

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9769 HISTORY

9769/58 Paper 5h (Special Subject – Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867–1886),
maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

- 1 (a) How far, and why, do the views about the importance of the monarchy given in Documents A and B differ? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents, rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other and/or differ, and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation. Candidates should make use of the content of the headings and attributions, as well as the text, of the documents. Good candidates should see that, although the views of Disraeli and Harrison about the role which the monarchy *should* play are diametrically opposed, there is considerable agreement about the role which the monarchy *actually is* playing in the early 1870s. Thus, Document A makes clear Disraeli's view, that the monarchy is important and is an integral part of the constitution. He goes on to argue that a monarch, in gaining so much personal information, plays a beneficial role since he or she will have a longer memory at a high level than will most ministers. The concluding sentence confirms Disraeli's view that it would be idiotic for a minister to treat monarchical influence 'with indifference'. Harrison agrees that the monarchy is important – 'associated with every phase of English society'; 'a most potent symbol'. He goes on to explain the significance of monarchy for 'governing classes' and the middle class. Thereafter, the analyses diverge. Harrison argues that the monarchy is anachronistic and is 'a cramped and obsolete notion'. The final sentence presents a standard radical argument in favour of merit and against deference to an 'accident of birth'. In explaining the extent of difference, it is legitimate for candidates to employ skills of source evaluation. Here the requirement will be to make effective inferences both from the content of the sources and from their provenance. Candidates should be aware of such issues as provenance, purpose and reliability. Here, it is significant that Document A comes from a public speech and candidates can reasonably infer that one important purpose of the speech is to build up Conservative party strength – in this case in one of the leading industrial cities of mid-Victorian Britain. Disraeli might, therefore, be deliberately stressing the importance of monarchy to persuade an audience, many of whom will be aware of, indeed perhaps members of, a Liberal majority among the middle classes. Candidates can make use of the information given about Harrison in the provenance. Although it is unlikely that many will have heard of him, they can infer from what is written that here is a statement of the antimonarchical position from the radical wing of Liberalism, and they should know something about the unpopularity of Victoria at the beginning of the period. The appeal to rationality and a sense of historical perspective might also be expected from an 'intellectual' like Harrison. Some may also infer (not unreasonably) that Harrison is writing for a readership of thinkers, many of whom are likely to be amenable to the argument, lurking only just below the surface, that monarchy stands in the way of progress. Thus, candidates may conclude that there are considerable similarities in the analysis of the present importance of monarchy, whereas Harrison seeks to change this situation and Disraeli to sustain it.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

- (b) How convincing is the evidence presented by these documents for the view that respect for the existing constitution and support for the empire were central to the development of Disraelian Conservatism in the years 1867–74?**

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and should make effective use of each, although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Here the focus of that argument should be on making a historical judgment of the selected factors – respect for the existing constitution and support for the empire – in explaining the development of Disraelian Conservatism from 1867. Good candidates should see that this requires examination of a range of factors, not all of which are represented in the documents. The main omission, probably, is the absence of any discussion of the 'bread' element of 'bread and circuses'. Contextual knowledge is likely to be extensive on this area and candidates can, of course, draw on it. It is perfectly possible to argue that the attention Disraeli gave to support for the working man was critical in winning support in a number of urban constituencies in 1874. The Documents are, however, rich in other relevant material. Good candidates will note how Disraeli in Document A sees the importance of monarchy *within* the wider context of support for the existing constitution, the 'programme of the Conservative party'. Specific detail on monarchy fits better into the territory of question (a). Document B offers less evidence than the others but its message can be used inferentially. Harrison clearly regrets the importance not just of the monarchy but the extent of respect for the 'status quo'. This Document can be read as evidence provided by a non-Conservative for issues and ideas on which the Conservative party can build. Document C expounds Disraeli's belief (or at least his assertion – which was going to be sorely tested in 1874) that 'the great body of people of the country' were Conservative. The points Disraeli then develops relate to both the Empire and to the English people's adherence to 'national principles'. His speech attempts to link these key beliefs of Conservatism to the people's apparent support for them. Again, there is much contextual knowledge which can be added both to develop, and in some respects to challenge, the argument being put forward here. Some candidates might also note that this speech appears long on confident assertion and relatively light on supporting evidence. Document D argues for the importance of organisation as a key element in the development of Conservatism. Without it, what is stated to be 'the great Conservative strength' has been 'deprived of its just influence upon public affairs'. This Document ends with one specific example of how 'widening the basis and deepening the foundations of the Constitution' was threatened by Gladstone's government – and how the NUCCA lobbied against Irish Church 'resolutions'. This should link with contextual knowledge on Gladstone's Irish policy during his first administration. Document E is an election address and good candidates should be able to evaluate its evidence in the light of what the provenance tells them. Disraeli returns to his key theme of 'national institutions' and 'Empire'. His purpose in this address is to draw attention to Gladstone's dangerous political allies. Contextual knowledge should fill in the picture. Candidates might wish to discuss the growing gulf between Whig grandes and the Liberal radicals who were gaining increasing influence in many large towns. They might particularly discuss the role of the nonconformists in agitating for state education and, having got a form of it in 1870, pressing for marginalisation of the Church of England. Contextual knowledge might suggest to them the tendentiousness of this section of Disraeli's address. The great majority of Liberal radicals were practising Christians, if not Anglicans, and it is surely pushing it to pass off their hostility to Anglicanism as a desire 'to thrust religion', rather than as a further assault on the hegemony of the Church of England in 'national education'. From contextual knowledge, candidates should be aware of the key ideas which lay behind the Conservative recovery in the early 1870s. They can say more about the new party machine, the organisational roles of party agents and officials both

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

nationally and in the constituencies. They should also be aware of how Disraeli 'pitched' his leadership. Candidates are likely to make more use of the Manchester and Crystal Palace speeches of 1872, with their emphasis on the Empire and patriotism and also the need to provide policies for the benefit of new voters, especially working men in the boroughs. Good candidates may also discuss how Disraelian Conservatism attacked the priorities of Gladstone's government, with attacks on foreign policy as 'weak' and showing insufficient patriotism. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. The question requires a judgment about the relative importance of selected factors. This requires candidates to examine other factors. Here, candidates may concentrate on writing by Shannon and others about Disraeli, and the extent to which this raises his reputation in comparison to that of Gladstone. They might wish to argue on how far the Tory revival represented a personal triumph for Disraeli. Did it reflect Disraeli's presentational skills more than a revival in support for the old constitution and defence of the empire?

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

- 2 'In its domestic policies, the Gladstone government of 1868–74 demonstrated clear adherence to liberal principles.' How far do you agree with this judgment? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Gladstone's political ideas in the period 1867–86. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus requires an understanding both of what 'liberal principles' were and also the extent to which Gladstone's government followed those principles. Candidates may identify the following 'liberal' principles: concern for reform, especially administrative reform, in the cause of efficiency; self-help; free trade; low taxation (especially low direct taxes), increased opportunities for individual development with emphasis on free trade and lower taxation; support for individual liberties; the maintenance of government efficiency and competence. Within these broad categories, candidates will be able to pick out specifics - probably concentrating on the famous administrative reforms of 1868–74: army, civil service, public health and education reforms; support for individual liberties including legal recognition of the rights of trade unionists in 1871 and, although hedged about, increasing the number of citizens entitled to vote; free trade was an established article of faith which Gladstone took over from Peel but it was linked to low taxation in an overall policy of 'peace, retrenchment and reform'. Candidates may know that the 1871 budget costs represented only 10% of Gross National Product, most of that going on the armed services. Gladstone also fought the 1874 election, unsuccessfully, on a programme of abolishing income tax, remembering that Peel had introduced it in peacetime only to bring down a damaging government deficit which no longer existed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the extent to which the government followed liberal principles. They might wish to argue that the policies outlined above owe more to Gladstone's own ideas and the forcefulness with which he followed them. He offered a broadly reformist agenda and pushed those ideas through Cabinet. Some good candidates might wish to argue that the policies of this government owe much to Gladstone's desire to maintain party unity in the face of increasingly divergent paths taken by the aristocratic Whig wing of the party and the radical liberals, whose agenda tended to be both nonconformist-driven and predominantly urban. This led, they might think, to some messy compromises (education, not least) and to some policies which worked poorly (army reforms, perhaps). Some might argue that liberal policies were little more than a reassertion of a dominant, and cross-party, 'Victorian ethic' already in place by 1867. Some might argue that Gladstone's interpretation of the modernising agenda could be seen as challenging the continued pre-eminence of the Whig element within the Liberal party, ironically. This can be seen as an irony because Gladstone professed himself attracted to the 'aristocratic ideal' and was usually much more comfortable in the company of the well-heeled than he was with radical nonconformists who were, in his view, were inclined to push too hard and to risk the stability necessary for his retrenchment and reform agenda. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. Here, some candidates may be aware of recent debates about the nature of Gladstonian Liberalism and the extent to which it was actually a system of ideas or little more than a cloak to cover Gladstone's driving ambition and his determination to pursue 'issues' irrespective of their political expediency. The debates on Gladstone's alleged hypocrisy and also on his reputation as a 'moderniser' continue to rage. Candidates might also note Jonathan Parry's view that the Education Act of 1870 was both one of the most expensive pieces of social legislation in Victorian Britain and gave a considerable impetus to local government.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

3 Explain why the question of Irish home rule exerted such an influence on British domestic politics in the years 1873–86. [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Irish problems and of British attempts to deal with these. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus is on the increasing influence of Irish politicians on British domestic politics in the selected chronological period. Material on the situation in Ireland is acceptable but it needs close linkage to the arguments deployed by politicians in the UK, both at Westminster and more widely. Similarly, material relating to the period 1867–74 (the so-called Fenian Outrages etc.) can be made relevant, perhaps by suggesting that it 'raised consciousness' about Irish matters among British politicians. The key issues on which candidates are likely to concentrate include: the legacy failure of Gladstone's mission to 'pacify Ireland' through land and church reform; the foundation and impact of the Home Rule League (1873); the roles of Butt and Parnell; the Irish Land League (1879) and the role of Michael Davitt; the policy of 'Boycotting'; Coercion Act (1881); Land Act (1881); Kilmainham Treaty (1882) as an attempt to end violence in Ireland; The Phoenix Park Murders (1882); the impact of the Reform and Redistribution Acts (1884–5); Gladstone's commitment to Home Rule and its short-term impact (1885–6). Candidates might use this, and similar, evidence to show how Ireland played a central role in UK politics and that a number of attempts to deal with the concerns of nationalists, and others, were made.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about cause: in this case the reasons why the Irish question figured so largely on the agenda of British governments at this time. Key reasons which candidates are likely to identify, and perhaps adjudicate between, will include the following: British politicians found Irish 'problems' intrinsically difficult to solve – at least in ways acceptable both to a majority in Ireland and also in the rest of the UK; the intrinsic difficulty of addressing separate issues (security of tenancies, education, pressure for much greater autonomy etc.) since they were so often linked in both the minds and presentations of key Irish figures; the potent, and for many toxic, long-term legacy of the Irish Famine, used by nationalists to demonstrate that, more than 30 years on, the British were fundamentally unsympathetic to even the most devastating of Irish problems; the radicalism of calls for self-government after 1873 changes the focus of debate; The difficulties presented to UK governments by the large number of Irish MPs and their increasing support for Home Rule; the increasing threats presented by Irish nationalism after 1873; Irish nationalists' emergence as a significant independent force at Westminster, rather than a small, and sometimes deferential, minority within a previously dominant Liberal coalition. In 1874, Nationalists won 58 seats; in 1880 65 seats, and in 1885, after redistribution, 86 of the 101 Irish seats. Thus, while political opinion within Ireland was overwhelmingly in favour of nationalist solutions, Nationalist MPs at Westminster could deny both Liberals and Conservatives a majority and could use their political powers directly. The impact of the Home Rule and Land League made the Irish question more critical and also polarised it. Polarisation in Britain also kept the issue high on the political agenda. Conservatives were closer to the Protestant elites who were mostly fiercely resistant to any form of self-government, let alone ending the Union. Liberals were split between a minority who saw Home Rule as a logical extension of liberal foreign policy in support of nations 'struggle to be free' and a majority which saw no need for Home Rule and who anyway wished to meet force with force in response to violence. Candidates may ask how far Westminster initiatives (whether 'liberal', as in moves towards devolution, or 'repressive' as with the Coercion Act) increased attention paid to Ireland. They divided the Liberal party and provoked a strongly-articulated 'unionist' stance by many Conservatives. Some may argue that Irish policies of 'boycotting' and 'filibustering' produced intransigence at Westminster. It is difficult to deny that parliament was being prevented from

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

acting as an efficient legislature while Irish issues remained unresolved. The Phoenix Park murders strengthened opinion – coercion was the only response. Some candidates might argue that, at the end of the period in question, Gladstone was almost personally responsible for the attention given to Ireland. He was the first major British politician to think: radically about 'solutions' which went beyond religious change, land redistribution and Catholic tenants' rights. Candidates may argue that he turned Ireland into an obsession. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of debates about Gladstone's personal commitment to 'the Irish question' and to arguments about the relative importance of the various factors keeping Ireland at the forefront of political debate. Was Ireland so important because of perceptions in Westminster about the depth of Irish problems and the most effective ways to tackle them? Or were the leadership, tactics of, and clear majority support for, Irish nationalist leaders, more important?

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2011	9769	5h

4 How different were imperial policies of the governments of Disraeli and Gladstone in the years 1874–85? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge about the imperial policies followed by the Disraeli and Gladstone governments. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus requires the making of a historical judgement on the extent of difference between the two administrations. Candidates should be aware of the importance of imperial policy to Disraeli's agenda in 1874–80: the immense importance of India; and the purchase of the Suez Canal shares as a means of consolidating the centrality of India in commercial policy and of increasing Britain's influence in the growing middle East trade; the use of the Empire as a means of combating the Russian expansionist threat in South-East Europe; the acquisition of Cyprus in 1878 as part of the resolution of the Eastern Question; the annexation of Transvaal (1877) and Walvis Bay (1878); the Zulu War (1878–9) and early setbacks before victory at the Battle of Ulundi; the Second Afghan War (1878–80) and recognition of the independence of Afghanistan; the role of the British Empire in Disraeli's propaganda; the Royal Titles Act (1876) giving Victoria an imperial title; Disraeli's assertion that defence of its Empire is central to Britain's role and standing in the world. Key imperial elements in the Gladstone government of 1880–85 were: the First Boer War (1880–81); Madhi revolt in Sudan and its outcome (1881–5): defeats of Hicks and Gordon; the Egyptian War (1882) and, in effect, Britain's takeover of the country; Berlin Conference (1884) and emergence of plans to partition Africa among European nations; extent of imperial acquisitions during the Gladstone government.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the extent to which Disraeli's and Gladstone's imperial policies were different. The judgements reached should refer to imperial policies as such, although some good candidates might wish to argue that foreign and imperial policies were, in strategic terms, closely linked – not least in respect of South-East Europe and the Middle East. The acquisition of Cyprus gave Britain a substantially increased presence in the Mediterranean. Many candidates may argue that Disraeli's policies were motivated by a much stronger ideological appetite for imperial expansion than were Gladstone's. On the other hand, and despite the rhetoric on both sides of the political fence, Gladstone seemed as anxious as Disraeli both defend Britain's existing empire and to expand it in the face of competition from other European nations, particularly Germany and France. Though not the main focus of answers, it is permissible for candidates to discuss differences in the relative success of the Disraeli and Gladstone policies. Both had successes and failures, although Gladstone's 'failure' in the Sudan attracted more long-term obloquy in Britain than Disraeli's in Afghanistan. It is also possible to debate similarities and differences in the impact of the two prime ministers' policies. Imperial policy, it might be argued, engendered instability and conflict in South Africa, Afghanistan and the Sudan. On extent of difference' also, candidates might debate how far the imperial motivations of Disraeli and Gladstone differed. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware that some historians have questioned whether Disraeli's commitment to the Empire was not as strong as the rhetoric suggests, being made for more than the benefit of domestic politics. Similarly, Gladstone's concern for the health of trade may have led him into a more active imperial policy than is usually suggested.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effective of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.