

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/58**

Paper 5 (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 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

### **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.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

## **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.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

### 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.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

### **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.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

### **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 2012	9769	58

- 1 (a) To what extent, and why, does the impression given in Document B of the Turkish presence in Bulgaria differ from that given in Document A? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and candidates should show awareness of the grounds on which *The Times* (Document B) attacks Gladstone (Document A) to indicate differences of perception about the Turkish presence in Bulgaria. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents, rather than by separate treatment. Candidates should offer clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other and/or differ, and also suggest reasons as to how, and why, these similarities and/or differences exist. 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. Document A makes Gladstone's views implacably clear. Candidates should be able to conclude that Gladstone is making an unequivocal attack on Turkish policy and that he does not see a legitimate presence for Turkey in Bulgaria. Candidates might note that his attack is in wildly intemperate language, especially for a politician: 'extinction of... executive power', 'bag and baggage', civilisation 'affronted and shamed' and the like. Thus, *The Times* (Document B) can attack both the substance and the style of Gladstone's argument. It takes on the totality of Gladstone's attack, suggesting that he is traducing not only the whole of the Turkish Empire but Islamic civilisation as a whole. The newspaper implies that this is both an unwise and a dangerous move, since Mohammedanism 'implies no slight force in human history' etc. On 'To what extent', candidates are likely to argue 'fully'. The views offered on the Turks seem diametrically opposed. Both agree that the Turks are maintaining a significant presence in Bulgaria but, beyond that, virtually everything seems to stress difference. The newspaper points out that Gladstone's argument is exaggerated. The tone of the newspaper's response is measured and not, apparently, exaggerated. It stresses the long-lasting force of Mohammedanism and implies that its cultural heritage is significant. The intention is to undermine the forceful language which Gladstone presents. On 'Why', candidates can note Gladstone's strong hostility to the Turkish presence and should infer his strong support for 'Christian' methods which are implied to be so much more civilised than those of the 'Mohammedan' Turks. They might note that Pamphlets such as this were often used as the vehicle by which polemical literature was launched. They can also use contextual knowledge to flesh out Gladstone's Christian principles and also, perhaps, a domestic political agenda in which Gladstone was trying to outflank the government by this intervention. *The Times*, candidates should know and can certainly infer from the argument in Document B, was a long-standing opponent of both Gladstone and most Liberal causes. The paper was probably exaggerating Gladstone's case to suit its own political ends. As some may note, Gladstone calls here just for the Turks to get out of Bulgaria, not for the end of 'Mohammedanism' as a whole. They could use contextual geographical knowledge to add another reason for Gladstone's intervention about the Turkish presence. His concern seems to be for the domination of Christianity in Europe, not in Asia.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	58

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by these documents for the view that the government's policy over the 'Eastern Question' in the later 1870s was in Britain's best interests? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–D). [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 on whether the British government's policies over the Eastern Question were in Britain's best interests. From contextual knowledge, candidates should be aware of the key elements relating to the Eastern Question and of the heated debates to which it gave rise, some of which are directly represented in the selected documents. Attention is likely to be given to the divergent priorities which British statesmen had in respect of the Eastern Question. Expect comment on Britain's overall objectives in the Mediterranean, including both the safeguarding of trade routes to India (especially, where there is an obvious imperial dimension too) and to maintaining a balance of power in the Balkans which would prevent Russian expansionism in the area. These were key areas of debate concerning British interests. Candidates should also understand how, and why, South-East Europe had become a volatile region, why Britain's interests were perceived to be affected by developments there and why Disraeli seems to have been prepared to risk another war with Russia. The religious issue – Christianity and Islam – was also frequently brought to the forefront. Candidates should know that, broadly speaking, the Liberals were more pacific than the Conservatives. They might also note that one of Disraeli's long-standing criticisms of Gladstone was his insufficiently robust response to challenges in foreign policy. Good candidates will also be aware that the Eastern Question was divisive within the two main political parties as well as across them. There was much criticism of Gladstone's intervention from within the Liberal party, and especially by those who suspected ulterior political motives and ambitions. On the Conservative side, candidates should know that Derby resigned as Foreign Secretary in 1878, believing that Disraeli's policies were not in the nation's interests and, indeed, risked wholesale war. Good candidates should use contextual knowledge broadly along these lines and will link it confidently and appositely with the evidence they find in the sources. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Here, Document A makes a clear statement about the religious question and the use of extreme language is itself indication of the divisiveness of the question. Candidates can make use of Document C to show how the issue is controversial, and that Disraeli himself notes the risk of war if opponents of the Turks (like Gladstone) go much further than the government was doing in asserting the rights of Christian subjects in a region controlled by a Muslim power. Disraeli asserts here that he was attempting to reach a settlement by diplomacy. This can cross-refer to Gladstone's moralistic statements in Document A. Document D derives from the period immediately after the resolution of the Eastern crisis by the Treaty of Berlin and it can be mined for evidence of Disraeli's apparent belief that this settlement suited British interests well, because Britain had reached an accommodation with Russia and also because the preservation of peace should provide the conditions under which British trading and commercial wealth could be advanced. Some might even know of the music hall song 'We don't want to fight, but, by jingo, if we do ...' and the much more defensive satire ending 'and the Russians can have Constantinople' which it provoked. Similarly, Document D refers directly to 'those who are our critics' even of a settlement at Berlin which Disraeli holds to be reasonable and to 'open a new continent to the civilisation of Europe'. He then attempts to attack Gladstone's position on the Settlement, which can be cross-referred to his earlier position of 1876, as reflected by *The Times* in Document B. Candidates should identify those areas relating to the controversy, especially over 'Britain's best interests'. It is relevant to mention, for example,



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

that the documents say little or nothing about divisions *within* the two political parties over the British interests which were at stake in the Eastern Question. It could also be argued both that relatively little is said about the Conservative position on Christianity v 'Mohammedanism' and also that the documents are somewhat stronger on the earlier phase of the 'Eastern Question' as it developed during Disraeli's premiership than they are in discussing the extent to which the Treaty of Berlin was in British interests.

Expect candidates to make at least some comment on the usefulness of the documents in making an overall evaluation on 'convincing'. In particular, they might wish to note that both Documents C and D derive from partisan political speeches. Good candidates might detect a whiff of self-indulgent triumphalism from Disraeli as he addressed known supporters in Document D, and also the opportunity which his speech in Aylesbury gave (Document C) to explain and defend government policy. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. Here, candidates may concentrate on writing by Shannon and others about Disraeli, and also about recent work which discusses the 'moralism' of Gladstone's foreign policy statements and the extent to which the Bulgarian Atrocities was merely a convenient excuse to return to the political fold.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

## **2 Why did the Conservatives lose the general election of 1868 so comprehensively? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the issues and the outcome of the general election of 1868. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus requires an explanation not just of the Liberals' victory but, more specifically, of why the Conservatives were so roundly beaten and the selected knowledge should illuminate that issue. Candidates should know about the scale of the Conservative defeat. Gladstone's Liberals won more than a hundred seats more than Disraeli's Conservatives. The result is normally rendered as Liberals 382 and Conservatives 276. The Liberals won more than 60% of the popular vote. The outcome, though the balance had swung more to the Liberals, was not markedly different from that of 1865. A few candidates may know that the Conservatives lost about 20 seats, while the Liberals gained about 20. Candidates should also have knowledge of where the main political parties were relatively strong and where relatively weak, both across the nations of the UK and also in different types of constituency. Thus, they should have knowledge about the Liberals' relative strength in Scotland, Ireland and in most industrial areas, whereas the Conservative strength was concentrated in England and, especially, in rural areas and the smaller towns. Some candidates might also like to point up some contrasts in sectarian support for the two parties, with much more nonconformist support going to the Liberals.

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 causes of the Conservative electoral defeat of 1868, and particularly the reasons why that defeat was so comprehensive. Candidates should realise that their predominant analytical focus needs to be on causal factors. The main causes likely to be adduced include: Liberals as the 'natural' governing party since 1846; the electorate returning to its 'usual' home; strength of the Liberals in many urban constituencies; perceptions of Gladstone as a strong leader; image of the Liberals as a party in favour of free trade, peace and prosperity; as Britain's industrial revolution became consolidated more voters were concentrated in constituencies which became more numerous as a result of the electoral changes of 1867–68 and where, in normal circumstances, the Liberals would be expected to do well. By contrast, and despite Disraeli's attempts to change it, the Conservatives were often seen as the party which instinctively reacted against change; their strength was in relatively small constituencies. Strong candidates must make some comment on the scale of Disraeli's defeat: 'so comprehensively' as in the question. They may also argue that the 1868 election, though carried out under the new franchise, came too soon for the full implications of the changes to have worked through the system. In particular, there had been no massive expansion of electoral organisation and new techniques of 'guidance and persuasion' were being trialled in constituencies. Thus, any anticipated 'pro-reform bounce' for the Conservatives was likely to prove premature as early as December 1868. Some candidates may wish to make a minor challenge to the assumptions in the question. Relevant to point out that, though the Conservatives lost decisively, they did relatively well in Lancashire (including the defeat of Gladstone there) and in parts of London. Candidates may wish to use this to demonstrate the electoral force of sectarian division and, especially, of anti-Catholicism in areas of relatively recent Catholic migration. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. Here, some candidates may be aware of debates about the electoral appeal of Liberalism and on Disraeli's expectations in 1868. They might also know about the increasing influence of Irish issues in several constituencies.

AO3 [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	58

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.

**3 “Disraelian” conservatism represented a coherent body of ideas.’ Discuss with reference to Conservative domestic policy in the years 1867–80. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Disraeli’s political ideas both as prime minister and as leader of the opposition. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus requires students to reflect on ‘Disraelian conservatism’ in the context of domestic policy and to reach a judgement about the extent to which it represented a coherent body of ideas. It is important here that candidates follow the chronology and include material on Disraeli as leader of the opposition (1868–74) as well as prime minister. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of key issues related to Conservatism: support for the established church; support for landed society, and especially perhaps for the ‘squirearchy’ by the 1870s; support for free trade. Within this broad, and pretty constant, framework, candidates should know about the distinctive Disraeli contribution: the potency of his attacks on the Liberals as ‘exhausted volcanoes’; his attempt to capture the support of the newly enfranchised, especially the working classes in urban areas; the ‘social’ initiatives related to Artisans’ Dwellings, Public Health, Sale of Food and Drugs Act, Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act etc.; his use of imperialism (Royal Titles Act etc). Although imperialism and an ‘active’ foreign policy should not receive detailed attention, (and, since the question concerns domestic policy, may well be ignored by most candidates) it is legitimate to refer to expressions of patriotism and clear, proud statements of national identity as part of Disraeli’s domestic vote-winning strategy. Candidates might argue that Disraelian conservatism was primarily about making the Conservatives the natural party of government after a long period on the sidelines of power.

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 specific focus requires candidates to reach a judgement about the coherence of Disraeli’s political ideas. Candidates should all attempt to make a judgment about what represents a coherent set of ideas, though the less able are likely to concentrate on an adumbration of policies with some assertive comments on how well they linked together. Some candidates will argue that, if the prime purpose of Disraeli’s policies was to win and then retain the loyalty of the new voters, then there was some merit in a ‘bread and circuses’ policy, backed up by a much more professional party organisation, which perhaps emphasised image over reality. Candidates might also say that facilitating a much more professional organisation from the early 1870s (albeit with detailed outworking in the hands of others) helped to push a basically populist message home and thus the policies deserved to be considered coherent, at least at the level of overall strategy rather than detailed tactics.

Those who are less charitable on overall coherence might argue that many of Disraeli’s domestic policies were fairly blatant window-dressing (allowing peaceful picketing while leaving the legal deck strongly stacked against trade union action; giving local authorities powers to address the problems of slum housing which they were under no compunction to use and, given the cost, generally did not) and not, in themselves, coherent. There was criticism of Disraeli’s policies from within his own cabinet, not least from R. A. Cross who bemoaned the fact that there was no detail, merely ‘headlines’, in most of the ideas which came onto his desk. As policies, candidates

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

might wish to argue, they were not inherently coherent. If, however, the main purpose was to win elections, then the overall objective might be seen as coherent – not that they seem to have won Disraeli many votes when the next general election came around in 1880. As ever, the line taken does not matter, so long as the argument is itself developed and coherent and also depends on appropriate selection of evidence. Attempts to deal with historiography and of differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, some candidates may be aware of debates about Disraeli's overall objectives and might wish to follow Paul Smith's line about the essential cynicism of the prime minister's approach. Others could make use of the high place which Disraeli still holds in the pantheon of Tory leaders and look to evidence both from the years in opposition as well as in government to explain why he is so highly regarded by Blake and others.

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 effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2012	9769	58

**4 To what extent were the changes to the electoral system made in 1883–85 responsible for the upturn in Conservative fortunes in 1885–6? [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge about the changes to the electoral system in the years specified and also of the apparently increased popularity of the Conservative party in the final years covered by this Special Subject. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Here the focus requires the making of a historical judgement on the extent to which one factor (electoral change) had an impact on Conservative fortunes. The key pieces of legislation which candidates should know about are: the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act (1883) which limited expenses and made candidates and agents accountable for what was spent; the Third Reform Act (1884) with its uniform franchise, doing away with differences between county and borough qualifications to vote; the Redistribution Act (1885) which disfranchised 159 parliamentary seats, created 175 new ones, established the principle of single-member constituencies and made a reasonable attempt in the direction of the Chartists' 'equal electoral districts'. Candidates should be aware that the question asks about the relative importance of electoral factors. Others factors explaining the upturn in Conservative fortunes, which candidates might wish to cite, are: Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule and the consequential ructions within, and eventual split of, the Liberal Party; the strength of the Irish Nationalists, which made a Liberal majority difficult to sustain; the evidence that Salisbury could head a minority government competently (1885–86); Conservative party reorganisations (though these were deeply divisive in the period of Churchill's 'Fourth Party'); the work of the Primrose League; the effectiveness of the leadership of Salisbury and, in the Commons, Stafford Northcote.

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 the factors which helped the Conservatives to emerge from the major changes of 1883–85 as the dominant political party from 1886. Specifically, they should weigh the selected factor (franchise extensions and other electoral changes) against others on reaching an overall judgement. Candidates may argue that electoral changes were substantial and that the Conservatives emerged from a period of change as the real beneficiaries. The abolition of dual-member constituencies made life difficult for the Liberals, and particularly for the landed, Whig, element which found party selection difficult. Liberals appeared less 'aristocratic' and perhaps more sectarian (urban, nonconformist) than before. This, they could argue, helped the Conservatives to present themselves as a truly 'national' party. They might also argue that Salisbury proved more fleet-footed than his Liberal opponents in exploiting the tactical opportunities contingent on electoral change. The Conservatives would have expected to gain additional benefit from the increased numbers of voters in rural areas (though not in those rural seats where mine-workers formed an important element in the electorate). The Corrupt Practices Act substantially reduced opportunities to 'buy' votes, thus giving a greater premium for above-board efficiency in party organisation. The Conservatives had paid considerable attention to sharpening organisation in the wake of the 1880 election defeat. All of these are significant issues.

There is, of course, much to be said on the other side of the case. The evidence that Ireland lost the Liberals office is overwhelming, not least because they were as split in 1886 as the Conservatives had been in 1846. It is relevant to mention (and strong candidates might well make much of this) that the Liberals retained a healthy (if reduced) majority over the Conservatives in the 1885 election. It was the voting power of the Irish nationalists which caused Gladstone's defeat on an increase in beer and spirits duties (an issue on which the brewer-supported Conservatives were rock-solid!) and his resignation. Salisbury used the opportunity to show that the post-Disraeli Conservatives without a majority could pursue what the electorate might consider

<b>Page 14</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2012</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>58</b>

sensible policies. He only achieved a working Tory majority, however, after Gladstone flew his famous Hawarden kite, and the consequential split of almost 80 'Liberal Unionists' from a Liberal party which had already lost much support from an electorate which, as a whole, was far less keen on Home Rule than Gladstone had become. Most candidates will probably wish to argue that Irish events were more important in re-establishing the Conservatives in office than recent electoral changes had been. However, there is plenty to be said about the structural problems which those changes presented to a party perhaps overly in thrall to Gladstone's 'old man in a hurry' obsessions. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses, as will an ability to engage with controversy. In this question, some candidates may be aware that historians have tended to make rather more of the detailed implications of the franchise changes than used to be the case and that an explanation which is grounded exclusively (or even disproportionately on one issue – Ireland) is deficient.

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 effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgments concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.