, **A** focuses on his activities in the Long Parliament, claiming that his prominence can be explained by his pre-existing political connections. **B** notes that these were based on both social and family connections. Candidates may elaborate on and analyse further the role that these connections played in determining the part that he played in the Long Parliament. They may also pick up the reference in **A** to the claim that Cromwell was a very ordinary member of the Long Parliament. **C** and **D** are concerned with a slightly earlier phase in Cromwell's career, but one which just predated the opening of the Long Parliament. **D** acknowledges his family connections and includes reference to his career in local government, while **C** describes him as an obscure gentleman, while also acknowledging his familial connections. Both these Passages note that his social standing was insecure and declining during the 1630s.

Candidates may develop any or all of the hints offered in the Passages about Cromwell's early career, offering further details in support of their argument. They may refer to his activities in local government and as MP for Huntingdon, to the status and activities of his social connections such as John Hampden, and to variations in his economic status in the 1630s. They may attempt to reconcile the apparently conflicting arguments, noting the changed fortunes of the St. John/Pym/Hampden grouping in the Long Parliament in relation to the Bedford Plan and the extent of Pym's influence on the Commons. This may be used to explain the contrast between Cromwell's obscurity in the 1630s and relative prominence in 1640-42.

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

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

Focus: The extent to which Cromwell was consistent in his actions and ideas between the trial and execution of the King and his installation as Lord Protector.

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 'parliamentary cause' should be defined, and a range of points may be accepted. They may include a commitment to rule including parliament and without a king, and may also refer to religious policy – probably the army's view that a range of religious practices should be tolerated, in the context of reforming the church(es) and the manners of the nation in a puritanical vein. Candidates may consider the extent to which Cromwell served Parliament or ignored it. They may also discuss the purpose, composition and workings of the Nominated Assembly (Barebones Parliament) in relation to the 'cause'. There are different views on whether or not Cromwell was intent on controlling government during 1653. Did he dissolve the Rump in order to increase his power, or was he committed to seeking God's will? What was he trying to prevent in dissolving the Rump? Was he aware that Lambert was preparing the Instrument of Government when he accepted power back from members of the Nominated Assembly? On religion, they may consider the response of Cromwell to the Blasphemy and Adultery Ordinances as well as his attempts to placate the army regarding the Rump's religious actions. Religious commitment may also be considered in relation to Cromwell's campaign in Ireland and his campaign against the Scots may be used to illustrate his commitment to the cause.

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

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

Focus: The extent to which Cromwell's Protectorate was, or became, conservative.

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 clear and ongoing debate about the extent to which the Cromwellian Protectorate's constitutions and policies can be described as having retreated from a position of revolutionary regicide and republicanism by introducing a quasi-monarchical regime in which the traditional ruling elite were increasingly influential. Candidates may consider aspects of the regime and its workings, probably focussing on the constitutional arrangements under both the Instrument of Government and the Humble Petition and Advice (possibly comparing them). They may consider the serious consideration Cromwell gave to the offer of the crown. They may consider the influence of Army Grandees set against that of New Cromwellians, especially during the Second Protectorate Parliament. The religious policies of the Protectorate may be considered in terms of levels of toleration of beliefs and practices. Cromwell's insistence on toleration at the time of the First Protectorate Parliament, the imposition of 'godly reformation' especially by some of the Major Generals and the treatment of James Nayler are all possible foci for discussion. Candidates may also consider other aspects of policy such as the extent to which enemies of the regime were punished and the ways in which they were punished. Early commitment to simplification of the law and ease of access to it may be set against limited achievements. Candidates may refer to events after the death of Oliver Cromwell, such as the restoration of the Stuart monarchy, but must not be expected to do so.

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 reforms did not improve the government of Russia. [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 C** agree with the claim whilst Passages **B and D** point to more orderly systems that resulted in improvements. Answers that group the extracts might be more creditable than those that tackle them sequentially although the priority in assessment will be the quality of the argument.

Passage **A** sees Peter's reforms as unplanned and not wholly successful. Policies brought about change for only a minority in Russia and the peasantry suffered in particular. Passage **C** records the verdict of an historian who believes that Peter not only failed to create an efficient system of government but he even made things worse. The detailed description of crime might be powerful evidence of Peter's failings whilst the conclusion about 'under-government' is a strong condemnation that refutes the claim in the question. On the other hand, Passage **B** sees significant reforms in the later years of the reign with administration being re-organised. The last sentence shows the limits of the reforms. Passage **D** makes a series of points that support the claim that Peter improved government. The last two sentences might be seen as significant because they claim that Peter's ideas were shared by others in Russia.

Own knowledge can draw on other aspects of Peter's government, for example the creation of the *gubernia*, his introduction of a service nobility through the Table of Ranks, reforms of the economy in which the state took a stronger role and his suppression of dissidents. They might come to different conclusions about the extent of improvement in government. Examiners will note that candidates are not expected to have knowledge of later periods, for example of the troubles faced by his successors. Accurate references should be rewarded but answers that end in 1725 can merit the highest mark.

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

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

Focus: The condition of Russia at the accession of Peter the Great.

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.

Different assessments in the debate are that Russia was a very backward, traditional country at the time of Peter’s accession and that alternatively there were already signs of significant change. Factors that would contradict the claim might include the presence of strong traditional groups such as the *boyars* and the peasantry, as well as the influence of the Orthodox Church. The position of tsar was different from that of western European kings. The administrative and government systems were very different from those in the west. The economy was backward. Peter’s own upbringing points to the presence of wider influences. He spent much time in the German Quarter and met foreigners. Religious exiles from the west lived in Russia, especially in Moscow. There were some western buildings and foreign fashions were appearing. He was advised to travel to the west soon after his accession; it was not thought to be an aberration. Peter certainly called for rapid and wide-scale reforms after he gained power but candidates should focus on the situation at his accession.

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

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

Focus: Peter the Great's policies towards the Church.

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 a debate about Peter's relations with, and reforms of, the Church. It might be argued that his policies were part of a programme of westernisation, to bring up to date a reactionary institution. The Church, like every other institution, should be subordinate to the state. Some have claimed that it reflected his own lack of religious feelings. Others would claim that he did have religious feelings but favoured toleration although this was limited to foreign dissidents, not to Russians. On the other hand, it might be considered that his measures represented limited change. He interfered with the highest levels of administration (e.g. the increased powers of the Holy Synod and curbs on the power of the Patriarch 1721) and controlled Church lands and salaries, but did not seek to change rituals and doctrine. Candidates might argue that he did not wish to control but to improve the Church. He encouraged the building of churches and appointed priests to serve with the army and navy. It might be concluded that his reign struck very serious blows at the power of the Church or that his reforms did little to weaken the underlying strengths of the Church although they did bind it more closely to the state. Candidates are expected to have knowledge only of the reign of Peter but credit can be given to those who argue that he was not the first Tsar to try to bring the church under control. The reigns of weak rulers before Peter had seen the Church increase its independence and it might be claimed that Peter was seeking to restore a previous situation.

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

2589 Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955

Historical Investigations 1799-1955

Napoleon I

1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Napoleon's reputation as a military genius has been exaggerated. [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.

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.

Broadly speaking, A and B are favourable to Napoleon and C and D are less flattering. The different passages emphasise different aspects of Napoleon's generalship, and there is some apparent contradiction. That said, A and C, whilst offering different judgements, emphasise the importance of Napoleon's dynamism and sense of purpose as key, C and D suggest that 'blundering' was part and parcel of Napoleon's generalship and that his generalship was flawed because of this. However, C does not explicitly deny that Napoleon was a great commander – indeed candidates may well know that Connelly acknowledges his skill but saw it in 'scrambling' rather than in the strategy and planning admired by others (as in A and B). B and D seem to be contradictory in their references to Napoleon's organisation and planning.

There is much in the passages and the ideas here may be set in the context of candidates' own knowledge by references to different campaigns (the most likely references may be to Ulm/Austerlitz in support and 1812 in Russia in opposition – drawing on D, the advantages Napoleon enjoyed (perhaps picking up on A – his dual role as head of state and commander-in-chief, but also, for example, the quality of the French army), the role of his marshals (B) and other aspects of generalship not covered here.

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

2 Assess the view that order was Napoleon's prime objective in domestic policy. [45]Focus: evaluation of the debate on Napoleon's domestic aims

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.

The aims of Napoleon's domestic policy have been long debated. Some candidates may argue that the desire for order was clearly a strong influence especially as Napoleon courted the notables for support (and order was what they apparently wanted). There may be discussion of policies particularly relevant to stability and order – the repression of the Chouannerie, the use of prefects, police and 'prefects in purple' to watch and maintain order, the authoritarian nature of the regime, the aim of Napoleon to stand above faction, economic policies, the Concordat and the guarantee of property rights and so on.

However, candidates may argue that stability and order were but a means to an end – personal power, or that there were genuinely positive reforms – in law and education, for example, which cannot be solely explained in terms of stability and order. Candidates may argue that the key priority was securing himself in power and that policies such as appeasing the notables by, for example, guaranteeing their possession of *biens nationaux* were a necessary condition of securing his personal position (just as was securing a victorious peace over Austria in 1800). They may also argue that the design of the Constitutions belies Napoleon's true motives – not so much order as personal power – because, for example, the second and third consuls were without any authority to take decisions; they merely had the right to be consulted. Alternatively candidates may argue that there were genuine concerns to improve the governance and future of France through the codification of law, by guaranteeing the position of the Catholic Church (Concordat) in a state which also espoused religious toleration (Organic Articles) and by provision of a state system of education (*lycées*).

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

3 Assess the view that the attempt to enforce the Continental System was the main reason for the downfall of Napoleon's empire in Europe. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the reasons for Napoleon's downfall

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.

There have been a number of different explanations for the fall of Napoleon's empire and this picks up on one of the key themes. The argument is that Napoleon's attempt to enforce a continental blockade against Britain and to subordinate the economy of the continent to France together led to the downfall of the Empire. Candidates may point to the Continental blockade (imposed from 1806) which ensured the determined opposition of Britain, led to ultimately disastrous policy decisions such as the attempt to conquer Portugal and impose Joseph as king in Spain (Peninsular War) as well as the invasion of Russia in 1812 (although candidates may claim there were other issues considered apart from the Continental System in making these decisions). Candidates may also refer to the annexation of Holland and papal opposition. In addition candidates may refer to the detrimental effects of the blockade and the attempt to subordinate continental trade and industry to France (for example, the loss of colonial trade to France's western ports and the disruption to the economy of central Europe).

Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as Napoleon's arguable deterioration as a general and lack of realism as a leader, the relative decline of the French army, the lessons learned by enemies, the continuous opposition of Britain and the growth of opposition in Europe (and at home). Candidates may well argue that in the end the Continental System was at least an important long-term factor in bringing about the downfall of the empire.

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

Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80**4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Disraeli's success in the Conservative party was very limited up to 1865. [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.

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.

Passages **A**, **B** and **D** all contain hints that Disraeli had little success. **A** refers to his inactivity in the 1860s and problems with Lord Derby. **B** suggests Derby felt Disraeli lacked honour and that he was unpopular in the party. His Jewish background is characterised as unpromising. **D** backs up these points with references to Derby as a hindrance, to the odds against Disraeli and the character of the Conservatives. **D** adds the drawback of his own making, the destruction of Peel. In order to offer supported evaluation candidates could add more detail about any of these points, especially Disraeli's inherent disadvantages and his character defects, to argue that he was, indeed, not very successful and never trusted by many in the party.

The alternative view, that he enjoyed real success because of his abilities, is argued most strongly by Passage **C** which indicates Disraeli's several contributions to the development of Conservatism. Passage **B** outlines his great role in the House of Commons and his superiority to other Conservatives resulting from the lack of able rivals. It refers to the broadening appeal of the Conservatives, which some historians see as Disraeli's major contribution to the development of the party. Passage **D** suggests he worked hard to be successful, which is something of a contrast with the view of Passage **A**, and that he possessed great determination. He could be seen as refusing to give up, even after the debacle of his first budget. Candidates might mention Gladstone's refusal to serve with Disraeli, leaving him an unrivalled position. His novels revealed him as an original and striking writer with clear views on contemporary society and provided an ideological framework, within which he worked consistently according to some historians.

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

5 Assess how far Gladstone's development from Conservative to Liberal resulted from his desire for sound financial policies. [45]

Focus: the extent to which Gladstone's changing political allegiance was the result of his devotion to sound finance or the result of other factors.

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.

The debate is centred on whether Gladstone was chiefly concerned with fiscal practices or had other issues in mind in becoming a Liberal. The first view could be argued with reference to free trade, where Gladstone followed Peel despite the possible implications for his career, and his fiscal policies in government which made a real difference to people's lives, thus showing a considerable commitment. He was determined to reduce income tax and leave wealth to 'fructify in the pockets of the people'. He saw income tax as a dangerous temptation to governments to spend lavishly and indulge in foreign aggression. This all indicates that sound finance was a priority as it affected so many other policies.

The alternative view is that Gladstone was ambitious and could not remain a Conservative after 1846 as a result of his feud with Disraeli, and similarly would not join any of the Derby-Dizzy administrations. Gladstone can be seen as pursuing popular support through his use of the press and his campaigns in the north of England, which suggests a role for personal ambition. The Liberals offered him more hope of the leadership as Palmerston and others aged. It can also be argued that Gladstone was not a committed Liberal as he often ran counter to liberal policies, which implies that he was a Liberal for convenience, rather than for reasons connected with sound finance.

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

6 To what extent can the social reforms of Disraeli's government of 1874-1880 be described as 'Tory Democracy'? [45]

Focus: Was Lord Randolph Churchill's description of the reforms as 'Tory Democracy' valid, or were they a piecemeal and opportunist series of Acts?

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.

One view is that Disraeli had a clear idea of a programme of social reform to end the divide between the rich and the poor as his novels show. His Crystal Palace speech in 1872 supports this. He also hoped to win votes from the upper working class whom he saw as natural Conservative supporters. In this argument the reforms form an impressive legislative record allowing some limited state intervention, but also encouraging individual responsibility. From the Acts passed in 1875-6 several could be quoted as examples, particularly the trade union legislation and the efforts to make towns and cities more sanitary, the so-called policy of sewage. Education reforms can also be cited.

The alternative view has also been urged. This suggests that Disraeli did not have a sustained programme, but a piecemeal one, and that individual MPs such as Plimsoll were the main instigators of reform. Within the government individual ministers followed their own interests in proposing reforms which hardly indicates a coherent programme. Some historians believe Disraeli exaggerated what was being achieved or that Tory Democracy was merely attributed to him by later admirers and has no substance. Candidates could mention that Imperialism was popular with the classes whose votes Disraeli was pursuing so that the social programme may not have been the chief attraction. Disraeli did lose the 1880 election.

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 1858-1871

7. Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the German Constitution of 1871 was based on the principles of liberalism. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of the 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.

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

Candidates should show an awareness of the debate surrounding the Constitution of 1871 and to what extent it could be regarded as either a victory or a defeat for German Liberals. In terms of introducing their analysis, candidates might offer some attempted definitions of liberal and authoritarian principles and by doing so, establish a context for their evaluation. Although a number of liberal features can be identified within the Constitution these are considered by some historians as of lesser importance compared to the more authoritarian principles emphasised by Prussian control expressed through the Emperor and his Chancellor.

The passages reflect the debate in the following way. Passage **A** recognises that liberal features existed within the new Constitution but in practice these did not amount to significant concessions. Although the Reichstag was given the power to accept or veto the budget, this was not extended to military spending which was to be fixed on a seven year basis. Whilst candidates are not required to show an understanding of the political workings of other countries they should pick up from Passage **B** that even though the concessions to Liberals might be limited, in comparison with other countries they could be regarded as significant in terms of Germany's development. Passage **C** presents Bismarck as the "white revolutionary", i.e. as a moderniser yet at the same time a preserver. Not only did he safely introduce liberal changes but interestingly Waller goes even further and calls them "democratic". However, Bismarck's shrewdness as a politician meant that he could turn the Liberals into his allies and by doing so strengthen his power and prestige. Ironically, at the same time, he also alienated many Conservatives. Passage **D** agrees with Passage **C** on Bismarck's aim but presents him as more contemptuous and less sincere about his so-called concessions to liberalism – thereby agreeing somewhat with Liebknecht's verdict that they were no more than a "*fig leaf covering the nakedness of Absolutism*".

In support of their evaluation, candidates could refer to some of the following: the powers of state government versus the powers of federal government; the role of the Emperor and Chancellor; the role of the Bundesrat (including Prussia's veto); the role of other institutions within the State such as the Army, the Civil Service or even Bismarck's own Junker class as being indicative of authoritarian principles.

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

8 To what extent can Bismarck's claim that he planned for war with France be supported by his handling of events in the period from 1866 to 1871? [45]

Focus: To evaluate Bismarck's goals and the methods he used to achieve them

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 need to show an awareness of the debate surrounding Bismarck's claim to have a "master-plan" to defeat France and unite Germany in this period. Likely alternatives to this view might include Taylor's argument that Bismarck was an opportunist merely reacting to events or Pflanze's claim that Bismarck had not just one plan but a number of alternatives ("two-irons"). Likewise, discussion of the outbreak of war in 1870 will consider those arguments that it was planned and those that it happened by "accident". Candidates may not discuss all the alternative theories in their answers but they must show that there is considerable debate and much contradictory evidence surrounding Bismarck's claim.

A chronology of events alone will not provide a sufficient response but candidates may well isolate key points for more detailed treatment, such as the nature and terms of the Treaty of Prague, the Luxembourg Crisis, the Hohenzollern Candidature and the Ems Telegram. Whilst candidates may well concentrate their discussions on the events of 1870, full answers to the question will require a consideration of Bismarck's intentions as early as 1866 and there should be some recognisable element of this in their answers. Discussion of the events of 1870 alone are unlikely to proceed past **Band III**.

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

9 Assess the view that German Unification in the period from 1858 to 1871 was made possible only because of a favourable international situation. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of the extent to which German unity was built on the strength of Prussia and the weakness of other German and European states.

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 and evaluate the various factors which made possible the unification of Germany – including Bismarck's role.

In support of the title, candidates may consider the decline of Austria after the revolutions of 1848/9 and her political isolation after the Crimean War of 1854-6. They may also mention the relative weakness of Napoleon III's regime and the apparent "disinterest" of Great Britain to

European events at this time. This interpretation would suggest that Bismarck and Prussia were simply in the right place at the right time.

Against the title candidates could explore the notion of a Bismarckian "master plan" showing a natural progression from the army reforms of 1861, his "Iron and Blood" speech, his handling of the Polish revolt, his manipulation of the Schleswig-Holstein crisis, war with Denmark and then Austria, the setting up of the North German Confederation, his exploitation of the Luxembourg Crisis, his manipulation of the Hohenzollern Crisis, war with France and finally the creation of the Second Reich.

Candidates could also consider factors such as Prussian economic leadership of the Zollverein, the strength of German Nationalism and the effectiveness of Prussian army reforms as evidence that Germany was indeed in control of her own destiny at this time

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

Roosevelt's America 1920-1941

10 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the first New Deal promised much but delivered little. [45]

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.

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.

Passage **A** suggests that first New Deal did not promise much. Keynes takes the view that plans such as the NRA were misguided. Passage **B** suggests the opposite. The first New Deal did promise a lot and delivered. This is seen as one of most productive periods of US History. Passage **C** suggests the NRA brought only partial success. Passage **D** suggests a lot of the perceived success of the first New Deal was due to Roosevelt's skills rather than solid achievement.

From their own knowledge candidates could mention; the impact of Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA); Public Works Administration (PWA); Emergency Banking Act; Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) and assess their achievements. Candidates may also mention that several of the passages concentrate on the National Industrial Recovery Act and National Recovery Administration, which had clear limitations to the detriment of other 100 Days programmes.

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

11 To what extent was the USA isolationist in foreign policy in the period from 1920 to 1941? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of debate on US foreign policy 1920-1941

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 mention Harding's return to 'normalcy' from 1921; refusal to join the League of Nations and the traditional view that the US turned its back on European affairs until virtually the outbreak of WWII.

Candidates may argue that the US was not completely isolationist: - Washington Naval Treaty of 1922; Dawes and Young Plans and US involvement in Latin America are examples.

Candidates may mention that there is a view that matters changed with the appearance of Roosevelt in 1933. Others may argue that Roosevelt did not become more pro-active due to opposition within Congress (Neutrality Acts). After November 1938 Roosevelt was more interested in Europe. Offered Cash and Carry and then Lend Lease to European Allies.

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

12 Assess the view that the main reason why the Depression worsened from 1929 to 1933 was Hoover's policies. [45]

Focus: Evaluation of debate on Hoover's handling of the Depression

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.

Hoover has been the centre of controversy since the events of 1929-33. Blamed by many at the time (Hooverilles etc.), Hoover was seen as following *laissez faire*, non-interventionist policies. He lacked vision and determination to meet the challenge, in contrast with Roosevelt.

However, Hoover did try. Reconstruction Finance Corporation of 1932 was a turning-point in Federal involvement in economic affairs. He wanted to do more but was thwarted by Congress, the US Constitution (which gave the states responsibility over welfare) and Roosevelt's refusal to work with Hoover in the lame duck period of 1932-3.

Candidates may mention other factors such as the world wide depression; the decision by Congress to pass the Hawley-Smoot tariff in 1930 and long term structural problems facing the US economy.

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

Lenin and the Establishment of the Bolshevik Revolution 1903-1924

13 Using these four passages and your own knowledge assess the view that the Bolsheviks won the Civil War mainly as a result of the disunity of their opponents. [45]

What matters here is not the conclusion that the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the passages.

The passages highlight two sides of the debate – on the one hand the weaknesses of, and mistakes made by, the White armies and on the other hand the strengths and assets of the Bolsheviks. Both passages **A** and **D** discuss the essential lack of unity amongst the White armies. In **A** the Whites were ‘unwilling to sacrifice their individual interests in order to form a united front’ whilst in **B** the emphasis is placed on their failure to offer a programme which would appeal to either the peasants or the workers. Passage **C** reinforces the failure of the Whites to offer a programme which would attract the peasants whereas the Bolsheviks supported the policy of land redistribution and thus were described as the ‘lesser evil’.

Passage **D**, and in part passage **A**, focus attention on the other side of the argument – the advantages held by the Bolsheviks. In passage **D** the focus is on Trotsky and the Red Army, whilst in passage **A** reference is made to the Bolsheviks defending a ‘concentrated central area of western Russia’; having control of Petrograd, Moscow and the railway network and having greater access to munitions and war supplies.

In terms of own knowledge candidates might be expected to discuss the limited effectiveness of outside intervention – British and French troops were reluctant to serve in Russia and countries like Poland and Romania intervened in the Civil War in order to gain their independence, not in order to topple the Bolshevik regime. The role of Trotsky and the Red Army could be developed more fully as could the use of terror. Emphasis might also be placed on the unified command and clear objectives of the Bolshevik Party as opposed to that of the White forces.

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

14 Assess the reasons why the Bolshevik Party was successful in seizing power in October 1917. [45]

Focus: Discussion of the reasons why the Bolshevik Party achieved power in October 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.

The collapse of the autocracy in February 1917 came as a surprise to the revolutionary parties. Lenin was not even in Russia at the time. Initially both the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks advocated support for the new bourgeois government. However, Lenin's return to Petrograd in April 1917 quickly changed the situation. Lenin immediately issued his 'April Theses' demanding hostility to the Provisional government and worker power based on the soviets. He also coined the slogan 'Peace, Bread and Land' displaying his ability to identify himself with the needs of the peasants. However, in the summer of 1917 Lenin by no means commanded the unanimous support of the Bolshevik party leadership with men like Kamenev and Zinoviev opposing his policies.

At this stage had the Provisional Government offered effective leadership and popular policies then the eventual triumph of the Bolsheviks would have been far from certain. However, the Provisional Government failed to provide either. Their failure to capture Lenin and their decision to remain in the war both proved to be fatal mistakes, particularly after the failure of the Kerensky Offensive in the summer of 1917. The Provisional government failed to satisfy the demands of the peasants for land and rising inflation and food shortages worsened conditions for the urban population.

The debate is likely to centre on the degree to which Lenin can be credited with transforming the position of the Bolsheviks as opposed to the role of the Soviets, Trotsky and the weaknesses of the Provisional Government.

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

15 'Nothing more than a brutal dictatorship.' Assess this view of the Bolshevik regime from October 1917 to 1924. [45]

Focus: Discussion of the extent to which Bolshevik rule between 1917 and 1924 was based upon coercion rather than consent.

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 historical debate.

There is plenty of evidence of the brutal nature of the Bolshevik regime, particularly in the period 1918-21. The dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918 after one day; the creation of the Cheka (estimated to have been responsible for the death of 50,000 in 1918 alone); the introduction of war communism with forced grain requisitioning; rampant inflation and widespread famine in 1920 and 1921. The Kronstadt rising could be seen as evidence of the increasing unpopularity of Bolshevik policies. One of the most damaging charges against Lenin and in support of a charge of brutality was the widespread and sustained use of terror. Defenders of Lenin would point to the massive economic crisis and the existence of counter-revolutionaries as factors which forced Lenin to adopt drastic measures, arguing that the use of terror was only a temporary expedient. Critics of Lenin would argue that terror was an integral part of Lenin's plan to introduce a dictatorship which he would preside over.

The introduction of the NEP in 1921 could be seen as a response to popular demand or alternatively as a recognition by Lenin that the situation was so grave that the survival of the Bolsheviks in power would be threatened if a change in policy did not occur. The introduction of elements of a market economy did help restore crop yields and cooperation between the peasantry and the government. However, significant elements of 'dictatorship' remained – the decree on 'factionalism'; banning of all political parties other than the Bolsheviks; the use of terror as an instrument of policy continued alongside the removal of personal freedoms (e.g. religious worship and educational freedom).

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 the British policy of appeasement ended as a result of the German invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939.

[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 issue is whether the clear violation of Munich in March 1939 was the key to a major change in Chamberlain's policy, or whether the policy did not change so dramatically and that Chamberlain kept hoping for negotiation, continuing rearmament to have a stronger bargaining position at future negotiations, rather than really contemplating war. Historians have argued that the guarantee to Poland was limited to independence not territorial integrity, that the rearmament was focused on defence and there were few plans to take any active war into Europe and that there was little attempt to cultivate an agreement with Russia. However some have argued that there was a new mood in foreign policy after March. Passage **A** would certainly support that as would Blake in **C**. Passages **B** and **D** are more sceptical, so there is plenty of scope for considering the debate here.

Passage **A** is a piece of special pleading by Henderson. He states clearly that Prague was a turning point, but is careful to be quite generalized about its effects. Candidates might support his view by references to Hitler's methods – bullying Hacha, breaking Munich. However they might be sceptical about the extent of change. Chamberlain was reluctant to abandon appeasement until the very end and then only because of political pressures. The interpretative assessment might be of the view of **A** and **C** together. In Passage **C** Blake sees a major U-turn and makes Prague the turning point, though Chamberlain had also been moved by military advice that France could not be defeated if Britain wished to safeguard her own position. The nature of rearmament, the slow development of a BEF, the failure to have meaningful staff talks with France, the laughable mission to Moscow might cast some doubts on all this, but there are the guarantees and the faster pace of rearmament.

Passage **B** stresses that public opinion had been moved – and candidates could explain why Prague seemed so bad – Czechoslovakia had never been German and the occupation violated Munich. Public opinion had been moving away from appeasement since Crystal Night in November, and party opinion was moving as well. The view here is that Chamberlain remained reluctant to commit to war. This is backed by Passage **D** which sees the continuity of the dual approach of rearmament and conciliation continuing – Chamberlain had not really had a major change of heart and was not committed to a Grand Alliance after March 1939, but he had never totally relied on appeasement and rearmament had been a feature before Prague. This is a view which can be challenged, especially by reference to the stronger line taken in the Birmingham Speech and subsequent Guarantee, but candidates might well pick up the reluctance with which Chamberlain tried to forge the Grand Alliance recommended by Churchill and the scepticism with which he regarded support from both Russia and the USA. They could also point to the limited nature of the Guarantee to Poland and the lack of any effective planning to help Poland in the event of war. There is a lot of potentially relevant own knowledge which could be deployed and material referred to is only an indication of possible approaches when candidates attempt to offer supported evaluation.

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

17 How far was British policy towards Germany between 1919 and 1929 the result of a belief that the Treaty of Versailles had treated Germany unjustly? [45]

Focus: the motivation for British policy towards 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.

The issue is whether British policy was primarily motivated by a sense of guilt over Versailles or by other considerations, such as concerns for its economy, revulsion on the part of public opinion for war in general, or traditional foreign policy concerns of avoiding commitments.

The sympathy for Germany was one factor – Germany had been denied the self-determination extended to others; reparations were seen as unfair and a cause of economic problems; the disarmament clauses came to be seen as leaving Germany defenceless, especially after the Ruhr occupation; the ‘diktat’ was criticized. However, there are other explanations; dislike of French policies; a desire for trade to recover; a fear of Communism; a desire to settle European affairs so that Britain could concentrate on her newly-expanded empire; concern about the Far East and India. Better answers will go beyond a list of factors and offer sustained comparative analysis about what the major motivations might have been, keeping a strong focus on the key issue.

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

18 Assess the view that Chamberlain's pursuit of appeasement in 1937 and 1938 did no more than continue the policies of previous British governments since 1933. [45]

Focus: Was the 'high appeasement' different in scope and execution from the so called policy of 'drift' that preceded it, or were the policies broadly similar in aim and rationale.

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.

Here the issue is whether Chamberlain's proactive line in trying to meet German grievances amounts to a change in foreign policy and whether his methods – the shuttle diplomacy and personal meetings - amounted to a clear break with the diplomacy of January 1933 to May 1937. Since 1933 the MacDonald and Baldwin governments had allowed Germany to rebuild her army (conscription 1935), her air force and had signed a naval agreement violating Versailles and allowing Germany to rebuild battleships. Whether it was this or the neglect of arms spending in the 1920s, the fact is that Chamberlain's policy could not be based on the military power Britain had enjoyed in 1918. Also, the failure of his predecessors to support Collective Security had meant that the League could not be seen as an option, so again there was continuity, but Chamberlain paid even less lip service to the whole idea of collective security than Baldwin and MacDonald. The alienation of Mussolini by British policy over Abyssinia again removed options for Chamberlain and his predecessor had undermined the Stresa Front without gaining Mussolini's support. Chamberlain wanted to avoid this sort of ineffectual gesture. It could be argued that governments since 1933 had neglected to cultivate Stalin or Roosevelt, had allowed the first major breach of Versailles in 1936 during the Rhineland crisis and encouraged Hitler. All this suggests continuity, but Chamberlain saw previous policies as weakly drifting and intended to take the initiative in appeasing while increasing the pace of rearmament. It could be argued both that policies since 1933 had dictated Chamberlain's policies and also that Chamberlain was not merely following policies created by others, but pursuing his own very distinctive, clear and logical position on foreign policy. It could also be argued that the policy was dictated by economic, Imperial and financial considerations common to all the foreign policy 1933-38. There are plenty of possible arguments to consider here. Content is only indicative.

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 1941-1955

19 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Soviet Union was mainly responsible for causing the Cold War crisis in Berlin in 1948.

What matters here is not the conclusion that the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the passages.

Passage **D** does suggest that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War crisis in Berlin in 1948. **D** states that *'Stalin aimed to starve West Berlin into the Soviet zone of Germany'* and sets Stalin's launching of the Berlin blockade firmly into an expansionist context. Candidates may well describe the views in **D** as traditional. In arguing against this interpretation candidates may use Passage **B** which strongly defends Stalin from this charge. Passage **B** suggests that *'Allied policy towards Germany undoubtedly fuelled Stalin's long-standing suspicions of the west, and with good cause. There is no reason to suspect the existence of a Soviet plot to swallow up Europe.'* Candidate may well describe the views in **B** as revisionist.

Astute candidates might note that there is the merest hint in both **D** and **B** that supports the counter-argument. In **B** Ward states *'In February 1948 a Soviet-backed coup overthrew Czechoslovakia's coalition government.'* In **D** Philip states *'Western plans to introduce a new currency within their zones of Germany and Berlin was the catalyst for Stalin's Berlin blockade.'* Passage **A** can be used by candidates to defend the Soviet Union as lines 5 – 12 do suggest that Stalin was provoked into blockading Berlin and that the Soviet Union was portrayed *'in a bad light.'* Both **A** and **C** can be used to argue the case that the Cold War crisis in Germany was more or less inevitable because of Germany's geographical position and strategic importance. **C** also suggests that both sides acted out of fears they had about the other side's motives. Candidates may describe such views as post-revisionist.

In using contextual knowledge to evaluate this interpretation, candidates may consider the failure to come to absolute decisions about Germany at Potsdam, the collapse of the complex reparations agreement by 1946, and the subsequent breakdown of talks about Germany, as important. The western formation of Bizonia, then Trizonia, from the western zones of Germany may also be referred to.

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

20 Assess the view that the disputes between the wartime allies from 1941 to 1945 were caused more by the western allies than by Stalin. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the wartime disputes between Stalin and his allies balancing whether these were mainly caused by Stalin or his western allies

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 around the reasons why the wartime allies were in dispute, and whether Stalin or his western allies were mainly to blame. The extent of Stalin's frustrations in relation to the timing of a Second Front in the west, despite how the USSR endured the brunt of the suffering against Nazi Germany, can be used to argue that Stalin's western allies were more responsible than Stalin for wartime disputes. Candidates may argue that from 1942 to 1944 this was the most important cause of disputes. Candidates may understand that following the launch of Operation Overlord this was a declining area of dispute.

Candidates need to consider other causes of disputes such as arguments about the future of Germany and the increasing unease of the allies at the Red Army's actions in Eastern Europe, most especially in Poland. Candidates may well use Soviet actions in Poland in 1944 to argue that Stalin was mainly responsible for the escalation of wartime disputes in 1944 and 1945. Candidates may however trace disputes about Poland back to the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939 and the Tehran conference of 1943. Candidates might argue that the 'Percentages Agreement' between Churchill and Stalin in 1944 suggests that Churchill was happy with the creation of 'spheres of influence' as long as Britain 'got her share'.

Candidates may demonstrate an understanding of how disputes about the shape of post-war Germany become more critical in 1945, and will be likely to refer to Yalta and Potsdam. Candidates may well suggest that issues arose at the very end of the war in relation to the USA's possession and use of atomic weapons against Japan. A valid line of argument would make the case for the causes of and responsibility for disputes changing and evolving through time in line with the fortunes of war. Equally valid, the deep-seated differences between the west and the USSR could be seen as having united such unlikely partners in a stormy relationship and leading with a sad inevitability to misunderstandings and disputes between them.

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

21 'Marshall Aid was designed more to benefit the USA than Europe.' Assess this view of American policy. [45]

Focus: The extent to which Marshall Aid was designed to support and save Europe from collapse and the extent to which it was designed to defend American interests.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate centres around whether Marshall Aid was an unparalleled act of economic generosity, or whether it was simply designed to bolster and increase the power and prestige of the USA. Candidates who base their answer around different interpretations of the Marshall plan are likely to do well. Candidates are likely to discuss a variety of valid interpretations from giving selfless help to needy West Europeans, to preventing the spread of communism (basically the financial clout behind the Truman Doctrine), to dollar diplomacy – an attempt by the US to implant an informal American Empire in Europe. Candidates may cite orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist views as explanations for the Marshall Plan. Generalised historiography that is not grounded in the events and actions leading to the introduction of the Plan will gain little credit. The view in the title is the revisionist interpretation – that the main aim of the US in this period was self-interest. In support of the revisionist assessment in the title candidates may well refer to the Marshall plan as 'dollar diplomacy' (see above.) They may also argue that in many other ways, from the announcement of the Truman Doctrine to the formation of NATO, the US was anxious to increase her 'sphere of influence' for selfish economic ends.

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 To what extent were the financial needs of kings the main reason for the changes in English central government during the period from 1066 to 1216? [60]

Focus: assessment of the importance of the financial needs of kings compared with other factors in bringing about changes in central government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

With increasing costs of warfare and administration, one of the main concerns of kings was to maximise their revenues through the systematic exploitation of their finances, and this led to the establishment of government machinery to enable this. The work of Ranulf Flambard and the development of the Exchequer in Henry I's reign, with sheriffs rendering regular account and the appearance of the first extant Pipe Roll, are indicative of the Anglo-Norman kings' desire to control their finances. This continued under the Angevins with, for example, the great inquests of 1170, 1194 and 1213 which were partly intended to bring sheriffs under firmer control. However, in order to access the higher bands, financial needs should be set against other reasons for the changes in government and compared. A major factor was the need to find a system of government which could function in the absence of the king and this led to the development of the chief justiciar, the key figure in the administration, who eventually performed vicegerent duties. Candidates might also point out that behind this lay the possession of the continental lands. Some may also argue that the Conquest was the main reason as this imported Norman ideas to build on Saxon foundations, including the growth of feudal government. Some may even argue that the main changes came in the reign of Henry II and that these were prompted, at least in part, by Henry's determination to re-establish firm control after the problems of Stephen's reign.

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

2 'Characterised more by change than by continuity.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the role of feudalism in the military organisation of England during the period from 1066 to 1216? [60]

Focus: assessment of the degree of the change in the role of feudalism in English military organisation.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Throughout the period it was possible to perform feudal service in person but it declined in importance and there is a marked contrast between its role at the beginning of the period and at the end. Under William I feudal society was organised for war. Knights trained, did service in war, performed castle guard and escort duties. By John's time, paid professional soldiers formed the bulk of the army and feudalism was essentially a system of landholding through which money was raised to pay for the professional soldiers. However, change was gradual and some candidates may argue that it was more of degree than kind. Even William I used mercenaries and while Henry I reduced the length of knight service, indicating that he did not regard it as particularly important, kings right through the period made some use of the feudal levy, Richard ordering to Normandy with him in 1194 a third of the knights who owed him service. Commutation of knight service and the collection of scutage are seen from William II's reign, although they become far more common under the Angevins. John collected scutage about every eighteen months in contrast to Henry II's four or five years. The feudal host was never sufficient to supply all England's military needs, even when England was the most feudal state in western Europe. In addition to the feudal levy and mercenaries, all kings made use of household knights and other trained soldiers, maintained permanently in their households. To access the higher bands candidates will need to assess examples of both change and continuity in reaching their judgement.

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

3 'The personalities of kings was the main reason why effective government came close to breaking down in the period from 1066 to 1216.' To what extent do you agree with this assessment? [60]

Focus: evaluation of the importance of personality compared with other factors in the breakdown of effective government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Effective government came close to breaking down only in the reigns of Stephen and John, so it seems reasonable to suppose that this resulted from something unique to their reigns, and personality would appear to be an obvious answer. Neither was trusted by their barons; neither did anything to encourage baronial loyalty; Stephen was brave but unreliable and found difficulty in pursuing anything to its conclusion; John could be cruel and opportunistic. Other rebellions, e.g., those in 1075, 1095 and 1173-4, which had the potential to undermine effective government did not do so because they were dealt with, arguably thanks to the firm leadership provided by the kings concerned. However, personality was not the only factor that made it more difficult for Stephen and John to preserve the working relationship between king and baron which was important in the effective exercise of government. Some candidates may point to the problems arising from the continental possessions. Under Stephen, barons wished to limit the difficulties of having two overlords, in Normandy and in England, something which had not arisen since Robert's mortgaging of Normandy to William II, while John's loss of Normandy and attempts to raise taxes for an unpopular war to regain it led to tension with the barons. Again, this is in marked contrast to the situation under Henry II and Richard. In addition, Stephen suffered from the effects of a disputed succession and prolonged civil war which severely disrupted royal government, though not necessarily all effective government, in those areas held by Matilda. John's presence in England arguably contributed to problems of his reign as this meant that he attracted all the baronial animosity that might otherwise have been directed towards his chief justiciar. It is also possible to argue that effective government came close to breaking down when barons rebelled in reaction to years of particularly strong government. Stephen's reign followed those of William II and Henry I when Anglo-Norman government reached its height and John followed years of strong Angevin rule. This could also be an explanation for the rebellions of 1075 (at least in part a reaction to extension of royal control in the Marches), 1095 (in response to William II's strong government) and the rebellion of 1173-4 (in answer to Henry II's firm control.) To gain the higher bands candidates must assess several factors and evaluate the role of personality in comparison with them.

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 'Becket did more to strengthen the English Church than any other archbishop of Canterbury during the period from 1066 to 1228.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]

Focus: evaluation of the work of Becket compared with that of other archbishops in strengthening the church.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates will probably limit their discussion to the work of Becket, Lanfranc, Anselm and Langton, as these are in the specification. No reference to any other archbishop is required although credit should be given if candidates make relevant reference. Becket was determined to defend the independence of the church and was prepared to stand up to royal authority during his prolonged quarrel with Henry II. His insistence on the clergy being tried only in ecclesiastical courts helped to strengthen those courts and to clarify areas of jurisdiction. His martyrdom, canonisation and Henry II's subsequent penance at his shrine all helped to strengthen the reputation of the church.

However, his achievements in these respects must be set against the damage which he did to the church: his quarrel with Henry gave the king the opportunity to try to bring the other bishops under his control, and also allowed the Pope scope to strengthen his control through more intervention.

To gain the higher bands candidates should also compare Becket's work with the contribution of other archbishops. Langton's inability to enter England until 1213 and his subsequent suspension by the Pope made it difficult for him to strengthen the church and indeed, during his period as archbishop, the Pope placed England under an interdict and the king sequestered church property. Lanfranc and Anselm, however, did more to build up the English church. Through his reforming councils, Lanfranc brought greater unity to the English church and brought it into closer contact with the European while avoiding the excesses of the Investiture Contest. His close work with William I helped to increase the power and prestige of the church and there was also the beginning of separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Anselm embroiled the church in the investiture dispute but eventually managed to achieve a compromise with Henry I, which went some way to increasing the independence of the church, since Henry surrendered investiture with the ring and staff. Anselm's reputation as a theologian also enhanced the prestige of the church. In addition, Archbishop Theobald did much to promote canon law and, like Hubert Walter in Richard's reign, enjoyed legatine authority which helped to bolster the power of the archbishop and thus his authority over the church. Despite his lack of zeal, Walter held councils to improve discipline and to some extent restored stability in the church.

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

5 To what extent was the period from 1066 to 1228 one of increasing papal intervention in English affairs?

[60]

Focus: assessment of the extent of papal intervention in English affairs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

There is a marked contrast between papal intervention at the beginning and at the end of the period. Whereas William I and Lanfranc successfully resisted Gregory VII's attempts to persuade William to become a papal vassal, and Lanfranc to go to Rome in the cause of church reform, for much of the time John made little headway against Innocent III. Innocent successfully intervened in the Canterbury election imposing an archbishop unacceptable to the king. He excommunicated John, placed England under interdict, and later suspended Langton, so demonstrating the full force of papal authority. Even before this the papal legate had for some of Richard's reign been in charge of the English church in the absence of the king and the archbishop.

However, throughout the period it is also arguable that Popes intervened whenever they had the chance, in order to maintain or to strengthen their authority. Urban II involved himself in English affairs by supporting Anselm against William II; in Stephen's reign the pope not only gave Stephen vital support in the disputed succession but later intervened to support Henry of Blois against the Archbishop of Canterbury, partly in the interests of enhancing papal power at the expense of that of the metropolitan. The Pope also intervened in the Becket dispute, threatening to place England under interdict.

Some candidates may wish to argue that it was not the extent of papal intervention that changed but how far Popes were successful. It is also arguable that intervention became more dramatic as time went on as Popes themselves felt more secure thanks to advances in papal power as a result of papal reform. Candidates need to examine examples of both change and continuity in order to assess to what extent there was increasing papal intervention.

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

6 'The main turning-point in the development of English monasticism was the flourishing of new monastic orders in the reign of Henry I.' How far do you agree with this assessment in relation to the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]

Focus: assessment of the significance of the flourishing of the new monastic orders 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.

The new orders, the Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinians, Gilbertines, Premonstratensians, gave new life to English monasticism and a new vigour that the worldly Benedictines had long lacked. They attracted new members and new patrons. The Augustinians provided a rule that proved appropriate for many small houses, giving them greater strength. The Gilbertines, the only home-grown order, allowed men and women to be members of the same monastery. Without these orders there would probably have been no 'golden age' of English monasticism.

However, some may argue that the main turning point was the rapid expansion of the Cistercians in the generation after Henry I. Their radically different life of simplicity, poverty, humility, righteousness, was very attractive and gained not only new converts but those from other houses too. As the order grew it attracted thousands of lay brethren as well as monks. However, it is also possible to see the work of Lanfranc as the main turning point in the development of English monasticism: he brought it into the mainstream of European development, abolishing some of the more idiosyncratic English customs, and revolutionising life in English abbeys, and without this it might have been much more difficult for the new orders from the continent to gain a foothold.

Some candidates may wish to argue that the main turning point was the arrival of the friars from 1221 as they provided a completely different form of monasticism, or that the decay and growing worldliness of monasticism under Henry II and John was the major turning point as this was in contrast to the growth in piety and extent of monasticism throughout the earlier part of the period. To reach the higher bands candidates need to set the developments of Henry I's reign in the context of other possible turning points and compare.

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 'The aims differed but the nature of Tudor rebellions remained the same.' How far do you agree with this statement? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the aims and 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.

Rebels' **aims** did change in the course of the period. Henry VII faced dynastic rebellions intent on overthrowing him whereas disturbances in 1525 and 1536 targeted Henry VIII's chief ministers, and most rebellions thereafter were aimed at changing policies not regimes. After the Reformation, religious aims became more prominent until 1569, and social and economic objectives were key underlying features in the disturbances in Edward's reign. It may also be argued that taxation was a common complaint in the early Tudor period but less so after 1549.

The **nature** of Tudor rebellions reflected both continuity and change. Politically motivated rebellions required the rebels to be armed whereas demonstrations against taxation and enclosures were largely non-violent protests – and the rebels of 1536 always claimed to be peace-loving pilgrims. Some candidates may point to a decline in frequency, size and level of violence in the second half of the period. For instance, the 1536 and 1549 rebellions were far larger than those facing Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth. Some candidates may reflect on the nature of leadership and organisation: the camping rebellions in 1549 were very well controlled and planned compared with those of Wyatt and the Northern Earls.

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

8 Which presented a greater threat to the stability of Tudor England: political factions or changes in the English Church? Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: Comparison of two factors that destabilised Tudor society.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Political factions were responsible for several rebellions. Some were led by factions (e.g. Lincoln, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, Northumberland and Westmoreland); some factions encouraged instability (e.g. supporters of Aragon, Mary Tudor, Mary Stuart); and some factions hoped to remove or embarrass a principal minister (e.g. opposition to Wolsey in 1525, Cromwell in 1536, Somerset in 1549, Northumberland in 1553, William Cecil in 1569 and Robert Cecil in 1601). Changes to the Church also provoked a fierce and widespread reaction from many social and political groups. Rebellions in Lincolnshire and the north (1536-7), Cornwall and Devon (1549), Norfolk (1549), Kent (1554) and again in the north (1569-70) could be usefully assessed. On these occasions, the fabric of society and pillars of order were shaken as nobles, gentry, abbots and clerics led commoners in protest. Candidates could discuss why religious changes evoked such strong feelings. Better responses are likely to compare the two factors directly, determine their relative significance and explain patterns of change and continuity over time.

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

9 'There were fewer large-scale disturbances in the later Tudor period because governments became increasingly skilful at maintaining stability.' How far do you agree with this statement about the period from 1485 to 1603? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of why there were so few large-scale rebellions during the later 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 reasons why there were few large-scale disturbances in the later years of the Tudor period. Governments certainly became more skilful at maintaining stability, and examples of this could include social and economic legislation, the appointment of nobles to key administrative and political positions, and the adoption of popular domestic policies, such as the religious settlement of 1559. Other factors also played a part, such as the decline in feudal relations, increasing social and economic stability, and the longevity of Elizabeth's reign. These factors should be contrasted with the circumstances surrounding disturbances in the earlier period. These may include dynastic, religious and economic instability, and the ways in which governments attempted to maintain order.

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

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603

10 Assess the importance of royal marriages to foreigners in shaping English foreign policy from 1485 to 1603. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of dynastic factors and comparison with other factors.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A full evaluation of dynastic factors requires both an assessment and comparison, even if implicit, with other influences. Marriage treaties and links with foreign houses of Trastamara, Stuart and Habsburg may well overlap with political issues such as national security. The Tudors, like all early modern rulers, saw the benefits of marriage agreements and they played an important part in shaping the policies of Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary but less so Edward VI and Elizabeth.

However, some unions were more important than others. For instance, Arthur's and Henry's marriage to Catherine were more influential in firming up the Anglo-Spanish alliance of 1489 than Margaret Tudor's marriage to James IV, which did not prevent Henry VIII from invading Scotland. Similarly, Mary Tudor's marriage to Philip II influenced her relations with France whereas dynastic concerns were less significant for Elizabeth, even though she played the 'marriage card' to good effect when dealing with France and Spain.

Candidates should examine how far royal marriages 'shaped' (i.e. formed and influenced) foreign policy by comparing them with factors such as religion, the economy and personalities.

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

11 Assess why relations between England and Scotland changed during the period from 1485 to 1603. [60]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the changing relations between England and Scotland.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

In 1485, and for much of the early period, Scotland was England's 'postern gate' that French troops might exploit and they were present in Scotland until 1560. English armies invaded Scotland in 1513, 1542, 1547 and 1560, and threatened invasion in 1497. Much of this enmity was traditional but under Henry VIII and Somerset, war was a result of personal ambition.

Conversely, Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth adopted a more diplomatic approach. Candidates may suggest the expulsion of the French court and troops in 1560 was a turning point since a Protestant and pro-English faction was installed in Edinburgh. Coming at the same time as Anglo-Spanish relations started to decline, Elizabeth cultivated friendly relations with the French regent, Catherine de Medici. Some candidates will point to the arrival in England of Mary Queen of Scots as a key change in relations. Cecil tried to use Moray and Morton to secure a pro-English faction at the Scottish court, which worked until 1581. Relations with James VI were uneasy but never poor. He toyed with conversion to Catholicism and welcomed his French cousin Esmé Stuart to his court between 1579-81. Elizabeth was reluctant to acknowledge him as her heir; he was reluctant to abandon his mother. Matters were only resolved in 1586-7 when he accepted a pension and Mary was executed.

Candidates may assess reasons for the following moments of change, including the Treaty of Ayton, Henry VIII's and Somerset's determination to wage war, the Scottish Reformation, the French Wars of Religion, the Dutch Revolt and rise of Spain, and the arrival of Mary Stuart in England.

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

12 'Defence of the realm was the main reason why England went to war.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1485 to 1603? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of reasons why England went to war with particular reference to national defence.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The Tudors went to war on a number of occasions: in 1489-92, 1512-14, 1522-24, 1542-50, 1557-59, 1562-64, 1585-1604. Defence of the realm could be argued in 1492 when Henry VII attacked Boulogne to prevent France from keeping Brittany and supporting Warbeck. In 1497 he also prepared to invade Scotland to nullify the threat from Warbeck. Henry VIII sent armies to Scotland in 1513 and 1543 to pre-empt an invasion of the north, and Elizabeth found herself defending England from Spain in Ireland in 1580-81 and 1601, and in the Armada in 1588.

Candidates may argue that some of the Scottish wars were caused more by personal ambition (in 1543 and 1547), and the war of 1513 was only a sideshow to the main event in France. Indeed candidates may claim that Henry VIII went to war mainly to indulge his love of campaigning and to strut the battlefields of Europe with Charles V and Francis I. Somerset can be viewed as having taken war to the Scots to conclude his unsatisfactory earlier campaigns. Mary went to war with France in support of her husband though it may be claimed that it was also in defence of Calais.

Candidates may argue that Henry VIII and Elizabeth were imperialists: Henry aspired to extend English lands in Normandy and Picardy; and Elizabeth tried to recover Calais and in the 1590s garrisoned 'cautionary' towns in the Netherlands in return for aiding the Dutch. Candidates might also refer to trade wars in 1493-6 and 1503-6 against Burgundy, 1527-8 and 1563-4 against Spain, and argue that a major motive for fighting Spain was economic rivalry in the Atlantic and the periodic seizure of English ships, supplies and men.

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

The Development of Limited Monarchy in England, 1558-1689

13 'The power of the English monarchy was greatest in James II's reign.' Assess this view in relation to the period from 1558 to 1689. [60]

Focus: Assessment of the monarchy under James II in the context of the period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

An evaluation of the power exercised by James II may be the starting point for many candidates before they compare him with other rulers. James expanded the standing army to 18,000 and increased the navy even though the country was not at war. He used his prerogative to dispense with the law and, when challenged by some of his bishops, prosecuted them. He revised town charters, purged JPs and lords lieutenant, threatened the freehold of Oxford University and sought to compromise judicial independence. Parliament met once and after November 1685 was not convened again but his revenue was in excess of £1.2 million and Hales' case (1686) gave the crown the power to legislate without parliament.

A counter-argument might discuss the impact of theories of monarchy/ government and suggest that the more James behaved arbitrarily, the less powerful he became. James alienated the politically active groups upon which effective government rested. Candidates may compare James with Elizabeth. She exercised considerable power because her prerogatives were undefined but she was reliant on parliament for finance and ruled with the support of her people. James I spoke about the Divine Right of Kings but understood that he was constitutionally restricted and ruled according to the law. Charles I resisted attempts by the Church and parliament to limit his power and between 1629 and 1640, ruled arbitrarily when required. Charles II had financial, religious and political limits but used his skill and duplicity to enjoy extensive power.

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

14 To what extent did religious groups become more effective in opposing English government during the period from 1558 to 1689? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the effectiveness of religious groups as opposition.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should compare different religious groups across the period and decide what is meant by 'effective...in their opposition'. Better responses should assess the main religious groups as indicated in the specification.

Roman Catholics may be judged to have failed in their plots against Elizabeth and James and (allegedly) Charles II in the Popish Plot; and the penal laws were extended after 1570 and again from 1605. Charles II and James II used their dispensing power to assist Catholics but could not overturn the Clarendon Code and Test Acts. By 1689 Catholics were not even tolerated by the Toleration Act.

Puritans failed in their attempts to change the Church Settlement in Elizabeth's reign but they were more successful in opposing government policies between the 1620s and 1650s. Calvinists became a well organised and widely supported group in church and state, and in parliament effectively criticised James I's and Charles I's religious and foreign policies. By Charles II's reign, Calvinist Anglicans dominated the restored Church of England and resisted nonconformity and Catholicism in the pulpit, law courts and parliament.

Dissenting Protestants failed to oppose government policies until the halcyon days of Cromwell when toleration was allowed, and the few exemptions granted by the later Stuarts to Quakers and Baptists.

Candidates may point out that the effectiveness of religious opposition varied according to the involvement of different groups in political affairs during the period.

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

15 Assess the reasons why Elizabeth mainly succeeded in handling parliament whereas the Stuarts largely failed.

[60]

Focus: Explanation for Elizabeth's comparative success and the Stuarts' failure at managing parliament.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

High responses should compare Elizabeth with the Stuarts, whereas weaker essays may well focus on one element. Candidates are likely to suggest that the policies and personalities of the rulers were critical factors. Elizabeth diligently watched over parliamentary proceedings, employed her councillors to control debates, and when required personally intervened. By pursuing policies in her subjects' best interests, she was able to manage parliament effectively.

In contrast, most of the Stuarts mismanaged their parliaments and often pursued unpopular policies. James I paid little attention to the emerging committees of the whole house and lectured parliament on its shortcomings. Charles I resented their refusal to vote him tonnage and poundage for life and their criticism of his ministers. Both Charles II and James II tried to pack parliament and lost the support of the gentry and clergy in the process. Perhaps Charles II came closest to controlling parliament, as he demonstrated during the Exclusion Crisis and the Oxford parliament of 1681, and thus some candidates may challenge the statement.

It may also be pointed out that parliament's role changed during the period. Elizabethan parliaments met occasionally when the crown needed finance or popular support. They had no rights but were keen to convert their privileges into something more permanent. By 1625 parliament was more outspoken about government policies, ministers and royal favourites. In the 1630s -1640s parliament learned the art of opposition, and then government. After 1660 it was an integral part of administration, fiercely guarding the people's rights.

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 Assess how far English authorities tolerated Protestant non-conformists during the period from 1558 to 1689. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of degree of tolerance extended to Protestant nonconformists.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to offer a developmental account within a chronological time frame. 'English authorities' may be taken to mean the crown, church, parliament, judiciary, universities and local government officials. Better candidates should define 'non-conformists' and distinguish between what the law stated and how far it was enforced. Elizabeth's and James I's reign provides good examples of this reluctance to enforce the law. Toleration was extended to Protestant non-conformist groups by Cromwell, Charles II and James II, and the 1689 Act legalised freedom of religion for several Protestant sects. For much of the period, the law discriminated against Protestant minorities who were excluded from church and state appointments. Elizabeth silenced them through parliament and her bishops, and in the civil courts. Charles I and Laud persecuted them via the civil courts and Court of High Commission.

Unlike his parliaments, Cromwell was relatively tolerant towards Protestant dissenters and the tolerance they enjoyed in 1660-61 was due to the presence of Presbyterian MPs in the Convention parliament and to troops in London. New elections ended this, and the passing of the Uniformity, Conventicle and 5 Mile Acts restored the Anglican Church's supremacy. From 1661 Quakers were banned and Presbyterians, though treated leniently in the 1660s, were persecuted in the 1670s until the Popish Plot. Some candidates may suggest that many Presbyterians secured some protection when they joined the ranks of the newly created Whig party.

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

17 To what extent were English rulers successful in handling the problems presented by Puritanism in the period from 1558 to 1660?

Focus: Comparative evaluation of how well English rulers dealt with Puritanism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main problems Puritans presented were their reluctance to acknowledge bishops' authority, their refusal to pay church tithes, their rejection of church rituals that were deemed unbiblical, the desire of some sects to elect their own ministers and secede from the established church, their influence in many rural and town parishes, the support from some academics and MPs to reform the prayer book and their revolutionary potential evident in their political activities in the 1640s. Candidates may suggest that the extent and nature of these problems varied from period to period, partly as a result of how English rulers handled them. Candidates are likely to assess Elizabeth's skill at dividing and ruling Puritans through her council, bishops and parliament. James I mishandled Puritans from the outset, neither satisfying their demands nor suppressing their complaints. Charles I failed to control them and his policy of persecution intensified their opposition and resulted in civil war. Cromwell suffered for giving Puritans far more freedom and subsequently suppressed many of their activities. By 1660 Puritanism had developed into well-established sects.

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

18 'Hostility towards Roman Catholics in England was increasingly political rather than religious.' How far do you agree with this judgement on the period from 1558 to 1689?

[60]

Focus: Explanation for changing attitudes towards Roman Catholics.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Some candidates may claim that it is impossible (or unwise) to differentiate between political and religious attitudes, and, though this may be true at times, better candidates will be aware that it is not always the case. In Elizabeth's reign, attitudes towards Roman Catholics were coloured by the religious legacy of Mary Tudor, the Excommunication of 1570, plots to put Mary Stuart on the throne, the arrival of missionaries and Jesuits, and fear of a Spanish invasion between 1585 and 1604. Recusant and penal laws were passed and enforced and by 1603 there was more familiarity with Protestant services, doctrines and practices. Further political and religious hysteria followed the Gunpowder Plot, James' support for Arminianism, anxiety about Catholic successes in the Thirty Years' War, Charles I's Catholic marriage and rumours of an Irish Plot in 1641. Cromwell's religious opposition to Catholics seemed justified when stories of Irish massacres reached England and at the Restoration the Church of England stressed the need to keep Catholics suppressed. Moreover, many English people still suspected latent support for Catholicism from Charles II and James II, which was confirmed by their own marriages and domestic and foreign policies. Fear of royal absolutism, associated with the Catholic dynasties in France and Spain, saw anti-Catholic attitudes harden in 1666 (the Great Fire) and led to the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis in the 1670s. James II's attempt to get Catholics into the army, universities, judiciary and parliament, resulted in political concern that remained after his abdication.

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 How effectively did French governments deal with religious issues from 1498 to 1610? Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of success/failure of governments at handling religious issues.

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 answer this question either by looking at religious issues thematically or by evaluating each reign in turn. The main religious issues were:

(1) the monarch's relations with the Papacy concerning its temporal and spiritual authority in France; Francis I resolved this very effectively in 1516 though the Paris *Parlement* still had reservations.

(2) the need to reform the French clergy; little was achieved to enhance clerical standards and salaries.

(3) the threat of heresy; dissenting groups like the Waldensians were persecuted by regional *parlements*, the Sorbonne and the Chambre Ardente (1547).

(4) the growth of Huguenotism and demands for toleration; a serious problem from the 1520s that faced Francis I, Henry II and the later Valois rulers; it was weakened by civil war and partially resolved by Henry IV at Nantes.

(5) the spiritual needs of the people; humanists were suppressed by Francis I and there was little improvement apart from individual initiatives from some bishops and lay orders.

Candidates may suggest that on balance most governments dealt ineffectively with religious issues, which underscored the civil wars, divided society and weakened the monarchy until the reign of Henry IV. Weaker responses are likely to focus heavily on various governments' inability to prevent the Wars of Religion.

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

20 Assess the reasons why economic problems were difficult to solve in France from 1498 to 1610. [60]

Focus: Explanation for the enduring economic problems.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to discuss the state of royal finances during this period but higher responses should explain some of the difficulties in industry, trade, commerce and agriculture as well.

In **finance** the main problems were the inefficient and unequal tax system, tax farming and insufficient revenue to meet the state's requirements; long periods of foreign war and civil wars disrupted administration and increased crown debts; and inflation was exacerbated by court affluence and patronage. Francis I implemented reforms that centralised the system but did not tackle issues of corruption and exemption. Henry IV could only begin to solve the difficulties caused by civil wars by cancelling debts and gradually initiating reforms after 1598.

The nobility and *officiers* had the wealth and potential to invest in **trade and industry** but throughout the period showed little interest as long as *rentes*, crown pensions and from 1604 the Paulette were more profitable. **Trade** was in the hands of merchants who were heavily taxed and disadvantaged when competing with foreigners. There were few improvements in **agriculture** due to the depressed condition of the peasantry and disinterest among landowning nobility who preferred to hunt over the crops. There was little investment in industry and agriculture until Henry IV and Sully began to encourage state subsidies.

Population levels rose to 17 million by 1610 (largest in Europe), which put pressure on urban employment and food supplies, and increased the likelihood of plague, poverty and revolts. Local and regional opposition to a more unitary **transport** system and an excessive number of tolls impeded the movement of goods.

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

21 To what extent was the reign of Henry II (1547-59) the most important turning-point in the development of France as a nation state from 1498 to 1610? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the reign of Henry II as a turning-point compared with other possible turning-points in the development of France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Henry II's reign saw several key developments that underlined earlier features and changed the direction of others. In 1559 he ended the long-running Italian wars and made peace with Spain, which held until 1595. Cateau-Cambresis acknowledged Spain's supremacy in Europe and finally ceded French claims to Italy. Royal finances were bankrupted, which made the crown vulnerable to the nobility and states. Rivalry between the Montmorency, Bourbon and Guise families surfaced, which coloured French politics for the next 40 years. After 1559 many nobles lost their *raison d'être* and turned to domestic violence. Henry II was also a staunch Catholic who persecuted Huguenots through the *Chambre Ardente* but failed to suppress their growth in the 1550s. His unexpected death in 1559 left four young sons and an Italian queen mother in charge of France, which proved a recipe for disaster.

Candidates are expected to be aware that the power of the monarchy had been steadily growing since 1516 and with it many centralising features. Henry however lacked interest in administration and much resentment developed as a result of his heavy-handed dealing with the Paris *Parlement*, nobles and provincial estates. Candidates should focus on the main developments of Henry's reign and set them in the context of the period before 1547 and after 1559. They should compare his reign with other turning points, such as the reign of Francis I, the outbreak of civil war, or perhaps the restoration under Henry IV, before reaching a judgement.

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 contribution of sixteenth-century popes to the Catholic Reformation.****[60]**

Focus: Evaluation of 16th century popes to the Catholic Reformation.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

An assessment of the work and leadership of the Papacy should be central to this question. Most answers are likely to stress the contributions of **Paul III** (commissioned a survey of the church, opened the first session of the Council of Trent, founded the Roman Inquisition and Index, and acknowledged the Jesuits), **Paul IV** (revised the Index and encouraged the Inquisition but opposed Trent, the Jesuits and Spain), **Pius IV** (issued the Tridentine Decrees), **Pius V** (reformed the Curia, Catechism, Breviary, Missal and improved Rome), **Gregory XIII** (refurbished Rome, encouraged Jesuit missionaries), **Sixtus V** (reformed the Curia, established 15 'congregations', rebuilt St Peter's, enforced episcopal residence), **Clement VIII** (revised the Vulgate, issued a new Index). These achievements should be compared with the work and limited contributions of earlier popes such as **Alexander VI** (secular-minded and corrupt), **Julius II** (patron of the arts, warrior prince, convened Lateran council), **Leo X** (nepotist, simoniac, ended the council, banned Luther), **Clement VII** (allowed Lutheranism to expand, papal lands were invaded and Rome sacked). Some candidates may choose to focus on factors other than or in addition to the Papacy, such as the work of the Council of Trent, Jesuits or secular leaders. Comparative comments should be rewarded but the balance of the essay must be on an assessment of the popes.

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

23 Explain why some Catholic states in Europe were more successful than others at reforming their Churches in the period from 1500 to 1600. [60]

Focus: Explanation for different rates of success in the European Catholic Reformation.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may suggest that the extent of Catholic success between 1500 and 1600 depended upon the following factors:

- (1) degree to which Protestantism, especially Lutheranism and Calvinism, had taken root
- (2) proximity of the Papacy to the state concerned (eg. more successful in France, Germany and the Italian states)
- (3) political conditions of a state (eg. instability of France, attitude of nobility, support of secular rulers)
- (4) prevailing social conditions: rural communities were conservative in their attitudes towards reform and reluctant to abandon traditional practices
- (5) economic conditions: more urbanised states resented papal taxation, and were more receptive to Protestant ideas and propaganda spread by the printing press
- (6) extent to which Jesuit and Capuchin missionaries were well received (resistance in northern and western Europe; welcomed in southern and eastern Europe).

States where the reformed Catholic Church had the greatest impact were Spain, Portugal, Italy, Poland, Hungary, southern Germany and Austria. The least successful were England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, the Spanish Netherlands, northern and western Germany, Scandinavia. Candidates may well conclude that states where the Catholic Church had most success throughout the century had already begun to reform their church before the emergence of Protestantism.

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

24 'Without the Protestant Reformation there would not have been a Catholic Reformation.' How far do you agree with this statement? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the causes of the Catholic Reformation with particular reference to the Protestant movement.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to agree with the premise but should be aware that the answer is not quite so clear-cut. Some features of the Catholic Reformation owed a great deal to Protestantism – the emphasis on preaching and the sermon, the role of the consistory and the confessional, the attraction of biblical humanism, a more liberal approach to education, the need to reform clerical discipline and abuses, the need to define doctrine more clearly and to address the spiritual needs of the laity more directly. These issues were highlighted after 1517 and featured prominently in several new orders and the work of the Council of Trent.

However, candidates can be expected to suggest that the Catholic Reformation developed independently of Protestantism. The idea of reform had been debated in the 14th and 15th centuries, and Leo X presided over the Fifth Lateran Council between 1512 and 1517; some monasteries had established observant orders and stressed the value of preaching; lay groups were set up to combine piety and pastoral work; an inquisition already operated in Spain to enforce uniformity; new orders were established before and after 1517 in Italy to improve people's lives rather than to counter Lutheranism; individual clerics like Ximenes, Savonarola and Briçonnet reformed their dioceses in advance of Luther. Some candidates may claim that the premise is hypothetical but there is enough evidence to argue that, though the Catholic reform movement began before 1517, it was affected by Protestantism in terms of its speed, character and achievements.

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 Assess how far Spain was in a continuous state of decline in the seventeenth century.

[60]

Focus: Evaluation of Spain's condition throughout the 17th century.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Some candidates may claim that Spain's decline was permanent. Crown finances and the economy in general were continually weak; the political leadership of her rulers was consistently poor; the living and working conditions of most Spaniards deteriorated as evident from the fall in population for much of the century; the administration expanded in inverse proportion to its level of efficiency and probity; military and naval defeats became commonplace; and provinces revolted and territories were seized by foreign powers.

On the other hand, candidates may point to periods of reform, recovery and relative success. In the years between 1609-18, 1659-72 and 1685-88 there were signs of economic improvement; Lerma, Olivares, Haro and Oropesa tackled domestic problems with novel reforms; military and naval victories at the height of the war with France in 1652-54 suggested Spain's international decline could be arrested; and the absence of sustained war after 1659 brought an illusion of continuing military strength.

Arguably the key to Spain's condition lay with her kings and their enemies. After 1665 Charles II was personally incapable of leading Spain out of her internal crises and Louis XIV was intent upon exploiting her vulnerability. Most candidates are likely to conclude that retrospectively any periods of recovery were exceptions to the overall condition of steady decline and that Spain's economic demise preceded her military and political decline.

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

26 To what extent can Spain's decline as an international power from 1598 to 1700 be explained by the rise of France? [60]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for Spain's international decline with particular consideration given to the role of France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Spain's decline as an international power in the 17th century may be seen in terms of the wars she fought and lost, her military and naval defeats and lands lost in treaties, her commercial vulnerability, and her increasing incapacity to defend herself or her overseas empire. In this context France played a major part, particularly in exposing Spain's military weaknesses between 1635 and 1659, and the ease with which she invaded the Spanish Netherlands in 1667-68, 1672-74, 1683-84 and 1688-97. Even Catalonia was periodically occupied by French troops in the 1650s and 1690s.

The 'rise' of France, however, was a slow process; not until after Richelieu had strengthened French finances and Mazarin had survived the Fronde was Louis XIV able to pursue a more aggressive foreign policy towards Spain. Candidates should therefore point out that other factors contributed to Spain's international decline, most notably the war against the United Provinces from 1621-48 and Spain's failure to suppress the Portuguese revolt (1640-68). Candidates may also argue that internal factors played a part too: Philip IV's resolve not to contemplate an inglorious peace; Olivares' reforms that failed to realise military and naval improvements but provoked domestic revolts instead; and Charles II's inability to lead a united government at a time of grave international crisis are valid arguments.

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

27 'Spain's domestic problems in the seventeenth-century were mainly caused by the Spanish kings.' How far do you agree with this judgement? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the causes of Spain's domestic problems with particular reference to the role of the kings.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to devote a lot of space to Philip III and Philip IV and their condemnation for Charles II. Kings were responsible for overseeing their governments, appointing ministers, and endorsing/ rejecting their advice. By dint of their age, physique and character, Philip III and Philip IV played a more direct part in policy-making than did Charles II, at least until the latter reached maturity in 1675. Financial problems were worsened by the crown's unwillingness to tax the nobility and clergy or retrench expenditure. Olivares, Haro and Oropesa would all have benefited if their monarchs had fully supported their reforms. Philip III's keenness to take Spain into the Thirty Years' War adversely affected the economy. Philip IV's determination to force his Dutch and Portuguese subjects to yield to his rule and his rejection of peace offers in the 1650s (with France) and 1660s (with Portugal) also underpinned many of Spain's domestic problems between 1621 and 1668. Court factions caused political divisiveness in the royal councils for much of Charles II's reign.

On the other hand, candidates could argue that the kings were not mainly responsible for Spain's domestic problems. The legacy of Philip II, ill-advised reforms of Olivares, corrupt *validos*, poor relations between Castile and the other kingdoms, the attitude of privileged towards unprivileged groups, administrative atrophy in central government, little investment in trade, industry and agriculture, commercial rivalry from the Dutch and English, could be assessed as contributing causes.

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 Did fighting foreign wars hinder or help France become a great power from 1610 to 1715? Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: Assessment of the impact on France of fighting foreign wars.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might begin by determining what constituted a 'great power' and how fighting wars abroad affected France's international standing and domestic condition.

Arguments in favour of wars hindering France:

(1) The state was financially crippled: costs of waging war rose from 16 million *livres* in the 1620s to 120 million in the 1640s to 2 billion in 1714 and bankruptcy. War generated heavy taxation in the 1630s and 1640s, which led to revolts and civil war.

(2) The economy was adversely affected: the Code Michaud was abandoned; Richelieu's financial and commercial reforms were destroyed; Colbert abandoned his policy of protectionism and encouraging trading companies after 1672; agriculture declined and famine occurred.

(3) Wars after 1680 led to the formation of powerful coalitions (League of Augsburg and Grand Alliance) and it was the Dutch, English and Germans who ultimately defeated France.

Arguments in favour of wars helping France:

(1) France increased her power in Europe. Winning lands at Westphalia strengthened her frontiers and weakened her enemies. The Pyrenees gave her a claim to the Spanish throne. Spain and the United Provinces were weakened, and the security of the Holy Roman Empire threatened.

(2) War strengthened royal absolutism by acquiring a 'monopoly of violence' through military reforms, naval improvements and administrative changes.

(3) War was popular with the nobles, who were kept occupied and rewarded, and with the people who enjoyed the kudos of continuous victories until the 1690s.

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

29 'In the reign of Louis XIII, absolutism was an illusion; under Louis XIV, it became a reality.' Assess this view of France from 1610 to 1715. [60]

Focus: Comparison of the nature of absolutism under Louis XIII and Louis XIV.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to agree with the statement but point out exceptions. Arguments can be made to illustrate **absolutism under Louis XIV**: his demi-god status at Versailles; the writing of Bossuet; Louis' control over national and regional assemblies, *parlements* and royal councils; his highly developed administration, salaried *intendants* (agents of absolutism) and bureaucracy of *officiers*; his largest standing army in Europe; state censorship; treatment of Fouquet, Huguenots, Gallican Articles. Conversely, candidates could point to his **limitations**: the self-serving and corrupt officials who weakened royal finances and administration; *parlements* that could obstruct royal edicts; Colbert's failure to reform the *rentes*, *paulette*, *financiers*, or extend the *taille réelle*; religious dissenters that survived persecution; aristocratic governors who still acted independently; corporate bodies which retained privileges; seigneurial and church courts which impeded a uniform legal system.

Louis XIII also demonstrated **absolutist** traits: polemicists like Loyseau and Le Bret wrote of his absolutism; Richelieu weakened the nobility; recalcitrant Estates and Huguenots lost their privileges; *intendants* grew in number and authority; the Paris *Parlement* was instructed to register edicts; uncooperative bishops were dismissed; *chambre de l'arsenal* (political tribunal) operated from 1631-43. But his absolutism was also **illusory**. The king and his ministers could not do as they wished. Magnates remained strong; the Estates-General showed their power in 1614; Richelieu failed to raise revenue to meet war costs or stop corruption among tax farmers; he had to negotiate with the *pays d'état* to extend taxes, and they resisted his use of *élus*.

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

30 Which minister contributed most to the ascendancy of France in the seventeenth century: Richelieu, Mazarin or Colbert? Explain your answer referring to each of these ministers.

Focus: Comparison of three ministers in the context of France's development.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A case can be made for each of these ministers. Some candidates may compare Richelieu and Mazarin in terms of how they dealt with over-powerful nobles, the Estates and *parlements*, raised money for war, administered the state and church, strengthened the monarchy and waged war. They may suggest that **Richelieu** contributed more because he solved the Huguenot problem and worked closely with the Catholic Church. He expanded the army and navy, set up trading companies, reduced the power of the estates, humbled the aristocracy, expanded the *intendants* and laid the foundations for victory in war against Spain. **Mazarin's** main contribution lay in negotiating beneficial terms at Westphalia and the Pyrenees, which gained France lands in Savoy, Alsace, the Netherlands and the Rhineland (1648) and lands in Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the Pyrenees and acquired a claim to the Spanish throne (1659). A negative feature was the Fronde, which was partly a result of his own unpopularity and financial mismanagement. **Colbert's** claim lay in his management of the economy, which provided the basis for France's military achievements under Louis XIV and the creation of Versailles. Revenue increased 400%, taxes rose 40%, corruption was reduced in administration and by 1672, the budget was balanced. Unlike Richelieu, he built up an effective navy of 300 ships and 4 new dockyards; improved road and canal transport and revitalised textile industries. However, he failed to reform the fiscal system, his law codes could not be enforced and attempts to establish trading companies failed.

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

Europe 1661 – 1796**From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661 - 1796**

31 How far did the French monarchy change from absolutism to enlightened despotism during the period from 1661 to 1789? [60]

Focus: Assessment of change in French absolutism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers might be structured chronologically or thematically. Alternatively, candidates might consider a series of themes. A valid alternative approach would be to argue that none of the French monarchs in this period was an enlightened despot; the judgement could be completely negative. It will be necessary to show an understanding of the term 'enlightened despotism' but some candidates might demonstrate this implicitly. Some candidates might turn the question into a comparison of France with other countries, for example it might be claimed that France was less an enlightened despotism than Joseph II's Austria. The focus of answers should be on France. Louis XIV claimed a high degree of absolutism and candidates can draw material from his political, religious, cultural and social ideas. Few are likely to discuss his views of the economy. He was supported by most French thinkers such as Bossuet. It might be argued that the ideas of the Enlightenment and its application to despotism had not yet appeared in Europe. Louis XV's reign saw the burgeoning of enlightened ideas but candidates might disagree about the extent to which his rule represented an enlightened despotism. Neither Louis XV nor Louis XVI was much interested in changing the basis of monarchy nor were they pre-occupied with the ideological basis of government. On the other hand, the monarchy as an institution was influenced by the spread of new ideas. Candidates might disagree about the importance of the *philosophes* but some courtiers, lawyers and others became critical of the way in which the regime was run.

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

32 Compare the problems that faced Peter the Great and Catherine the Great in maintaining absolute power in Russia.

[60]

Focus: Comparison of the problems of two rulers over an extended period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Examiners can reasonably expect a balance between discussions of the two rulers. Band IV will need an adequate understanding of the problems of one of the rulers. The most successful answers might consider factors that reveal either the similarity or differences of the problems. Some answers might organise their arguments in themes, for example, government, administration, religion, the effects of social forces, the economy and the army, the significance of opposition.

However, answers that discuss Peter and Catherine sequentially but include comparative elements should not be undervalued. Candidates might consider issues such as the circumstances of their accessions. Neither gained power easily. Both had to contend with strong Russian traditions. The nobility was influential. The strength of rebellion might be considered. Peter had to suppress the *streltzi* whilst Catherine faced the Pugachev rebellion. Neither could rely on an efficient administrative system to govern the extended Russian empire. On the other hand, Peter did not have Catherine's disadvantages of being a foreigner and a woman.

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

33 'A reliance on Reason replaced a reliance on tradition.' How far do you agree with this view of the Enlightenment? [60]

Focus: Assessment of a judgement about the Enlightenment.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might agree with the description of the Enlightenment or they might qualify it. (It is difficult to see them rejecting it completely.) Whichever approach is taken, answers should explain what is meant by 'reliance on Reason' and 'reliance on tradition'. The former put a priority on questioning and logic. New scientific methods were applied to many areas, for example government, religion, social structures and economic systems. Laws that revealed the nature of human behaviour and the best means of living and governing could be discovered. However few thinkers of the Enlightenment were atheists. The majority accepted the presence and influence of God but viewed Man in a different light. However, the traditional view that strong governments were necessary was accepted by most thinkers. Rousseau might be seen as an exception.

Most candidates will probably interpret tradition as referring to orthodox religion and the Church but it went wider, for example in the respect for political and social traditions that justified privilege or the special roles of particular groups. Historically, Austria, France and Russia (the only states mentioned in the Specification) needed strong rulers to secure order. A frequent analogy was the relationship between the head and body. In terms of religion and the Church, divine right was important. Rulers were appointed to, and accountable only to, God. God had also created other social groups with their own distinct functions.

Candidates might point out that the Enlightenment was diverse and that it is difficult to provide an all-embracing definition, but this point might well be made by very few candidates. Candidates might disagree about the claim that tradition was replaced. It is possible to argue that tradition prevailed at the end of the eighteenth century and that the Enlightenment was a movement that attracted a minority. This will be a valid point although the thrust of the answers should be on the nature of the Enlightenment rather than on the extent of its appeal.

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

Themes in History 1763-1996

Britain 1793 – 1921

1 How far do you agree that Parnell was the most effective leader of constitutional nationalism during the period from 1798 to 1921? [60]

Focus: an evaluation of the effectiveness of the leadership of constitutional nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Effective answers will be comparative in nature, considering the relative impact of O'Connell from 1823 – 45, Butt from 1873 – 79, Parnell 1879 – 89, Redmond 1889 – 1918 and Dillon 1918 – 19. Comments on Butt and Dillon can be brief. The focus is expected to be on O'Connell, Parnell and Redmond, particularly their relative effectiveness in mobilising support, establishing clear policy aims, tactics and the attainment of aims. In O'Connell's case consideration will need to be given to the achievement of Emancipation in the 1820s, its practical implementation and reform within the Union in the 1830s and to repeal of the Union in the 1840s. In the first two he clearly achieved much, far more in practice than later leaders although, like them, Repeal and Home Rule remained elusive. Unlike Parnell O'Connell did not see the need to extract economic or land reform, other than the ending of religiously based tithes. Parnell was more effective in this respect, forcing Gladstone to reconsider Land Reform in the 1880s by linking Davitt's Land League to his cause. The Land War of 1879 – 1883 could be usefully compared to that of the early 1830s, the latter lacking the focus and coherence of the former. O'Connell's Roman Catholic Association became a model for 'constitutional' agitation in the 1820s and, by using the Catholic Church (the 'Rent', the priest, the buildings) was able to survive formal bans. Its ability to mobilise numbers to influence the Irish freeholders, and thus Irish elections, was to be used by later leaders to provide a constitutional voice to Irish Nationalism. However O'Connell had less success with such tactics in the 1840s. The NRA mobilised large numbers in Monster Meetings but Peel had by then removed the Freeholders. He also had less success in creating a disciplined Parliamentary party in the 1830s than Parnell did in the 1870s and 1880s. Parnell's aims were very focused on tactics at Westminster ('obstructionism') and he gained complete control of the Irish political process outside Ulster. However both he and O'Connell became divorced from Ireland itself, O'Connell returning in the 1840s to a divide over his 'moderate' tactics, whilst Parnell never recovered from the O'Shea Divorce case and split in the party in the late 1880s. Nonetheless candidates could argue that O.'C. achieved more in association with the Whig government (Lichfield House Compact) on matters such as 'catholic' appointments, Tithe Reform and Municipal Reform than Parnell did in association with Gladstone or Redmond did in relation to Campbell Bannerman and Asquith. Butt founded the Irish Nationalist party; Parnell gained a liberal commitment to Home Rule and substantive Land reform. Redmond secured Home Rule but not its implementation whilst Dillon ended up in alliance with Sinn Fein. Redmond could be accused of neglecting grass roots support in a way that O'Connell and Parnell never did. Redmond found land issues had largely been resolved. Unlike O'Connell and Parnell, Redmond was never considered an 'uncrowned' King of Ireland'. However O'Connell was never trusted in England. He was seen as a dangerous terrorist. Both Parnell and Redmond were more effective in gaining the trust of Gladstone and Asquith. O'C never gained Peel's trust. However all three were broken, O'Connell by imprisonment in 1843 (Parnell used his to advantage in the Kilmainham Treaty of 1882), Parnell by the O'Shea divorce case (which lost him 'Catholic' support) and Redmond by the Great War and the Easter Rising. All three were very dependent on the fortune of Whiggery and Liberalism and all 3 ignored Ulster, Redmond at great cost. It is likely that most candidates will see either O'C or Parnell as

the most effective leaders of constitutional nationalism although all could be considered failures, or merely effective in different ways.

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

2 'Ireland gained far more from Tory, Conservative and Coalition governments than from Whig and Liberal governments in the period from 1798 to 1921'. How far would you agree? [60]

Focus: a comparison of the relative importance of gains from Tory / Conservative / Coalition governments or Whig / Liberal ones.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

There are a variety of approaches that candidates may take. Some may proceed chronologically provided there is comparative judgement within defined periods (say Tory / Whig 1799 – 1852; Liberal / Conservative 1859 – 1893; Liberal / Conservative and Unionists 1894 – 1921). Another way of approaching it would be to examine specific types of 'gain' – political and constitutional, religious and economic and social. It could be argued that the Irish gained more political and constitutional concession from the Whig /liberals than the Tories / Conservatives via Municipal and Patronage matters in the 1830s and 1880s, Irish Disestablishment in 1869, proposed University Reform in 1873, 3 Home Rule Bills from 1886 and Parliamentary Reform from 1850. In contrast the question's assertion could be agreed with by citing economic concessions (Peel's land proposals, the Land Purchase Acts of the Balfour – Wyndham period after 1886), the major concession of Roman Catholic Emancipation, the political concessions involved in the Act of Union itself in 1800 and the large scale devolution of local power in the 1880s and 1890s. Lloyd George's Coalition conceded the Government of Ireland Act in 1920 which granted Home Rule to both Ulster and the South, followed closely by the Anglo-Irish Treaty conceding an Irish Free State with Dominion Status. This would suggest that the Conservatives conceded far more to Ireland. Nonetheless Irish constitutional nationalism usually preferred to work with Whigs and Liberals who conceded much on religion and economic reform (Tithes in 1838, Land Reform in the 1880s and an economic rationalisation under Birrell's Chief Secretaryship to 1916). Some may stress the similarities between the different types of government. Both frequently resorted to Coercion (the Whigs setting up a police force in the 1830s, the Liberals in the 1880s, whilst the Tories frequently coerced from Pitt to Peel and on to Bloody Balfour who often took repressive action). Both parties talked to 'terrorists', the Whigs to O'Connell, Gladstone to Parnell in the Kilmainham treaty of 1882, Lloyd George and his Tory Coalition partners to Sinn Fein and the IRA prior to the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921. All parties were determined to maintain the Union and any Irish 'gain' was seen as simply making the Union work until 1920 – 21. Financially the Balfour / Wyndham land Purchase Acts and Birrell's Edwardian welfare were 'generous'. Politically concessions on local power by both Whigs in the 1830s and the Conservatives in the 1880s proved more valuable than Liberal Home Rule. Candidates can thus agree or disagree with the assertion, or argue there was little to choose between the two political groupings.

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

3 To what extent did land issues change in Ireland in the period from 1798 to 1921?
[60]

Focus: an evaluation of land issues in Ireland to 1921.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to demonstrate an understanding of the land issues in the period. There was the belief that the 17th century land settlement was based on confiscation and that 'English' ownership of large parts of Irish land was based on illegality. There were legal disputes between **English Land Law**, which invested absolute right in the person of the landlord, and **Ulster Tenant Right** which accorded forms of dual ownership (the 3 F's – free sale, fixity of tenure and a fair rent). Could Irish customary law be accommodated with *laissez-faire* English property law? There was also the related issue of **eviction** for non payment of rent. Always a problem, this reached a height in the mid 19th century following the famine. Then there was the issue of **Land Ownership and Purchase**, of particular importance to British governments who came to see in it a solution to both the legal problems of land and a means of changing **agricultural backwardness**. The latter was arguably the most persistent problem linked to Land. Irish agriculture, potato dependent, remained backward for most of the period. A chronological approach is acceptable provided candidates focus on change or the lack of it. However an examination via theme may be more effective. The Protestant Ascendancy and Landlord Class remained dominant in the first half of the century with agrarian violence as much inter- village and family as it was aimed against Landlords. There were elements of this in 1798 and it flared again in the 1830s in the form of the Tithe War where land linked to religion. Feeling became more focussed on the Landlord than the Church after the Tithe Commutation Act. Peel's government was the first to examine land issues in the 1843 Devon Commission but its recommendation on compensation for improvements were rejected by Parliament. The Famine may have taken the pressure off the overcrowded West but it also led to eviction and the beginnings of Ascendancy landed decline. The turning point came with the Gladstone Land Acts which by 1881 had granted effective dual ownership after the failed start of the 1st Act in 1870. **Legal inequalities** had thus been solved, albeit through the pressure of the 1879 – 81 Land War waged by Davitt's Land League. The turning point for **land transfer and purchase** from the Ascendancy to large scale tenant farmers came in the 1880s and 1890s, with the Land Purchase Acts (the Bright Clause in 1871, the 1885 Act and especially the Wyndham Act of 1903). **Agricultural backwardness** was not tackled until the Edwardian period when various cooperative schemes, investment in dairy and fishing schemes were undertaken. Even then Ireland's agriculture remained mainly small scale and the West in particular had regional problems. Nonetheless the political heat had gone out of Land by the 1900s, in contrast to the violence of the 1880s, and earlier, although it revived again in the early 1920s, with attacks on Ascendancy estates.

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

War and Society in Britain 1793 – 1918**4 How far did the growth of the media hinder or help British governments in their conduct of war in the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]**

Focus: an evaluation of the role of the media in relation to the governments conduct of war to 1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to be aware of the way in which the media developed in the period. This is largely a question of the press. In 1793 this was local and limited; although in London it could be very vitriolic. In the 1860s the repeal of the Paper Duties and the application of the Steam Press enabled a popular, national press to emerge with popular dailies by the 1890s. In addition there were magazines, prints and cartoons. Post 1900 the Cinema rapidly gained ground. The media's opinion became more important during the century. Better candidates will be aware that in some instances, it helped governments, in others it imposed constraints. The media could aid opposition to war or facilitate governments' prosecution of it. In 1793 government ignored public opinion outside Parliament, with some justification, but the ideological content of the Revolutionary War and the low reputation of the Prince Regent forced the government to take action against the Radical Press and make active moves to mould opinion using the media. The Napoleonic War and patriotism made this easier and one could argue that Pitt and his successors to 1815 managed the media well via increased Stamp Duties. However the middle of the century saw the media hinder government. Russell's journalism at the Times exposed the inefficiency of aristocratic war and government in the Crimea, aided by the new photography, facilitating Roebuck's motion of no confidence in the Commons. Although government evaded real change and was able to turn defeat into glories it did not prevent the fall of Aberdeen. Equally the press could be patriotic, rescuing Palmerston from radical condemnation of the Opium Wars with China. Disraeli found a Liberal press hounded him over the Bulgarian atrocities and publicised Gladstone's Midlothian campaign over military intervention against the Zulus and Afghans but it could just as easily support war, as it did over Disraeli's threats to Russia in 1877 and 1878. Popular comics and dailies in the 1880s and 1890s backed Imperialism (not always to the government's liking) and initially certainly facilitated the Boer War. However it could expose issues like 'Concentration Camps' and 'methods of barbarism' post 1902, making it difficult for governments to continue. Between 1793 and 1862 Stamp Acts had limited press circulation. A popular media moved in different directions and could push governments into action or hinder them depending on circumstances. In 1914 the government via DORA took firm action to control the press, Lord Beaverbrook entering government. It and the cinema helped create an efficient Home Front that frequently hid ineffectiveness from the public, although the Shells Crisis in 1915 is an interesting case that could be interpreted either way. Effective answers will be balanced but much will depend on the patterns detected as to media developments and government attitudes to them.

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

5 To what extent were trade and the Empire the most important reasons why Britain fought wars in the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for Britain's wars in the period 1793 to 1918.

No set answers are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to assess the reasons why Britain fought wars, comparing them relatively with each other. A useful distinction could be made between wars fought in Europe and those overseas, although the former often involved the latter. **Trade and Empire**, with the possible exception of the French Wars 1793 – 1815, was usually of secondary importance. However, in the 18th century the Anglo-French conflict was naval, global and 'mercantilist'. The Navy moved to secure the West and East Indies and used **trade** as a weapon against Napoleon. However, the **strategic** importance of the Low Countries, especially Belgium, proved the main cause of war in 1793 as it did in 1914. Belgian neutrality was the initial cause of war in both instances with the Belgian crisis of the 1830s culminating in Britain guaranteeing her neutrality in the 1839 Treaty of London. However wars were fought to secure trade. France, Russia and Germany threatened this at various points in the period and trade was a weapon used by all three against Britain and by Britain against them. Key ports were acquired in the Napoleonic Wars (Cape Town and Malta in 1815; Singapore in 1819; Hong Kong in 1841, then Shanghai; Cyprus in 1878 and Alexandria in 1882). These were frequently the fruits of war and gave Britain naval power to protect trade in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, the South China Seas, and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. **Empire** was less important between 1815 and the 1880s when Britain had no overseas rival and it is difficult to argue that Britain fought the great powers for this reason. Nonetheless the 'New Imperialism' forced some military action to perceived Franco-German threats in Africa, Russian threats in Asia (Afghanistan) and Franco - Russian - US threats in Asia and the Far East. Colonial Wars were also triggered by rebellion, greed or expansionists 'on the spot'. After 1911 Africa and Asia were quieter following Ententes with France and Russia. Conflict with the Ottomans in the First World War saw a new Middle Eastern Empire emerge although this had not been a cause of war. **The Balance of Power** could also be seen by candidates as an important, perhaps the most important factor, in the 3 major wars of the period. Against France to 1815 there was the need to prevent French domination of Europe. Britain would accept an extended France but the Amiens Peace showed the mistrust on both sides. In 1854 Britain acted to prevent Russian expansion towards the Mediterranean at the expense of the Ottomans and continued to fight in 1855 to secure the Black Sea Clauses. In 1914 Germany in association with the Austrians threatened France, Russia and the Ottomans (who joined with them). Candidates could therefore argue that strategic interests, of which the balance of power was one, were the main reason for fighting wars in the period. However the emphasis on naval power might suggest trade and Empire was the key. It may depend on what sort of war Britain was fighting. Better candidates will be aware of such nuances.

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

6 How responsive were British governments and their armed forces to technological developments affecting war in the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]

Focus: an assessment of the responsiveness of governments and the armed forces to war technology in the period 1793 to 1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Better candidates will point to a very mixed picture. Technology promised much in the period but was not always obvious in its application. It also cost in a period when the pressures were for keeping expenses to a minimum. Militarily technology before the mid century was not the issue. In the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars the aristocracy dominated both army and navy. Privateering, cavalry and purchases of commission produced a conventional and conservative outlook in the armed forces that chimed with cheap government. The exception was with the design of warships where Britain's dockyards remained responsive to new designs. Metallurgy and armaments industries were insufficiently developed before 1856 when Bessemer and later Gilchrist Thomas produced strong and cheap steel. Technology improved existing guns and railways were reluctantly used in the Crimean at Sebastopol (at Brassey's private investigation). Governments kept up the pressure for economy, and Britain faced few challenges that required recourse to new technology. It could be argued both governments and armed forces were more responsive in the second half of the period. Palmerston reacted quickly to the threat of a French Ironclad fleet in the 1860s, as did the Liberal government and Fisher to a German Dreadnought fleet in the early 1900s, but candidates could point to Gladstone's neglect of the navy in the 1870s and 1880s whilst Admiralty incompetence was highlighted in a series of reports. In the First World War it was 1915 before anything was attempted to harness British industry. The army did respond to improved rifle design, breech-loading, and the machine gun as well as to artillery developments from the 1880s. Yet Britain's colonial wars did not put a premium on technological responsiveness. The cost of technology between 1815 and 1905 curbed what was possible. The social class of generals and government, where tradition was revered also had an impact. Even in the First World War the Tank had to be developed under the aegis of the Admiralty. Yet the post 1900 period and the First World War also saw considerable responsiveness to technology, particularly in the army. Chemical weapons (Gas) were developed, the Tank was deployed, albeit early, air developments ensured that Britain had the largest air force by 1918 capable of considering long range bombing and radio and telephone were eagerly embraced. Candidates could well conclude that when the need was there government and armed forces responded but the need was not especially obvious before 1900, except in battleship design. By maintaining a relatively small army Britain did not need the technological boosts needed to deal with the very large numbers involved in continental armies.

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

Britain 1834-1996**Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**

7 Assess the view that the concept of laissez-faire was the main influence on government policy towards the problem of poverty from 1834 to 1948. [60]

Focus: an analysis of laissez-faire ideology throughout the period

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to agree that laissez-faire thinking was prevalent throughout the second half of the 19th century but faded to be replaced by collectivism in the first half of the 20th century. This might help explain why, despite the Poor Law Amendment Act, Booth and Rowntree were able to reveal that about 30% of the population in London and York were in poverty, i.e. by 1900 laissez-faire individualism was seen to be failing and the poor could not help themselves. Thus, governments had to change more or suffer the political, economic and social consequences. Better answers may argue that changes in attitudes depended on the nature of political parties. They are also likely to show how changing ideology was connected with a changing political, economic and social context. The rise of the labour movement, socialism and a more educated working class put pressures on governments to change. Economic booms and slumps also influenced attitudes, as did social change (rising living standards, secularisation, the Women's movement, mass media). Generally, there should be an attempt to discuss a range of influences on government thinking with an assessment of relative importance if answers are 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.

8 'The 1902 Education Act was the most important turning point in the development of education in the period from 1834 to 1948.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: an assessment of the 1902 Education Act as a turning point in the development of education.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Some will argue that the 1902 Act was revolutionary as it created a uniform state system of elementary and secondary provision and abandoned the patchwork duality of provision left by Forster's Act. However, there were those who felt it did not go far enough, especially in the context of developments elsewhere in the world (Germany, USA) and a changing economic climate where foreign competition had become a serious issue. Also, the Act did not deal with religious issues and controversy which prevailed throughout the previous century. Better answers might start with 1902 and compare this with events before and then after, before making a judgement. The formation of the Privy Council for Education, the Newcastle Commission, Forster's Act, Fisher's Act, the Hadow and Spens reports and Butler's Act are all contenders for major turning points. However, there must be an attempt to compare events and demonstrate the degree of change. A mere listing of and description of events, however well informed, is unlikely to get beyond Band III.

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

9 To what extent were public health reforms influenced mainly by political pressures in the period from 1834 to 1948? [60]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for public health reforms.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may argue that there were political pressures from above and below throughout the period. Reforms in the first part of the period (e.g. 1848 and 1875) were carried out by governments who feared the political repercussions of the increase in diseases associated with urbanisation, especially cholera. By the end of the nineteenth century, public health improvement was seen as essential for the smooth running of a nation whose imperial and world economic status was being challenged by others such as Germany, USA and Japan. In the twentieth century political parties used public health issues for electioneering purposes. This was evident in 1918 ('Homes fit for heroes' and Addison), throughout the interwar period, and in 1945. Governments were also put under pressure to make changes through the rise in working class consciousness. Trades unions, socialist groups and the Labour party all campaigned for more equitable and better quality public health facilities. Generally, as living standards improved over the whole period, the demand for improved health facilities disassociated with the Poor Law and improved housing increased substantially, resulting in notable improvements in provision, especially in the 1920s and 1930s (Addison, Wheatley, Greenwood, town planning, more hospitals). Candidates will need to go on to consider other factors, such as economic constraints, vested interests, the changing state of scientific and technical knowledge, philanthropic endeavour, changing social attitudes and the impact of wars. For marks in **Bands I and II** there should be a clear attempt to evaluate the relative importance of factors.

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 outcome of elections mainly dependent on the strength of party organisation in the period from 1868 to 1992? [60]

Focus: an evaluation of the factors that influenced the outcome of elections.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

There is something of a case for stating that elections were won mainly due to the strength of party organisation. In the nineteenth century, the Liberals were 'strong' under Gladstone and the Conservatives clear victors under Disraeli and Salisbury. This pattern continued throughout the rest of the period. The Liberals were united in 1906 over the economy and trade and this continued until 1914. Labour was a powerful force in 1945 in offering the creation of a welfare state and also in the 1960s with their plans for a 'new' technological and revitalised economy. The Conservatives were easily the strongest party in terms of number of seats and orthodox policies that appealed to important sectors of society during the interwar years. They also offered attractive alternatives under Macmillan ('never had it so good') and Thatcher (Trade Union legislation, Falklands, etc). However, some may argue that elections were lost rather than won, due to internal (weak leadership, party disunity) and external (economic depressions, wars, world events) factors. This might be true of the Conservatives in 1906, the Liberals in 1923, Labour in the 1920s, the Conservatives in 1945 and Labour in 1983. There is a case for stating that circumstance was, at times, a main influence on who governed, such as during wartime and periods of major economic crisis (e.g. with the formation of a National Government). For **Bands I and II** candidates should produce a balanced account, although they may well argue more strongly for elections generally being lost rather than won.

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

11 Assess the importance of the role of prime ministers to the development of democracy in the period from 1868 to 1992. [60]

Focus: an evaluation of how the role of prime ministers affected the development of democracy.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should be clear about how the role of prime ministers did change before assessing the importance of such developments. Over the period, parliaments were managed differently, relations with monarchs varied, control of cabinets increased and there was more responsibility for international affairs (especially wars) and disposal of finance (e.g. the Secret Fund). It might be argued that prime ministers handled such changes more skilfully as time went by, whilst having their power 'checked' by institutions, such as political parties, pressure groups, the judiciary and the media. Thus, democracy was never threatened. Another line of argument might be that the power of prime ministers was never kept in check enough, especially with respect to the later part of the period. Developments worth discussing might include 'Prime Ministers Questions', the appointment system, collective decision making in the Cabinet, control over Cabinet meetings, the exploitation of new technology (e.g. Baldwin), influence on the Budget, power to call elections, the right to remove ministers (1905 onwards) and decisions to go to war (eg. Chamberlain, Thatcher). There should be a focus on prime ministers, although to some extent 'assess' invites discussion about **relative** importance, and hence, of other influences on democracy. This should be given credit if material is linked carefully together.

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

12 'The growth in the provision of education was the main reason for the development of democracy in the period from 1868 to 1992.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: an assessment of the role of the provision of education in the development of democracy.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Many are likely to agree with the statement, pointing out that key reforms in education were often partly carried out to 'educate our masters' (i.e. the electorate). Thus, the 1870 Act succeeded the Second Reform Act, the 1902 Act was partly a response to a more politically empowered electorate demanding more secondary education and the 1918 Fisher's Act went hand in hand with the Representation of the People's Act of the same year. Later reforms in education were less closely tied to electoral reform, but were still generally to do with educating the 'people' to make informed choices. Some may go further and discuss the role of non-state provision (e.g. 'self-help' methods, the Church, the media, trades unions, Mechanics Institutes), and how this politicised the nation further. The question demands that other factors be considered, and candidates should measure the importance of educational reforms against other political, economic and social developments. These might include extensions to the franchise, changing electoral methods, the influence of political parties, reforms of the Commons and Lords, the rise of Trades Unions, the importance of religious groups and the influence of the mass media.

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

The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996

13 To what extent did the influence on society of the popular press change during the period from 1896 to 1996? [60]

Focus: the impact of the new forms of communication on society.

Effective answers here will need to take seriously the need to weigh up the 'extent' of change, rather than just produce a catalogue of changes, and will also need to grapple with the issue of what 'change' is and how it can be successfully measured, or indeed attributed to the popular press rather than other forces at work on society in this period. Candidates will need to be able to argue their ideas through convincingly. Weaker students are likely to be drawn into a list, unevaluated and undeveloped. Students who are able to categorise and link influences and changes in society (political, cultural; far-reaching or short-term; in order of importance etc) are likely to be more successful than those who are less analytical. The 'influences' and 'changes' are however likely to include: growth in political awareness and both political involvement and scepticism/alienation; improved education/knowledge/ understanding of issues; impact on values and morals; Americanisation; increased range of leisure activities/interests; impact on women and the family; high culture versus low culture debate; class awareness and conflict/envy; greater national unity & shared culture on the one hand, but greater awareness of differences and fragmentation on the other. At some point, many candidates may want to discuss 'why' the influence of the press changed, and although this is not explicitly asked for in the question, as long as it is done relevantly and does not dominate, it is a valid addition to the discussion.

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

14 How far do you agree that the role of the media was different during the two world wars from its role at other times of national crisis in the period from 1896 to 1996? [60]

Focus: the role of the press and broadcasting in times of national crisis.

Most of us will accept that during a major war, such as the world wars, the media can play an important role (informing/not informing, keeping up or undermining morale, shaping public perception for ill or good) and they are likely to scrutinise their role more than at any other time. Governments will hope to make use of the media, and they have to make a judgement about whether they are willing to be so used. In the case of both world wars, there were efforts to impose censorship to a greater or lesser degree. And there was also self-censorship. The key to success here is for the candidate to produce a structured answer that will allow due focus on the media in the two world wars while also recognising that this is a comparison question where evidence and arguments from crises drawn from the whole period need to be considered, for example the General Strike, which arguably Baldwin's government (and especially Churchill) treated like a war. There is also potential difference to be explored even between the two wars; for example the existence of 'the wireless' in the Second World War (and newsreels in the cinema) significantly changed the role that the media could play, while by 1939-45 the public was possibly better educated and more sophisticated perhaps in its attitude to the media. And there are interesting comparisons that can be made between the media's role and attitude in a 'minor' war (such as the Falklands) and a 'major' one.

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

15 Assess the extent to which the influence of techniques and programmes from the USA changed the mass media in Britain in the period from 1896 to 1996. [60]

Focus: the growing influence of techniques and programmes from the USA.

This question encourages candidates to evaluate the convention that the USA had a predominant influence on the development of the mass media in Britain in this period. There is no doubt that important aspects such as the industrialisation of the press in the last part of the 19th century and the way in which television has developed in the second half of the 20th century, including the type of programmes (talk shows, comedy), advertising and the cable/satellite multi-channel options, do tend to support the view that America has been a vital influence. Counter-arguments which candidates may put forward could include the much stronger educational role and programming assumed by the BBC and popular press especially, the resistance to commercialism, the strong commitment to public information. Other significant factors (such as government pressure, changes in society unique to Britain) may also be argued as equally or more important in influencing the media, and they may spend quite a large part of the essay on this, but equally candidates could just weigh up the American influence and still achieve the highest marks, as long as this is done effectively. Good candidates may well make a useful distinction between 'techniques' from the USA (generally adopted keenly) and 'programmes' or content where British cultural expectations made for resistance.

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 use of new weapons in the Wars of Unification mark the most important turning point in the conduct of war in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of a turning point in the conduct of war.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The Wars of Unification saw the use of new weapons technologies in the form of breeched loading rifles (Dreyse needle rifle used by Prussia in 1866 and 1870-71, and the French Chassepot rifle used in 1870-71). Artillery also advanced with the introduction of steel rifled guns with greater range and eventually breeched loaders used by Prussia in the Franco-Prussian War. The development of the machine gun could be cited with the use of the crank loaded Mitrailleuse by France in the Franco-Prussian War. The Italian War of 1859 saw the widespread use of rifled muzzle loaders in the form of Minie technology used by both France and Austria.

Candidates might be expected to evaluate the impact of this technology on the conduct of war. The argument for this period being a turning point might be the impact on battle tactics, the sharp rise in battlefield casualties, and the impact of greater ammunition use on logistics. A counter argument might be that armies did not change their doctrines and fought essentially Napoleonic style battles with similar organisation and tactics. These two positions are very applicable to the American Civil War.

Candidates might seek alternative turning points; examples might be the changes prompted in the organisation of armies and the creation of sweeping strategic battles in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods. Candidates might argue the turning point did not occur until World War I, and that until then warfare was essentially based on constant principles.

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

17 Assess the importance of alliances in the successful conduct of war in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]

Focus: the impact of alliances on the conduct of war.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

There are two key ideas to be evaluated here; firstly the importance of alliances on warfare, and secondly, whether the importance of such alliances changed across the period and their relative importance in relation to other factors, eg leadership, size of armies, military technology.

Alliances tended to have more importance at the beginning and end of the period when Europe was in a state of general warfare. In the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods, coalitions of European powers were vital to containing and eventually defeating France. Candidates may also argue that France forged alliances of sorts with states in the wake of military victories; an example would be Bavaria and other German minor states, the alliances with Austria and Prussia between the middle part of the Napoleonic Wars and the Russian campaign of 1812. World War I – the run up to the war and the war itself – also fits neatly into the question.

In other periods alliances were less important and tended to be used to isolate powers rather than create large armies. Good examples are all of the Wars of Unification and the Crimean War. The American Civil War might be used, candidates arguing that the Confederacy could only win with an alliance with a European power, an event that did not take place.

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

18 “Superior industrial power always brought victory in war.” How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]

Focus: the impact of industrialisation on war.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need a clear grasp of what is meant by industrial power. Examples will probably come from the emerging industrial state of Britain right from the start of the period and the developing industrial might of Prussia and Germany in the middle and later part of the period. The obvious approach would be to compare Britain to Revolutionary/Napoleonic France and cite this as a reason for final French defeat. Another approach might be to compare industrialised Prussia with her Austrian (1866) and French rivals (1870-71). The other obvious part of the period that might be discussed would be World War I.

Examiners need to be aware that other examples of industrialisation do exist in the period. For example, in Revolutionary/Napoleonic France weapons were produced at an industrial – if decentralised – level. The industrial weakness of Russia might be cited, for example in the Crimean War.

Candidates should weigh industrialisation with other factors – generalship, quality of soldiers, for example. The Revolutionary/Napoleonic period would fit into this approach; candidates might argue that the weaker industrialised power of France was very successful for almost 25 years until defeated. They might point to the bulk of anti-French combatant powers waging war with very limited industrial bases. The Italian War of 1859 is not characterised by the struggle of one stronger industrialised power against another. Good answers would explain why industrial might is so effective in some circumstances, not so in others.

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 aims of German nationalists were undermined by Prussia in the period from 1815 to 1919? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the extent to which Prussian ambitions undermined the aims of German nationalists in the period 1815 to 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 aims of German nationalists’ and evaluate whether these were either undermined or furthered by ‘Prussian ambitions’ in their answers. Candidates should compare the various aims and ideas of German nationalism with the developing impact that Prussia had on Germany. Candidates may consider the impact that the Prussian Zollverein had on the development of nationalism. Candidates may discuss the role played by Prussia in the 1860s in forging the new Germany. Candidates may demonstrate that they understand that the German Empire in 1871 represented Kleindeutschland and an enlarged Prussia. They may argue that it was a Prussian Empire rather than a German Empire. However not all German nationalists aspired to Grossdeutschland and it can be argued that the creation of the Second Reich was a crucial step forward for the aims of German nationalists. Candidates could point to the mythical status of Bismarck in German history and / or to the popularity and mass appeal of increasingly radical nationalism in the reign of William II to argue that Prussia’s creation of the Second Reich was consistent with the aims of many German nationalists. Candidates might argue that the aims and ambitions of Prussian militarism were to ultimately set the German nation on course for disaster and humiliation by reference to Germany’s defeat in the First World War and her humiliation at Versailles.

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

20 To what extent did industrialisation encourage the development of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919?

[60]

Focus: An evaluation of the impact of industrialisation on the development of 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 ‘the development of German nationalism’ and ‘the effects of industrialisation’ ‘encouraged’ or hindered it in their answers. Candidates should explain the impact of industrialization on the development of German nationalism, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia’s economic strength and, consequently, Prussian leadership of Germany. This also had a limiting effect on the development of German nationalism as Prussia was able to exclude Austria, first from the Zollverein and then from Germany. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the Prussian military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71 and the creation of the Second Reich. Military strength depended upon industrialisation: ‘Coal & Iron’ rather than ‘Blood & Iron’ could be usefully debated. The impact of the extraordinary developments in the German economy after 1871 should be discussed. Candidates may well argue that the quickening pace of industrialization led to urbanization and the development of increasingly radical socialism. Socialism gave the working class an alternative loyalty to patriotism and nationalism. This in turn led Kaiser Wilhelm II to embark on a foreign policy aimed at distracting the workers from their grievances.

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

21 Assess the claim that Metternich was more effective in his management of German nationalism than both Bismarck and Kaiser William II in the period from 1815 to 1919.

[60]

Focus: Evaluation of the management of German nationalism in this period by Metternich, Bismarck and Kaiser William II.

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 how effectively Metternich, Bismarck and William II managed German nationalism. Candidates will undoubtedly be more successful if they define ‘effective management’ in their answer. Candidates might define the ways in which the three were (or were not) effective: for example in controlling, harnessing or using nationalism. Clearly all three had different aims and different circumstances, which could enable candidates to make convincing cases for all of them. By 1848 / 49 no leader of the nationalist movement with mass appeal emerged. From 1815 to 1848 the nationalist movement was too weak to effectively challenge the Metternich System: arguably this demonstrates Metternich’s effective control over German nationalists. Equally Metternich fled Vienna in 1848, though his downfall was hardly dominated by German nationalism. Many candidates may argue in favour of Bismarck because of his critical role in the 1860s in the creation of the Second Reich; candidates may argue that he managed German nationalism by hijacking the nationalist cause for Prussia’s ends. This too could be considered effective management of German nationalism. Wilhelm II’s search for world power was undoubtedly populist, mirroring the development of radical nationalism, but it placed Germany in a vulnerable, dangerous position. The ultimate outcome of his policies was defeat in the Great War and humiliation at Versailles.

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

Europe 1855-1956**Russian Dictatorship 1855 – 1956**

22 ‘The need to catch up with the West was the most important reason why the rulers of Russia introduced reforms.’ How far do you agree with this view of Russia in the period from 1855 to 1956? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the reasons why the rulers of Russia introduced reforms in the period from 1855 to 1956.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the reasons why the rulers of Russia introduced reforms in this period. Candidates should argue both for and against the assertion that the need to catch up with the West was the most important reason. In support of the view that the rulers introduced reform to try to catch up with the West candidates may refer to examples such as Alexander II and the Emancipation of the serfs, Witte’s ‘Great Spurt’ in the 1890s and Stalin’s Five Year Plans. However they are likely to argue that even these reforms were not mono-causal. For example, candidates may argue that Russia’s long history of defeats in war led Stalin to embark on the Five Year Plans and collectivization in order that ‘old Russia would not be ceaselessly beaten’. The impact of defeats in the Crimean War, the Russo-Japanese War and the First World War may be used to develop the case that military weakness was often a significant reason why the rulers of Russia introduced reform. Significant reforms were granted after defeats in wars, for example the Emancipation of the serfs in 1861 and the October manifesto in 1905. Although significant reforms were granted after defeats in wars, the defeat in war was never the only reason for the introduction of reforms. Arguably the rulers were often motivated by the desire to gain or retain popularity or to reduce opposition. For example, the Kronstadt Revolt may be seen as a reason for the introduction of reform (the NEP) in 1921. Candidates may argue that significant reforms after 1917 were introduced mainly for ideological reasons as Russia became the USSR and moved towards socialism/communism. This argument could be applied to Lenin’s early reforms such as the Decree on Land and to War Communism, the Five Year Plans and collectivization. Candidates may see a desire to strengthen their power and authority as an important reason why some rulers introduced changes/reforms, for example Alexander III and Stalin.

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

23 Assess the view that Alexander II did more to improve living and working conditions in Russia than any other ruler in the period from 1855 to 1956. [60]

Focus: Evaluation as to which ruler of Russia in this period did most to improve living and working conditions.

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 whether the assertion that ‘Alexander II did more to improve living and working conditions in Russia than any other ruler in the period from 1855 to 1956’ is true. Candidates will probably find much to argue about in support of this assertion: they may well cite various reforms, such as Emancipation, the creation of the Zemstva and the introduction of trial by jury. However they may well also point out the inadequacies of much of his programme of reform and suggest that the people gained much less than might have been anticipated. Candidates must compare some of the other rulers of Russia with Alexander II. Any answers that are limited to an assessment of Alexander II, however full and accurate, are severely flawed and may not be awarded more than Band III. Candidates may well challenge the assertion by reference to Lenin or Khrushchev but must be credited for a valid case made in support of any other ruler.

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

24 How far do you agree that establishment of Stalin in power was the most important turning point in the development of Russian government in the period from 1855 to 1956? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the relative significance of Stalin's victory in the power struggle as a turning point in the development of Russian government 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 the phrase 'most important turning point' and 'the development of Russian government' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the victory of Stalin in the power struggle as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. What follows is not an exclusive list, but consideration could be given to 1855, 1866, 1881, 1905 / 1906, February 1917, October 1917, or Lenin's death in 1924. Candidates may argue that the assassination of Alexander II and his replacement by Alexander III was the defining moment in Russian history in this period. They could suggest that the assassination marked the end of any hope of meaningful reform from above by the Romanov dynasty, and set the Romanovs on course for revolution and their downfall. Candidates may argue that the end of over 300 years of Romanov rule in February 1917 was the most significant turning point as it ended the 304 year old Romanov dynasty, but may argue that ultimately this led to the replacement of 'Romanov Tsars' by 'red Tsars'. Many candidates will undoubtedly argue that October 1917 and the triumph of Bolshevism was the most important turning point as it crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia. Candidates however may well consider that the replacement of Lenin by Stalin, after Lenin's death in 1924, was the most significant turning point, perverting the true course of the Russian Revolution. Some candidates may use a counter-argument based on more recent archival evidence to suggest that there was significant continuity between Lenin and Stalin and use this to argue against the assertion in this question.

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

America 1763-1980**The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877**

25 Assess the significance of political groupings and parties in the development of the American political system in the period from 1763 to 1877. [60]

Focus - Assessing the significance of political parties and groups in the development of US constitutional history.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates could mention that the creation of Patriot groups following the end of the Seven Years War created the political climate for the outbreak of the Revolutionary War following the Declaration of Independence. The division of US society between Patriot and Tory (Loyalist) helped forge the future development of what became the USA. Therefore, the Patriot political grouping helped bind the 13 Colonies together in the Revolutionary War, produce the Declaration of Independence of 1776, the Articles of Confederation and the US Constitution in 1787.

Candidates may also mention the role of Federalist versus Jeffersonian Democratic-Republicans in the development of the US political system following the presidency of Washington. Federalists, associated with Alexander Hamilton, favoured a strong federal government. Democratic-Republicans supported States' Rights. This political split helped pave the way eventually for the sectional split of 1861-1865.

The rise of Jackson (1820s-1830s) saw the development of male democracy with the rise of the Democrats. Candidates may mention the impact of the decline of the Whig Party in the late 1840s and the appearance of the Republican Party from 1854 as a major cause of Civil War, where party loyalty split along sectional lines. The split in the Democratic party in 1860, when they offered northern and southern candidates for the Presidency, allowed the Republican Lincoln to win, thus helping precipitate Civil War. Following the Civil War, the dominance of the Republican party in national politics forced through the process of Reconstruction (1863-1877). Finally, candidates may mention the Compromise of 1877 when the election of Rutherford B Hayes as president, on a minority of the popular vote and by one electoral college vote, which resulted in the end of Reconstruction. Some candidates may mention political groups such as the Ku Klux Klan during the Reconstruction Period as a force which highlighted southern White resistance to Reconstruction, but it had very little impact of political development.

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

26 How far do you agree that the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was the most important turning point in the development of North-South relations, in the period from 1787 to 1877? [60]

Focus - Assessing the significance of a turning point in sectional relations.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates could mention that compromise brought a halt to severe sectional tension for a generation. The decision to allow Maine to join the Union as a free state in 1820, and Missouri as a slave state in 1819, maintained balance between free and slave states until after the Mexican War. The Compromise also limited the western extension of slavery to the territories to 36 degrees 30 minutes north. Candidates may attach importance to the 1820 Compromise because it lasted from 1820 to the late 1840s.

However, candidates should also mention other potential turning-points. The Constitution of 1787 created a strong federal union out of the loose union under the Articles of Confederation. The Compromise of 1850 brought to an end the sectional tensions which resulted from the Mexican War. It allowed California to join the Union as a free state and dealt with the issue of fugitive slaves and slavery in the District of Columbia. The major negative turning-point was the outbreak of civil war. Also candidates might cite the Civil War as a turning-point because it resolved north-south tensions through violence with the North restoring the Union by 1865, and during Reconstruction (1863-1877) allowed the southern states to be restored to the Union.

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

27 Assess the view that the US Supreme Court was the most important factor in the development of the US Constitution, in the period from 1789 to 1877. [60]

Focus - Assessing the role of a part of the Federal Government in the development of the Constitution.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The US Supreme Court was not mentioned in the 1787 Constitution. However, by 1877, it was a very powerful part of the Federal Government, in many ways rivalling the presidency and the Congress. The US Supreme Court was created by the Judiciary Act of 1789. In support of the assertion in the question candidates may mention the following. The fourth Chief Justice, John Marshall (1801-1835) laid the foundation stones of Supreme Court power through the doctrine of judicial review. In the 1803 Marbury versus Madison case, Marshall claimed the power to interpret the US Constitution by the US Supreme Court. From that moment on the US Supreme Court could veto presidential and congressional action if they were deemed to be unconstitutional as defined by the US Supreme Court. In the case of McCulloch versus Maryland, 1819, Marshall ensured that the Supreme Court would be the highest court of appeal in all federal and state cases. In the Dred Scott Case 1857, Chief Justice Roger Taney (1836-1864) exacerbated sectional conflict between North and South by declaring that slavery was lawful in all US Territories. These decisions helped make the US Supreme Court the centre-piece of political decision making and pivotal in developing sectional conflict between North and South.

Candidates may offer alternative views. They may regard the presidency as more important. As head of state, head of government and commander in chief the US president has had considerable influence over the development of the Constitution, such as Jackson's role in the Nullification Crisis of 1832 or Lincoln's role in the Civil War. Other candidates may choose the Congress. The Congress was responsible for the compromises of 1820 and 1850 which involved the admission of new states.

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

Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980

28 Assess the view that Martin Luther King was the most important African American to advance African American rights in the period from 1865 to 1980. [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the role of an individual in the advancement of African American rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may mention Martin Luther King's role in the Montgomery Bus Boycott 1955 to 1956. As Pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church he led the boycott to a successful conclusion. His support of non-violence brought him, and the Civil Rights Movement, national and international recognition. He subsequently helped found and lead the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) which helped spread the Civil Rights Movement across the South. In 1963 he again brought Civil Rights to the forefront of national attention with protests in Birmingham, Alabama. This helped persuade Kennedy to introduce a Civil Rights Bill to Congress, which Johnson passed in 1964. In Selma, Alabama, (1963-64) his leadership of the SCLC in a protest march helped Johnson pass the Voting Rights Act in 1965 through Congress. These were landmark reforms in the creation of full equality for African Americans.

However, King did have failures, in Albany, Georgia in 1964 and St Augustine, Florida, 1964 and Gage Park, Chicago, 1965. On each occasion he failed in his attempt at desegregation. Also, King's opposition to the Vietnam war, from 1967, alienated the Johnson administration and greatly reduced King's influence in Washington DC.

King's role could be compared to the roles of other African American leaders such as Booker T Washington in the 1880s to 1900. Washington set up Tuskegee College to offer African Americans a college education. He was a fervent advocate of African American social and economic rights but refused to openly attack segregation. WEB Dubois in the 1900-1920 period, helped found the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) and supported the idea of educating the African American elite to a high standard. Marcus Garvey in the 1920s supported African American economic advancement and rediscovery of their African heritage. A Philip Randolph in the 1940s and 1950s made great strides in ending racial discrimination in federal employment. Malcolm X in 1960s, and the Black Panthers in the 1960s-1970s advocated African American separateness.

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

29 How far was the New Deal the most important turning point in the development of trade union rights in the period 1865 to 1980? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the New Deal as a turning point in development of trade union rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may give evidence to support the assertion: Section 7a of the National Industrial Recovery Act, 1933-35 in favour of union recognition for the first time by the Federal government. The Wagner Act 1935 of the Second New Deal, gave trade unions the right to engage in collective bargaining. The creation of the National Industrial Relations Board, 1938 under the Labor Standards Act, 1938 established Federal arbitration in labour disputes. In addition, candidates may mention that several New Deal programmes greatly helped trade union members, such as the Public Works Administration. Candidates may also state that during the New Deal years of the 1930s trade unions enjoyed a rapid growth in membership, in particular, the auto-workers and miners. The creation of the CIO (Congress of Industrial Organisations) in 1936 was a milestone in trade union development.

Candidates may define the New Deal as covering the period 1933-1945 and may include references to the Second World War. In the 1941-45 period trade unions played a major role in administration of war production and prices and incomes policy.

However, candidates may offer alternatives, such as the 1890s with Homestead and Pullman Strikes. These strikes, and Federal and State action associated with them greatly limited trade union rights. Candidates might mention the 1920s with negative developments at Federal and State level, when laws were passed which limited trade union rights, allowing 'Yellow Dog Contracts' which were anti-union. Also large employers such as Henry Ford in car production were anti-union. As a result, trade union membership fell in the 1920s. In the post-1945 era candidates may mention as important milestones the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 which radically reduced trade union power, or the formation of the AFL/CIO (American Federation of Labor/Congress of Industrial Organisations) in 1955 as the creation of a unified, national union movement.

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

30 'Compared to Hispanic Americans, Native Americans faced far greater discrimination, in the period from 1865 to 1980.' How far do you agree? [60]

Focus: Comparative analysis of the development of civil rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should offer a comparative judgement. Native Americans were not US citizens before the Dawes Act of 1887 and then only some Plains Indian tribes. All tribes were given citizenship from 1924. Candidates may mention very poor living/working conditions on Indian Reservations throughout the period. However, improvements did occur from the 1934 Congressional Act and the ability of tribes to use independent nation status to exploit their economic potential e.g. Jicarilla Apaches, Mohawks. However, throughout the period the majority of Native Americans faced severe economic hardship and a very high incidence of social problems such as alcohol abuse.

Hispanics did not face such overt discrimination officially but faced discrimination in social and economic areas. This was common in those areas which bordered Mexico such as California, Texas, Arizona and New Mexico. Hispanics, like Native Americans, faced social and economic hardship and social and economic discrimination. Many Hispanics were forced to live in ghettos (called barrios) and could only get low paid, and usually, part time employment. The majority, up to the Second World War, were engaged in agriculture. However, by the 1960s the position of Hispanics began to improve. Migration into northern urban areas offered Hispanics opportunities for better employment. The Immigration Act of 1965 allowed greater official immigration. As a result, large numbers emigrated to the USA from Puerto Rico and Central America. Also, the civil rights legislation of the 1960s aided Hispanics as it did other ethnic groups. Also, action by Hispanics such as Cesar Chavez helped improve the working conditions of the predominantly Hispanic workforce in southern California agriculture. However, up to 1980 a major issue for many Hispanics was associated with illegal immigration. These Hispanics worked illegally and had no civil rights.

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

2592 & 2593

Independent Investigation

1 THE ARTS AND HISTORY

Choose a painting from any period you have studied. How far does it give an accurate insight into the values, ideas or beliefs of the age in which it was painted? [A 'painting' may be a single painting or a related series of paintings]

There are two requirements in this question. First, candidates have to *interpret* the content of their chosen painting as a source of evidence about contemporary values, ideas or beliefs. Second, and more important, they have to *evaluate* the source for its *accuracy* as a source of evidence. Some candidates may carry out these tasks separately, others simultaneously.

Candidates may choose to write about a single painting or about a series of paintings. As ever, selection will be critical. If a single painting were chosen, it would be useful if it had the narrative quality of much Victorian art. A 'related series of paintings' might comprise, for example, the war paintings of Paul Nash, or the various portraits of Elizabeth I. Obviously, a measure of sentiment or exaggeration on the part of the artist(s) can be turned to advantage when assessing the reliability and usefulness of the painting(s) as evidence.

Most candidates should be able to carry out the task of interpretation – possibly cross-referencing to other source material (primary and/or secondary) to help explain the content of the painting and the contemporary values it represents. More successful candidates will go on from this to evaluate the source – for example, by noting omissions or distortions (cross-referenced to what is known about the period from other sources), or by critical observations about the purpose of the artist or the circumstances in which the painting was made (again, supported by evidence from other primary and/or secondary sources) and what this might tell us about contemporary values.

2 ECONOMIC HISTORY

To what extent have trade and exchange been the critical factors in the economic development of any city, country or region you have studied?

The first task will be to identify a *range* of causal factors (including 'trade and exchange'). The second, to examine each factor (probably starting with 'trade and exchange') and assess its impact on economic development. Finally, the candidate should try to assess the *relative importance* of these various factors – but by means of demonstration rather than assertion.

For example, she might argue that Factor 'X' was the most important, because all other factors depended on 'X' being in place. Alternatively, the case for 'Y' might be undermined by an argument that economic growth was already in train before 'Y' occurred. Finally, and most difficult, it might be shown that the only factor *without which economic growth could not have occurred* was 'Z'.

More successful candidates are likely to produce thematically organised explanations, following one of the approaches mentioned above. Less successful ones may produce anything from a narrative account of economic growth to a factor-led explanation that either fails to make a judgment, or simply asserts that 'trade and exchange' was the main causal factor.

3 THE INDIVIDUAL IN HISTORY

How far would you agree that, 'No individual can alter the course of history'?

The critical phrase in the question is 'alter the course of history'. The quotation, not surprisingly, comes from Marx. Whereas the question might invite a critique of the Dialectic, it is meant to generate a more general debate about the relative importance of individual action and longer-term forces in the achievement of significant and lasting change. The line of argument is likely to bisect two competing notions. The first is that the course of history is driven by 'special' individuals, who, either by force of will or exceptional ability, altered the world around them in some significant sense. The second, following the title proposition, is that change in human affairs has been determined by longer-term political, social or economic developments – 'the tides beneath', as Braudel might have put it.

Clearly, in respect of the second notion (above), the argument needs to be made *manageable*, in view of the time available to write the answer. The obvious way of doing this would be to focus on a significant event or development involving the selected individual and assess the extent to which a successful outcome can be attributed to the individual or to longer term causal factors. For example, 'How far did Lenin direct or follow the 'course of history' in 1917?' 'How original was Hitler's policy of *Lebensraum*?' 'How much did Napoleon's achievements owe to the French Revolution?' Whereas uncritical narrative (and nothing else) is to be avoided at all costs, some sort of narrative framework will be needed in order to make sense of the individual's response to the unfolding of events – the key is to keep the narrative focused on the argument.

More successful candidates are more likely to recognise that this is an invitation to provide a *balanced* argument supported by critical use of source material, in which the achievements of an individual are weighed against more persistent trends in bringing about the event or development in question. When using secondary material in particular, they should avoid mere juxtaposition and the use of labels, such as 'intentionalist' etc., as though this were sufficient *on its own* to explain any historian's viewpoint. Less successful candidates may fail to recognise that this is *not* an invitation to write everything they know about the individual they have chosen.

4 LOCAL HISTORY

How far was geographical position the main factor in explaining the development of any historical site you have studied? [A 'historical site' may be anything from a single building – church, monastery, castle, mill – to a whole settlement]

This is a question that seeks to take advantage of the increased (and long awaited) interest shown by candidates in using local topics for their coursework investigations. As the information accompanying the question indicates, the term 'historical site' can refer to anything from a single building to a whole settlement.

A key word in the question is '*development*'. This means that the emphasis in the narrative should be on the growth, rather than on the establishment of the site. This in turn will require the candidate to relate the site to a wider context of social, political or economic change.

Evidence in support of the proposition should be readily available, enabling candidates to make full, critical use of both primary and secondary source material. 'Critical use' here is likely to involve considerations of *utility* more than those of reliability. A source might be more or less useful depending on e.g. the kind of evidence it contains; the consistency of the evidence with that taken from other sources; or what it tells us about how typical development of the chosen site was, compared with sites in other parts of the country. The most valuable source of all is likely to be the site itself.

As ever, the discriminating factor is likely to be the quality of the argument – in particular, the extent to which candidates are able to demonstrate that the development of the site was due to *factors other than geographical position*. For example, the site of a monastery may have been chosen for its isolation from the sins of the world, but its development may have owed more to fluctuations in the price of wool; similarly, strategic priorities become less important in the development of castles, as fortified strongholds give way to baronial palaces. On the other hand, a rural settlement of manorial foundation might have been transformed in the 18th or 19th Century by its proximity to a coalfield.

5 MILITARY HISTORY

How true is it of any military conflict you have studied that ‘wars are always won by the side with the most resources’?

This question invites candidates to consider, critically, the relationship between military might and military victory. Two possible approaches to an answer can be considered. In the first, the candidate chooses a single conflict and assesses the extent to which victory was due to one side having superior resources, or to some other factor(s). The second, more complex approach would be choose two contrasting examples of conflicts – one that was won by superior resources, and the other that was won *despite* the superior resources of the enemy. In each case, the outcome needs to be explained – e.g. in terms of inspiration, strategy or management of resources – and a conclusion drawn in respect of the title proposal.

More successful candidates will make critical use of source material to build their initial argument/explanation. Some may go on to test their conclusion by comparing outcomes in the examples offered, in order to determine whether superior resources or some other factor was most critical to the victory in each case. Less successful candidates may find it difficult to get much further than a narrative of events – though a narrative *that incorporates explanation/evaluation* could score quite highly.

6 POLITICAL HISTORY

‘The ends justified the means’. To what extent can this be said of the actions of any political leader or political movement you have studied?

This is a question about the morality of political leadership. It invites candidates to explore, for example, the murky waters in which high principle can be mistaken for betrayal (e.g. Peel), or where long-term gains can be obscured by short-term costs (e.g. Stalin)

As with any essay that focuses on political activity, structure of argument and management of narrative are essential skills. Uncritical narrative (and nothing else) must, of course, be avoided at all costs. However, some sort of narrative framework is needed in order to make sense of the actions and policies of the political figure or regime that is chosen – the key is to keep the narrative focused on the demands of the question. With this in mind, the candidate may wish to focus on one or two major political decisions made by the individual or regime that best call the ‘ends/means’ dichotomy into question, or to look for several examples over a longer period. There should be ample opportunity for candidates to make critical uses of source material, or to adjudicate between the interpretations of historians – but this must go beyond mere juxtaposition, or the listing of historians as ‘revisionists’ etc. - as though this were sufficient *on its own* to explain their viewpoint. A fairly straightforward judgement is then required – again supported by evidence – about whether the ends did, indeed, justify the means.

More successful candidates will make critical use of source material to produce a balanced argument and judgement. Others may settle for a narrative account of the career of the political leader, perhaps tackling the question by means of assertion in the conclusion.

7 RELIGIOUS HISTORY

For any period studied, assess the reasons why religious enthusiasm either increased or declined.

Candidates should note that 'religious enthusiasm' means an intensity of popular religious feeling. Its growth, can be associated with e.g. deliberate government policy (Marian persecutions), with superstition (witch hunts), with a sudden relaxation of censorship (English Revolution), or with 'revivalism' (Methodism, Nonconformity); Reasons for its decline, on the other hand, can be linked with e.g. the growth of secularism (e.g. the 'leisure revolution' of the 1880s and 1890s) or with advances in science or knowledge (Renaissance / Scientific Revolution / Age of Reason).

Candidates should also note that the question asks for the 'reasons'. They should therefore examine a number of causal factors, making critical use of source material, or comparing/contrasting the views of historians. Following this, they should begin to assess the relative importance of each factor – for example, by demonstrating that a number of dependent factors were dependent on one dominating factor, or by demonstrating why a particular upsurge in religious enthusiasm could not have occurred without a particular factor (or combination of factors) being present. A good approach to relative causal importance is to turn the problem around and attempt to demonstrate why one factor was *less important* than others.

As ever, quality of narrative is the likely discriminator between the work of more and less successful candidates. The former will spend time constructing a contextual framework, then developing within it a thematic explanation organised around various causal factors. The work of the latter is likely to be characterised by excessively descriptive narrative and a succession of assertions and/or inference that passes for explanation.

8 SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND HISTORY

Assess the historical significance of a single discovery or invention from any period you have studied.

The key phrase in this question is 'historical significance'. A discovery or invention that provides a solution to a local problem or a new way of doing something may be important in its immediate context, but this does not necessarily mean that it is 'historically significant'.

There are basically two ways of measuring historical significance – synchronically and diachronically. Synchronic significance is measured *across time*, taking account of e.g. how many people were affected, how did it link to other developments at the time? Diachronic significance is measured *over time*, taking account of e.g. the extent to which the discovery or invention was part of a trend, or formed a turning point in a longer line of development. In each case, interpretations of significance will need to be supported by critical use of appropriate source material. Candidates may be unfamiliar with these definitions, but they *are* familiar with synoptic analysis, which involves asking similar questions and taking a 'longer view'. Candidates may or may not use these criteria, but they will need to recognise that criteria *of this kind* will be needed to measure the historical significance of any discovery or invention.

More successful candidates will set their chosen discovery/invention within a longer context of prior and subsequent events, as well as assessing its contemporary impact. They will then use this analysis to explore whether or not the *direction* of development was altered sufficiently to warrant the classification of 'turning point'. Less successful candidates may offer a narrative account of the discovery and its immediate impact, without considering the longer view. In this case, significance will tend to be asserted, rather than demonstrated.

9 SOCIAL HISTORY

For any period studied, how easy is it to determine the conditions of life for ordinary people from the available evidence?

This is an invitation to candidates to explore, through both primary and secondary source material, the lives of 'ordinary people' and, on the basis of this study, to propose generalised interpretations, either about the ideas, beliefs and actions of these people, or about the societies in which they lived. 'Ordinary people' defines all of those who enjoyed neither privileged birth, social position or landed wealth.

It is difficult to predict the kind of argument that might ensue, but it may well be concerned, for example, with the extent to which the concerns/ideas/attitudes/beliefs/ actions of 'ordinary people' were consistent with claims made on their behalf, either in their own time by their educated betters, or subsequently by historians. Alternatively, an argument might revolve around 'How useful...?' since contemporary references to 'ordinary people', such as might be found in lists of rebel demands, in the records of Quarter Sessions, or Calendars of Prisoners, are useful in providing certain kinds of information, but not others. Finally, a source such as The Paston Letters might enable the candidate to test generalisations about the impact of the Wars of the Roses on life in England during the 15th Century.

Candidates will need to take particular care when evaluating contemporary material, since it is usually written *about*, rather than *by* 'ordinary people'. Another problem concerns the production of generalised statements about 'ordinary people' based on evidence taken or inferred from primary sources. Individual items, for example the agrarian grievances that rebels from Cumberland brought to the Pilgrimage of Grace, do not necessarily justify a generalisation, so corroboration and/or cross-reference will be needed. Similarly, evidence in the Paston Letters of local violence in Norfolk does not mean that the whole of England was devastated by civil wars of the mid-15th Century. Therefore, the *usefulness* of evidence is likely to be an issue in tackling this question.

More successful candidates will approach evidence sources with due respect and caution and produce sound 'technical' arguments around the utility of local records and/ contemporary testimony. Some may go on to propose generalised statements on the back of this. Less successful candidates may make valid inferences about the lives of ordinary people from contemporary and/or secondary sources, but their finished work may fail to provide an argument, as such.

10 WORLD HISTORY**Assess the achievements of any African leader.**

This is a straightforward invitation to candidates to provide a balanced assessment of any African leader, making appropriately critical use of available source material. The key word is '*balanced*' – it is no longer surprising how many candidates attempting this kind of question provide an uncritical narrative of the subject's life or career. These may be generally weaker candidates, but how much more does it take to include a dissenting opinion, supported by evidence critically used?

Avoiding a simple biographical narrative of the person's life does not necessarily mean, however, that all narrative should be abandoned – it may make sense to use a chronological framework, but to make regular, evaluative references back to the title (usually at the end of a paragraph), in order to sustain the relevance of narrative to argument. Alternatively, a thematic structure can be used, in which a series of 'achievements' are identified and evaluated. This is a more difficult argument to construct – largely because the chronological 'handrail' is abandoned. However, it is the best way to sustain a relevant argument (since each section represents an 'achievement' to be evaluated) and seems to facilitate more readily the critical use of source material. Finally, this is the sort of question that tends to attract uncritical juxtaposition of historians' views – or, rather, reported views. Candidates will do well to remember that it is the stated view of each historian that is required, supported by a comment that attempts to *explain* similarities or differences in historians' views, or about what agreement or disagreement might *mean* as far as the argument is concerned.

Differences in the quality of work of more and less successful candidates will certainly focus on the kind narrative structure adopted, the relevance of the argument and the handling of secondary sources.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE (Subject) (Aggregation Code(s))

June 2008 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2580	Raw	60	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2581	Raw	60	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2582	Raw	60	43	38	33	28	23	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2583	Raw	45	35	30	26	22	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2584	Raw	45	35	30	26	22	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2585	Raw	45	33	29	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2586	Raw	45	33	29	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2587	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2588	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2589	Raw	90	68	61	55	49	43	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2590	Raw	120	88	79	70	61	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2591	Raw	120	88	79	70	61	52	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2592	Raw	90	72	64	56	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2593	Raw	90	72	64	56	49	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (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	18.22	41.55	66.17	83.98	94.03	100.00	14917
7835	22.56	52.07	78.13	93.76	99.03	100.00	13220

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

