



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2011**

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

[AH111]

FRIDAY 3 JUNE, AFTERNOON

MARK SCHEME

Level of response mark grid

This level of response grid has been developed as a general basis for marking candidates' work, according to the following assessment objectives:

AO1a recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner;

AO1b present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements;

AO2 In relation to historical context:

- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;
- explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

The grid should be used in conjunction with the information on indicative content outlined for each assessment unit.

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	paraphrase sources or rely on direct quotation when commenting. There may be some attempt to evaluate the sources without adequate analysis of context and limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	combine paraphrasing with partial interpretation of sources and offer some additional comment on their significance. There will be some ability to compare sources and an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the questions in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	display accurate comprehension of sources and/or the interpretation they contain and assess their utility, supported by contextual reference, e.g. author and date. There will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	display complete understanding of content and context of sources, e.g. author's viewpoint motive, intended audience, etc. and be able to comment on points of similarity and difference. There will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

Option 1: England 1520–1570

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Explain the role played by the Duke of Somerset in the Edwardian religious reforms.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically make some vague, unsupported assertions about the Edwardian religious reforms with little emphasis placed on the role of Somerset. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and start to explain in general terms the role Somerset played in the Edwardian religious reforms. They may mention that, as Edward was a devout Protestant, he wished to pursue a Protestant religious policy. Somerset, as Protector, also wished to follow this. Answers may mention the first Edwardian Prayer Book which was made law through the Act of Uniformity. They may also make reference to services in English and priests being allowed to marry. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors about the role played by Somerset. They will look at the specific policies initiated by Somerset such as the first Edwardian Prayer Book and priests being able to marry. They may mention that in terms of doctrine little changed, little was said about transubstantiation and the sacraments. Somerset may have altered the appearance of the Church but, in terms of the Bible's teachings, very

little changed. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the specific role played by Somerset and not just the Edwardian religious reforms. They will assess Somerset's personal religious outlook and his commitment to Protestantism. They may also mention his desire to maintain the support of all political groups within England and how this limited his role in the Reformation. They will look at what he achieved but also the limitations of his role. In terms of the doctrine of the English Church, very little was achieved. There was no clarification regarding purgatory or saints, transubstantiation still remained. In the long term Somerset's role in the Edwardian religious reforms was limited. His policies increased hostility and helped to lead to the 1549 rebellions. It was his successor, Northumberland, who achieved a Protestant Reformation. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- (b) Explain the causes of the rebellion of the Northern Earls in 1569.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically make some remarks about the rebellion of the Northern Earls with little mention of its causes. They may be characterised by generalisations and poor understanding, giving little more than a narrative account of the rebellion. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about some of the reasons why the rebellion occurred.

Answers may mention the religious causes of the rebellion. Some of Elizabeth's Roman Catholic citizens were unhappy about the religious settlement and the question of succession. They wished to force Elizabeth to accept Mary Stuart as heir to the English throne. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing may be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little use of specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors. For example, the Rebellion of the Northern Earls' aim was to force Elizabeth I to accept Mary, Queen of Scots as heir. It was also a political rebellion as the leaders were from the ruling class, they were concerned about their power in the North. In terms of religion, it could be said that some were unhappy about the new Church settlement and had support from Spain. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss and understand the complexity of multi-causal reasons for the rebellion. Answers at this level will cover the religious and political reasons for the rebellion. Some Catholic subjects were unhappy about the Elizabethan Church Settlement but this was not the only reason for the rebellion. Answers will focus on the political causes of the rebellion and highlight the significance of this. Politically, the Earls of the North were unhappy about Elizabeth's interference in the governing of the North. They feared further intervention and curtailment of their power and influence. Responses should mention the leadership of the rebellion and the way the Earls attempted to exploit fear and rumour to secure their own position in the new regime. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the causes of the dissolution of the monasteries in the period 1536–1540?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of the historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, this is an extract from Richard Layton in 1535. It highlights some of the corruption and immoral behaviour within the monasteries. It mentions the use of relics and that the Holy Father had fathered children and that the Pope had granted him permission to continue with immoral relationships. Answers at this level mainly deal with the content of the source and analysis is limited.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. Answers will not only discuss the content of the source well but will also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. For example, this source is useful as it is an extract from Richard Layton, who was one of Thomas Cromwell's commissioners, and therefore will be in favour of dissolving the monasteries. Its audience is the government of England and Henry VIII. Its purpose is justification for the closure of these institutions. It suggests that many of the institutions were full of corruption and immorality. It implies that the people were deceived by the use of relics and that the Pope was aware of the immoral activities in these religious Houses. This answer will deal with the content of the source and have some analysis.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. For example, it is a primary source from a Commissioner who is clearly under the orders of Thomas Cromwell. It was written in 1535 before the dissolution of the monasteries occurred but at a time when Cromwell was seeking evidence to close the monasteries. Since Henry VIII required finance from the Church, he attacked the monasteries, first the smaller institutions and then the large monasteries. This may limit its reliability as Layton will want to protect his position and secure favour with Cromwell. Therefore, he

may report what Cromwell wishes to be reported. By 1535 Henry has broken from the Roman Catholic Church and achieved his divorce. However, he faced financial difficulties and Cromwell seized on the potential of the monasteries. Anti-clericalism and anti-papalism existed, though we are unsure about the extent of this. Cromwell used this to fuel an attack on religious Houses. It gives an imbalanced account of life in religious institutions; many were moral houses which helped the poor in society. Cromwell conducted visitations of the monasteries but gave strict instructions to those carrying out the inspections to produce negative reports about the conduct of these religious Houses. The purpose of this source is to justify the closure of many religious Houses. Answers at this level must refer to content, analysis and limitations of the source in detail. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources **and** your own knowledge assess to what extent religion was responsible for the dissolution of the monasteries during Henry VIII's reign.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and, the candidate's ability as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b), ([0]–[2]) AO2(b)

AO1(b):

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, it may be an account of the dissolution of the monasteries but fail to focus on the question. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the question as to the extent to which religion was responsible for the dissolution of the monasteries.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2(a), ([4]–[6]) AO1(b), ([3]–[5]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a partial account of the role religion played in the dissolution of the monasteries but there will be no mention of other factors. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, Source 1 highlights the religious causes of dissolution of the monasteries as they were institutions full of immorality. Source 2 mentions that some monasteries were in good condition. Source 3 comments on the success of the monasteries and how they were popular and in good condition.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations. For example, they may mention the view that religion was the main driving force behind the dissolution of the monasteries. They will have frequent lapses in meaning due to illegibility, inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there will be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2(a), ([7]–[9]) AO1(b), ([6]–[8]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may focus on the religious factors which contributed to the dissolution of the monasteries. For example, some monasteries had lapsed into a state of immorality. Some monks and nuns were behaving inappropriately. They were providing little comfort for the people. However, responses may also mention other factors which contributed to the dissolution. Henry wanted a complete break from Rome and feared that any connection with Rome would be a political threat to his rule. He wished to strengthen his political power. More importantly, Henry, under the influence of Cromwell, saw the financial gains to be made from dissolving the monasteries. By 1536 Henry needed money and dissolving the monasteries would provide him with this. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation. Source 1 highlights the religious justification for dissolving some religious houses. It implies that those in charge of these houses were conducting inappropriate relationships. It also implies that the Pope was not only aware of this but supported it. Source 2 presents a different opinion of the monasteries. It comments on the Abbot's and monks' behaviour at the monastery at Ramsey. It mentions how Godly the inhabitants are. It recommends that these monasteries should not be closed down. However, since this source was written to appeal to Cromwell not to close the monasteries down it might not present an accurate picture. Source 3 is from a revisionist historian who suggests that religion was not the main cause for the dissolution of the monasteries. Financial motivation must be taken into consideration.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, they may comment how at the time contemporaries believed that Henry was fully justified in closing the monasteries down. They may mention revisionist historians who believe that religion was not the only factor which contributed to the dissolution. Henry was motivated by financial gain. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times the style of the writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2(a), ([10]–[12]) AO1(b), ([9]–[11]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which the dissolution of the monasteries was due to religious causes. Answers may question Henry's motivation and the role played by Cromwell. They may mention the investigation of the monasteries and the purpose of this. They may also mention contributing factors which would lead Henry to seek money at this time. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Answers will interpret the sources with complete understanding and use them with contextual knowledge to provide a comprehensive assessment. For example, Source 1 was evidence which provided Henry and Cromwell with justification to close down monasteries. It was produced due to the investigation of the monasteries. However, this was the work of Cromwell who wished to close down the monasteries for financial gain. Contextual information would suggest that most monasteries were providing a useful service. Source 2 suggests this. It is written by a commissioner who was investigating the monasteries. It is written to Cromwell and is recommending that the houses he has investigated should not be closed down. Source 3 is a modern interpretation of the dissolution of the monasteries. It highlights how significant a role finance played in the dissolutions. It implies that religious motivation was not the ultimate reason why the monasteries were closed down. It also implies that the dissolution was the work of Cromwell.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may elaborate upon some of the points mentioned in Level 3 and include other interpretations. They may mention how recent research has questioned the role of religion. They will display a good awareness of the nature of the historical debate and how different schools lay emphasis upon financial and political factors rather than religious motivation for the dissolution. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 1

48

60

Option 2: England 1603–1649

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Explain how James I's policy towards Spain developed between 1603 and 1625.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically note some of James I's policies towards Spain. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. The meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the policies James pursued. The attempt to arrange a marriage with the Spanish Infanta for his son, Charles, or the improved position of the Spanish ambassador at court may be explored. The answers will have some supporting evidence. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to give a balanced, substantiated understanding of how James I's policy towards Spain developed during his reign. In 1604 James ended the Elizabethan war with Spain by signing the Treaty of London. James tended to pursue a balanced approach to foreign policy and from as early as 1614 James was seeking a Spanish match for his son as a counterweight for his connection with the Protestant Alliance and his daughter's marriage. Despite the opposition this link with Catholic Spain created, James, encouraged by the influential Howard family, made it a central issue in his foreign policy. It was through these

negotiations that the Spanish envoy Count Gondomar came to enjoy a close relationship with James and a prominent position at court. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the developments in James I's policy towards Spain in the period 1603–1625. James regarded himself as “rex pacificus” and sought to keep England at peace and avoid a major European war. His policies towards Spain were heavily influenced by these dual aims. The pursuit of the Spanish Infanta for his son had been heavily criticised at home, especially after the outbreak of religious war in Europe in 1618 when James's own son-in-law, in the Palatinate, had been attacked by Spain. Even then, James continued to pursue a diplomatic solution by the increasingly unlikely Spanish match. Ultimately his hope of securing a Spanish bride for his son, Charles, was to end in disaster after the humiliating trip to Madrid. Although James continued to resist a general war with the Spanish, an alliance of Charles, Buckingham and Parliament pressurised him into action. James had succeeded in remaining at peace throughout his reign. However, by 1625 England was on the brink of another war with the Spanish. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

- (b) Explain the impact of Charles I's religious policy during his period of Personal Rule (1629–1640). [12]

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically note some vague points about the impact of Charles I's religious policy in the period. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. The meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation

or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide coherent information about some of the ways that Charles I's religious policies impacted on his nation. The role of Archbishop Laud and his pursuit of the "beauty of holiness" may be explained. The answers will have some supporting evidence. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to give a balanced, substantiated understanding of the impact of Charles I's religious policy. Laud set out to restore an Arminian, ceremonial style of worship. He reintroduced the need for dignity and decency in services and restored the altar to the east of the church, having it railed off. He also sought to raise the quality and status of the clergy. He levied taxes, to pay for the reforms, which proved extremely unpopular. Laud was determined to impose uniformity in church, practice and suppressed unlicensed preaching. His actions were controversial in England and were to provoke open rebellion in Scotland. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the impact of Charles I's religious policy. Laud's emphasis on the sacraments, use of the sign of the cross, bowing at the name of Jesus and use of clerical vestments all met with some resistance. Clergy who refused to conform were charged by the church courts. The promotion of the clergy to positions of political influence met with considerable opposition and there was sympathy and support for men such as Burton, Bastwick and Prynne who fell foul of the church courts. Answers may note that the main opposition to Charles I's changes to the church came in Scotland in 1637. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of

writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the reasons for the growing opposition to the Duke of Buckingham in the period 1625–1629?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, Bacon argues that Buckingham was the main cause of the problems facing England at that time. For example, he is held responsible for the failings in foreign policy.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. Answers will not only discuss the content of the source well but will also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. Answers at this level may focus totally, or mainly, on its **merits as evidence** in a study of the growing opposition to the Duke of Buckingham. The source argues that the “excessive power” of Buckingham was the main reason for the “evils and dangers” facing England at that time. Bacon highlights the changes being made to religious policy, the failures in foreign policy, the decline in trade and even the poor state of the forts and castles. He argues that Buckingham has been abusing the power he holds and that the way the country is being governed is causing “alarm”. As an MP, Bacon's views may be considered representative of Parliament as he comments on the document being presented to Charles I outlining these concerns. His account suggests that opposition to Buckingham is extensive and that he is identified as the main problem in Charles I's government.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. For example, as a private letter to his wife, Bacon's account can be considered reliable as he has no reason to exaggerate

or manipulate the truth given the limited audience. His use of the term “we” and reference to the document presented to the King suggests he is speaking on behalf of his fellow MPs. However, the source is only one man’s opinion and may not be an accurate representation of the views of all MPs. The letter was written in 1626 when criticism of Buckingham was beginning to mount following the foreign policy failures in the Palatinate and at Cadiz. However, it sheds no light on the opposition to Buckingham that emerged from 1627 through to and even after his assassination in 1628. While it raises a wide range of reasons for the growing opposition to the Duke, it is of no use for understanding events and attitudes after 1626. In fact, Buckingham continued to be an object of criticism in Parliament even after his death. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the Duke of Buckingham was responsible for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles I and his Parliament between 1625 and 1629.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**; and the candidate’s ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination; analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2a, ([0]–[3]) AO1b, ([0]–[2]) AO2b

AO1(b):

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the question as to the extent to which the Duke of Buckingham was responsible for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles I and his Parliament in 1629.

AO2(b)

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of the extent to which the Duke of Buckingham was responsible for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles I and his Parliament in 1629.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2a, ([4]–[6]) AO1b, ([3]–[5]) AO2b**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a partial account of the role of Buckingham's foreign policy failures in the 1629 breakdown. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example: Source 1 suggests that Buckingham was the "main cause" of the problems in England. In Source 2 Clarendon suggests that Buckingham's rewarding of his own relatives "offended" the ruling classes of England.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of this subject.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2a, ([7]–[9]) AO1b, ([6]–[8]) AO2b**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers will provide a more complete account of the extent to which Buckingham was responsible for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles and his Parliament. The role of Buckingham will be more fully addressed, including the significance of his failed foreign expeditions. The mounting criticism of Buckingham in Parliament will be addressed. Candidates will also recognise the extent to which Charles was to blame for the escalating crisis. His use of forced loans and his collection of tonnage and poundage and ship money all contributed to opposition in the Commons. Charles only increased tensions further by imposing martial law and continuing the hugely unpopular billeting of troops. Candidates may touch upon the promotion of William Laud as another focus for criticism. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2 (a):

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation. Source 1 highlights the opposition to the changes in religious policy, foreign policy failures and concern about the very way the country was being governed. Specific reference is made to the decay in trade and decline in the state of the country's forts and castles. The responsibility for these problems is laid at the feet of Buckingham alone. Source 2 reveals that Buckingham had sole responsibility for distributing honours and offices. His tendency to favour his friends and relatives had, perhaps inevitably, provoked considerable opposition. The author recognises that Buckingham did possess an excellent character and that his advice was often wise. The source implies that opposition to the Duke was because of his control of patronage rather than his ability to counsel the king. Source 3 argues that under Charles I Buckingham became more dominant than ever before. Coward suggests that the nobility disliked Buckingham because his position as royal favourite prevented them from getting close access to the King. The source does argue, however, that Charles shares the responsibility for the failures of this period because of his attitude and actions.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of the subject. For example, contemporaries such as Bacon, in Source 1, readily identified Buckingham as the cause of the problems in government. Source 3 notes that Charles allowed Buckingham to become "more dominant than ever before" and that this led to him being "disliked" by the nobility. Coward argues that Charles I's personality was a crucial factor in creating opposition, as he was "unapproachable and uncommunicative". His foreign policy, controversial money raising methods and "support for Arminianism" all played a part in heightening the criticism of his rule.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2a, ([10]–[12]) AO1b, ([9]–[11]) AO2b**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which the Duke of Buckingham was responsible for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles I and his Parliament. Buckingham's rapid rise, more as a result of his beauty and personality than his political ability, caused considerable resentment at Court. His use of the patronage system to enrich himself and his family only increased opposition to him. While Parliament may have initially supported his foreign policies, they were alarmed at their implementation. The military failures and escalating costs made Buckingham a target for criticism in the Commons. The King's money

raising policies to fund his favourite's expeditions only served to inflame the situation further. Good candidates will examine the role Charles himself played in the breakdown, elaborating on his financial policies and their effect. The Five Knight's Case, the Petition of Right and the Protestation may all be addressed. Charles's continued collection of tonnage and poundage and promotion of Arminianism could be used to explain the increase in opposition. Good candidates will note that, although Buckingham was assassinated in 1628, a year before Parliament was dissolved, MPs continuing criticism of him even after his death contributed to the breakdown in the relationship between Charles I and his Parliament. The King was distraught at the death of his beloved favourite and angered by the celebratory reaction of many MPs. Good answers may also observe that it was opposition to the King's financial and religious policies which resulted in the issuing of the Protestation and a Parliamentary revolt. It may even be argued that MPs such as John Eliot who were willing to speak against their King, in the Commons, bear some responsibility for the breakdown in the relationship. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the inquiry using this information to inform the response. For example, Source 1 highlights the “excessive power” of Buckingham and argues that he was abusing his position. The fact that a group of MPs have gone so far as to present a document listing their grievances to the King is evidence of the opposition to the Duke even as early as 1626. It could also be argued that Charles must bear some responsibility for the ensuing crisis because he failed to respond to the concerns being expressed by his Parliament and continued to fully support his favourite. In Source 2 the author praises Buckingham for his rapid rise to power. However, by arguing that it was only down to “his beauty, gracefulness and attractive personality”, Clarendon appears to question its merit. Even the glowing appraisal of his ability to provide the King with “wise advice” only notes that he was “capable” of doing so rather than offering evidence that he actually did. Clarendon is clear in his analysis of the consequences of Buckingham's use of patronage to enrich his family, noting how it “offended the nobility of England”. Source 3 argues that the breakdown in relations between Charles and his Parliament was not solely down to Buckingham, although the Duke's closeness to the King certainly resulted in considerable problems for Charles. Coward highlights the criticism of England's involvement in war with Spain and France and Buckingham must bear considerable responsibility for Charles I's disastrous foreign policy. However, Charles was ultimately responsible for the policy of his country and his willingness to allow Buckingham a free hand means that he too was responsible for the crisis this created. His controversial financial and religious policies, and his detached attitude also contributed to the growing opposition he faced.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): There will be a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary and later interpretations of this subject. Answers may refer to contemporary opinion to illustrate the criticism of Buckingham in this period. MP’s speeches in Parliament may be used to illustrate the opposition to the Duke and his policies. Candidates may also utilise the Petition of Right or Protestation to evidence the concerns of Parliament and the implied criticisms of the King and his policies. Candidates may exploit the content of Source 3 to explain the interpretation that Charles shares the responsibility for the breakdown in his relationship with Parliament. Modern historians’ opinions may be utilised to support this interpretation or to suggest that other factors were more significant. Some support Coward’s argument that Charles relied too heavily on Buckingham. Other historians have argued that this period is most notable for the aggressive nature of Parliament which seized upon an opportunity to expand its power. Most recent historians would dispute this view, noting how moderate its requests, e.g. the Petition of Right, actually were. Answers should provide interpretations by way of appropriate comments which attempt to assess the extent to which Buckingham was responsible for the breakdown in the relationship between Charles and his Parliament.

[35]

48

Option 2

60

Option 3: England 1815–1868

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Explain why there were divisions in the Tory Party between 1827 and 1830.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically be vague about the problems facing the Tories after 1827. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and refer to some of the reasons for Tory divisions between 1827 and 1830. For example, the death of Liverpool, the role of Canning or Goderich. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing greater explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors about Tory divisions, describing some sources of division, such as Catholic Emancipation and personality clashes. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding,

explanation and analysis. Top level answers will clearly discuss the sources of Tory divisions. **Liverpool's** death saw his successor Canning split the party because of his personality, previous antipathy to Castlereagh and his endorsement of Catholic Emancipation. Goderich lacked the ability to form a cabinet after Canning's brief tenureship. Wellington's succession hastened divisions further because of his uncompromising style and contempt for the Canningites.

Emancipation was a long-standing cause of friction, contained by Liverpool's "agree to differ" approach. However, O'Connell's campaign came to a climax in 1828, and the decision of Peel and Wellington to acquiesce antagonised the powerful Tory Ultras. The latter joined with the Whigs to bring down Wellington's government following his refusal to contemplate **parliamentary reform**. There were additional tensions over the issue of to what extent, if any, the **Corn Laws** should be amended in times of economic crisis. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation, and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- (b) Explain the role played by the Anti-Corn Law League in the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate way. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically be vague and superficial about the role of the Anti-Corn Law League. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the League's activities, e.g. its use of propaganda, rallies, fund raising. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing may be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors regarding the role of the League, e.g. the importance of Cobden and Bright and some of their arguments against the Corn Laws. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate and there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will be well informed about the role of the League, e.g. **Organisation:** Free Trade Hall built in Manchester; League Council formed to co-ordinate activities.

Arguments: that repeal of the Corn Laws would lower bread prices, improve trade, increase real wages and improve international relations with new trading partners. Cobden made repeal a **humanitarian argument:** the starving would be fed, no longer denied by the selfishness of a privileged few. **Propaganda:** a journal “*The Anti-Corn Law Circular*”, with 300 people employed in the publication department and 500 in distribution. **Meetings:** the country was divided into 12 districts with paid agents whose job it was to arrange meetings and speakers. **Funds:** £50,000 in 1842, and £100,000 in 1844.

Communications: use of penny post and expanding railway network.

Elections: won 8 seats in the general election of 1841. *It may be noted that, in spite of the League’s formidable efforts, events in Ireland and Peel’s conversion to repeal were the key factors in the decision to repeal the Corn Laws in 1846.* Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar, the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate’s ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on the relevant points in the light of the question. For example, answers may reflect that the source is useful because it provides examples of unrest in England.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, the source reveals examples of the unrest that occurred in England during this period, and suggests some of the motives of those involved.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. Answers will not only discuss the content of the source well but will also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. For example, the source is written by a leading radical, whose working class background meant that he was in contact with and aware of the grievances and attitudes of the working class who agitated so much after the end of the wars with France. Moreover, writing retrospectively about the events, he was able to collate material on the unrest. His credible credentials are enhanced by the content of the source, and good answers should use their own words and appropriate extracts to illustrate this key aspect of value. Bamford describes many **locations** where unrest occurred. Moreover, he provides a clue to the **causes** of this unrest: bread prices, unemployment, mechanisation and the Corn Laws. The **geographical** spread – encompassing Devon in the South West, London, and Newcastle in the north – suggests the extent to which the working classes were disaffected. The atmosphere of 1816 is one of volatility and widespread disaffection on a grand scale.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, mode, author, motive and tone. For example, it can be argued that Bamford's very proximity to the radical/working class cause makes his assessment of the unrest questionable. While providing a detailed focus on the year 1816, Bamford's account says nothing about the years 1817, 1818, 1819 or 1820, so is therefore **limited in its range**. Moreover, **other causes** of unrest in the period are **ignored** in Bamford's retrospective account. For example, the inevitable post-war slump, which rendered unemployment to 300,000 demobilised soldiers and reduced contracts for clothing and arms manufactures to the tune of £50 million. It also led to a sharp fall in corn prices, thereby forcing farmers to reduce wages and lay off labourers. European tariffs reduced British exports, so that by 1818 nearly half of the blast furnaces in the country had closed and there was a corresponding reduction in the demand for coal. The new machinery such as the power-loom brought with it the inevitable and short-term decline in the wages of the handloom weavers.

[13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the unrest in England in the period 1815–1820 was due to economic grievances.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanations, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**; and the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination; analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b), ([0]–[2]) AO2(b)

AO1(b):

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there is reference to the existence of some economic grievances such as the price of bread and a rise in unemployment. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the causes of unrest. For example, Source 1 suggests some economic causes, while Source 2 blames government spies.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2(a), ([4]–[6]) AO1(b), ([3]–[5]) AO2(b)

AO1(b)

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]) Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a limited account of the causes of unrest in the period 1815–1820. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a)

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, Source 1 provides details of unrest in various parts of England, as well as mentioning some of the causes. Source 2 places the unrest in a different perspective, by blaming the activities of government spies.

AO2(b)

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of this subject. For example, there may be reference to the views of some members of the government or historians' opinions on the causes of the unrest.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2(a), ([7]–[9]) AO1(b), ([6]–[8]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis or judgements are developed and substantiated. It might be noted that, while there was widespread unrest, it was inspired by a mixture of motives, ranging from economic grievances to the impact of government policies, such as the introduction of the Corn Laws and the employment of spies who provoked more agitation. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the inquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, there may be contemporary opinions from supporters of Lord Liverpool's government, or from those who sympathised with the workers who were suffering in the period after the end of the war with France in 1815. Historians' interpretations could include opinions on the causes of the discontent, and the motives behind the unrest.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2(a), ([10]–[12]) AO1(b), ([9]–[11]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively.

Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide an assessment of the nature of the unrest, identifying those aspects which suggested revolution, and the extent to which economic concerns prompted agitation, as well as the impact of government policies.

Some of the unrest was partly revolutionary and political, as some groups used the economic slump to try to overthrow the existing government. The **Spenceans** were a small extremist fringe group based in London, who believed in the use of arms to transform Britain into a republic where everybody had equal rights. In 1817 a group of 200 Spenceans marched against the Tower of London. The **Pentrich** rebellion of 1817 was one of the first attempts in history to mount a wholly working-class revolt without middle class support. The aim was to capture towns in the North and then organise a revolutionary march to London. The **Cato Street** conspiracy of February 1820 was a plot by a group of Spenceans to assassinate Lord Liverpool's cabinet.

Much of the unrest was nothing more than local expressions of grievances carried out by hopeful protesters than determined revolutionaries. The popular protest of the period was essentially "**traditional**", i.e. non-political activity to redress **economic** grievances. **Luddism** was more of a rejection of new **machinery** than part of a serious political threat against the established order. **Spa Fields** and **Peterloo** were mainly **peaceful** and legal protests taken over by a tiny minority of extremists who took the law into their own hands. **The post-war economic slump accounted for most grievances**, caused by the rapid demobilisation of soldiers, the end of government contracts for war-related items regarding uniforms and weapons, as well as the impact of new machinery in the linen industry. All of these depressed the labour market and suppressed wages since jobs were at a premium.

Government policies contributed to the unrest. The **Corn Laws** of 1815 became the source of much controversy for the next thirty years. While the Laws benefited the landed interest which dominated parliament, the working and middle classes faced the consequences of artificially high bread prices. The **abolition of income tax** in 1816 increased indirect taxation on popular items such as beer and sugar, and had a disproportionate impact on the lives of the lower orders. The **use of spies**, such as Oliver, became the source of much contemporary and historiographical attention, as it was alleged that incidents such as the Pentrich Rebellion were partly attributable to the actions of *agents provocateurs*. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to

legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate, there is very good organisation and appropriate use of some specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([10–12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the inquiry and use this information to inform the response. Answers will explore the extent to which the sources support the proposition regarding the causes of unrest. **Source 1** implies an economic motivation, while the comment about the Corn Laws conveys implicit criticism of the government itself. After all, the Corn Laws were introduced by a landed-dominated parliament. There is much focus on the Corn Laws as the source of disturbance, while government repression is suggested in the manner with which the Cambridgeshire protest was dealt with. However, no explicit political agenda or demand is articulated, so economic rather than political grievances dominate this analysis. **Source 2** can be used to counter the notion that there was an economic cause of unrest. A member of the landed aristocracy, who might be expected to take fright at working class unrest, is able to detach the action of the majority of the disaffected from the spies whom he believes to be manipulating them. Oliver is blamed for virtually all the unrest: the *masses are contented*, while the *disaffected are few*. “Contented” *may be more applicable to an acceptance of existing political institutions than with economic circumstances*. **Source 3** provides a retrospective view, weighing up the motivation behind the unrest. Reference to *desperation of hunger* correlates with aspects of **Source 1**, while presenting a different opinion from Fitzwilliam on the role of spies and the level of “contentment”, bearing in mind unemployment levels and bread prices.

AO1(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject.

Contemporary opinions could be noted from leading radicals, such as Hunt or Cobbett; extracts from protesters’ petitions, or members of the government or those charged with ensuring law and order.

Later interpretations may take the form of historians’ views of the causes of unrest.

Or, more likely, candidates will suggest when/where/and why there was unrest and which incidents/responses were of particular significance during the period of unrest between 1815 and 1820.

Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [35]

Option 3

48

60

Option 4: Unification of Italy and Germany 1815–1871

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Explain Mazzini's ideas for a unified Italy in the period up to 1848.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers at this level will be inaccurate and demonstrate a superficial understanding of Giuseppe Mazzini's ideas for a unified Italy in the period up to 1848. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information on Mazzini's ideas for a unified Italy up to 1848, perhaps considering the importance of "Young Italy" which he founded in October 1831. However, there will be significant gaps and omissions. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation and/or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors. They will explore Mazzini's national aims and ideas in greater depth. The failure of the revolts in Italy in 1830–1831 convinced Mazzini that the secret societies were incapable of bringing about revolution and Italian revolutionaries would receive no help from France. In July 1831 he therefore founded "Young Italy", an organisation which promoted national aims, to be achieved through mass insurrection. For Mazzini the existence of an Italian "nation" was based on its common culture. He envisaged that the existing rulers would be deposed and Italy would become a republic

espousing the principle of equality and having a written constitution, including universal suffrage. According to Mazzini, kings had impeded the progress of Italian nationalism. Despite his support for a republic, Mazzini was willing to accept a constitutional monarchy as an interim solution. In 1831 he offered to support Charles Albert of Piedmont as King of a new unified Italy if Charles was willing to achieve Italian independence by expelling the Austrians from the Italian states. For Mazzini the Papacy was the main enemy. He wanted an end to the Pope's power and spiritual influence over the Italians and advocated a secular Italy with Rome as its capital. Despite his anticlericalism, Mazzini was a committed Christian, believing that God supported the unification of Italy and, once this had been achieved, Italy would inspire other nations to follow the same path. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers at this level will clearly discuss Mazzini's ideas for a unified Italy. He advocated that the unified Italy should include all Italian speaking states, since they had the same culture. According to Mazzini, "Italy" therefore should include the South Tyrol, Corsica and Malta. Mazzini refused to accept that states such as Sicily and Sardinia had separate cultural traditions and identities. He saw the unified Italy as a central, unitary entity and fiercely opposed those who advocated a federalist structure. Good answers may observe that, while Mazzini underlined the importance of universal suffrage, he had no time for the peasantry or urban masses. On the contrary, his vision of a unified Italy involved only educated groups such as lawyers, students and independent artisans. To sum up, Mazzini's ideas for a unified Italy involved the establishment of a unitary republic, based on liberty, democracy and universal suffrage. Only after the establishment of a republic would it be possible for Italians to enjoy freedom and self-determination. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- (b) Explain the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically make some remarks about the relationship between Cavour and Garibaldi. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about Cavour's relationship with Garibaldi, observing perhaps they had a tense relationship which deteriorated further after the spring of 1860. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little use of specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors. They will explain the key issues which led to the tense relationship between Cavour, the skilful diplomat, and Garibaldi, who achieved astonishing military successes with his army of 1087 volunteers in 1860. One issue was Piedmont's loss of Savoy and Nice to France in the Treaty of Turin in March 1860. This incensed Garibaldi, above all because he was a native of Nice. A second issue was Cavour's attempts to undermine Garibaldi's famous expedition to liberate Sicily. Cavour was unable to stop the expedition because he suspected that King Victor Emmanuel secretly supported it. However, Cavour did manage to ensure that Garibaldi did not receive the 12,000 modern rifles which had been earmarked for the expedition, obtaining instead only rusty old-fashioned flintlocks. Garibaldi was furious at the way he had been treated and never forgave Cavour. A third issue arose after the outstanding military successes of Garibaldi's volunteers. When they transferred into the Italian army, Garibaldi expected that they would all be accepted and would keep their original military rank but Cavour supported the view of War Minister General Fanti that a distinction would be made between the regulars and Garibaldi's volunteers. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers will reveal a more comprehensive explanation of relations between Cavour and Garibaldi. They may observe, for example, that Cavour dealt cleverly with Garibaldi in some respects. While the King of Piedmont-Sardinia, Charles Albert, refused Garibaldi's offer of help in 1848, Cavour wisely accepted the support of the National Society and permitted Garibaldi to bring together a group of volunteers in 1859. Garibaldi, however, was frustrated at what he saw as Cavour's unwillingness to promote nationalism for fear of conflict with France. After all, a key aspect of Cavour's foreign policy was his alliance with France and he was particularly concerned that if Garibaldi marched on Rome it might provoke a war with France since its troops were stationed there to protect the Pope. Relations between Garibaldi and Cavour reached an all time low on 18 April 1861, two months before Cavour's sudden death, when, in a parliamentary speech, Garibaldi accused Cavour of fighting a "fratricidal war". While this criticism seemed harsh and unjustified at the time, evidence later came to light that Cavour had ordered Garibaldi's men to be driven into the sea if they did not give up Naples. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying Bismarck's attitude towards France in the autumn of 1867?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. Bismarck underlines in a conversation with a British journalist that he is anxious to maintain peace with France and draws attention to the negative economic consequences for both France and Prussia of an armed conflict between the two countries.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The strength of the source lies in the fact that it is an interview with Otto von Bismarck, the then Minister-President of Prussia and future Chancellor of Germany. Bismarck's motive in giving an interview to a British journalist was to portray himself as "a man of peace" and reassure the British Government and British public opinion that Prussia's intentions were entirely peaceful in order to offset the potential danger of a Franco-British alliance against Prussia. The source is useful because, even though Bismarck stresses his personal wish to maintain peace with France, he strongly implies that German unity will come about with or without French agreement. As Bismarck put it: "France will have become accustomed to German unity" in some 10–15 years. The source is also useful because the Prussian Minister-President gives a coded message to France and the wider international community that they cannot take Prussia's desire for peace for granted. After all, Bismarck implies that, while he personally wanted peace with France, there were other influential groups in Prussian society exerting pressure on him to pursue a more aggressive policy towards its neighbour, referring to the Prussian generals who urged him to wage war on France in the spring of 1867 during the Luxembourg Crisis. He concludes by implying that, if German interests were not respected, he might come under pressure from public opinion in Prussia and the Prussian King to follow a less conciliatory policy towards France.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. Answers may draw on their contextual knowledge to observe that the date of the interview, September 1867, is also significant because it takes place against the background of Bismarck's recent humiliation of the French at the London Conference, held in May 1867 to resolve the Luxembourg Crisis. Answers will not only discuss the strengths of the source but also its limitations. The source has two important limitations. Firstly, Bismarck is widely acknowledged as the master of "spin" in nineteenth century European politics. He was ahead of his time in his ability to influence and manipulate public opinion and his political adversaries. His observations in this interview with a British journalist cannot therefore be taken at face value because they were designed for public consumption in Britain. Through the interview Bismarck hoped to persuade Britain that his intentions were peaceful in order to ward off the danger of a Franco-British alliance against Prussia. The second key limitation of the source is the author himself. Bismarck's private and especially public statements are notoriously unreliable because he frequently made statements he knew to be untrue and frequently contradicted himself. Therefore any statement

made by Bismarck should be regarded with caution unless it is supported by independent evidence. Another plausible limitation of the source is that some of the nuances of Bismarck's statements may have been lost in translation, though it should be borne in mind that he was a fluent English speaker and the interview was probably conducted in English. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Prussia was responsible for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**, and the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b), ([0]–[2]) AO2(b)

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and grammar or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources and fail to utilise the source content to address the question.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATION ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of the subject.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2(a), ([4]–[6]) AO1b, ([3]–[5]) AO2(b)

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a partial account of Bismarck's role in bringing about the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. There will be frequent lapses in meaning due to shortcomings in legibility with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, in Source 1 Bismarck maintains in 1867 that his policy towards France was entirely peaceful, Source 2 suggests that the French Government was under intense pressure from public opinion not to back down in any conflict with Prussia, while Source 3 underlines that, while Bismarck considered a war with France to be “an unavoidable necessity”, he did not want to be seen as the aggressor.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATION ([3]–[5]): Answers at this level will have some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of the subject. They may refer to a comment from Bismarck about the origins of the war or refer briefly to the historical debate about whether Prussia or France was mainly responsible for its outbreak.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2(a), ([7]–[9]) AO1(b), ([6]–[8]) AO2(b)**AO1b:**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers at this level are likely to present a more detailed discussion of the issue which provoked the conflict between Prussia and France. In September 1868 Queen Isabella of Spain was deposed by a revolution. There was no obvious candidate to replace her and in February 1870 the Spanish Government offered the throne to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. This offer had to be ratified by William I of Prussia since he was the head of the Hohenzollern family. The King, realising that Napoleon was alarmed at this development, wanted to withhold his consent but Bismarck managed to make him change his mind. But before Leopold’s acceptance could be ratified by the Spanish Parliament, Napoleon became aware of these developments, which, he feared, would mean that France was surrounded by hostile neighbours. He demanded that Leopold’s candidature be withdrawn. William I agreed but refused to give the apology demanded by the French or confirm that he would never again support Leopold’s candidature. On 13 July the King’s secretary sent Bismarck a telegram from Ems which the Minister-President edited to make the King’s rejection of French demands more intransigent. The response of the French was to declare war on Prussia. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation. In Source 1, an interview given three years before the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, Bismarck maintains that his policy towards France was entirely

peaceful, although he indicates that other key groups in Prussian society adopted a less conciliatory attitude towards France. Source 2 suggests that the French Government was under intense pressure from public opinion not to back down in any conflict with Prussia because of the shame it experienced when Prussia defeated Austria at the Battle of Sadowa on 3 July 1866. Source 3 presents a more balanced view of responsibility for the Franco-Prussian War, blaming the “catalogue of errors” committed by the French Government but also suggesting that Bismarck considered war with France “an unavoidable necessity” and that his main concern in 1870 was not to avert war but to ensure that Prussia was seen to be the innocent party if war broke out.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATION ([6]–[8]): Answers at this level will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. Answers at this level will discuss the degree of responsibility that Prussia had for the outbreak of the war, focusing in particular on Bismarck’s motives for editing the Ems telegram. Answers may discuss three possible interpretations of Bismarck’s actions. They may maintain that he was not to blame for the outbreak of war, attributing responsibility to the inept diplomacy and provocative actions of the French. They may argue that Bismarck deliberately intended to bring about the war, believing that the only way of completing unification was by winning the support of the South German states for a war against France. A third interpretation is that Bismarck had hoped to win a diplomatic victory over the French but went to war when this did not materialise.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2(a), ([10]–[12]) AO1b, ([9]–[11]) AO2(b)

AO1b:

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Answers at this level are likely to present a comprehensive assessment of Bismarck’s role in bringing about the crisis which led to the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. Answers should focus on the Ems telegram and analyse Bismarck’s motives for editing it. They may observe that, prior to his editing of the Ems telegram, Bismarck had secured promises of support from the South German states in the event of a war with France. He had also drafted but not submitted a proposal to the *Reichstag* to declare war on France if the French did not declare war on Prussia. Answers at this level will also discuss the role of the French in bringing about the war. They may show how the impetuous response of the French Foreign Minister made it appear that France was the aggressor and answers should also explore the influence of public opinion on the actions of the French Government. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Answers will interpret the sources with complete understanding and use them with contextual knowledge to provide a comprehensive assessment of Prussia's degree of responsibility for the Franco-Prussian War. For example, answers at this level may note that, while in Source 1 Bismarck maintains that his policy towards France was entirely peaceful, his attitude is nonetheless uncompromising in the sense that he assumes that German unity will come about irrespective of French misgivings. Answers at this level may use their contextual knowledge of French policy towards the Austria-Prussian War to discuss the impact of the Battle of Sadowa on French foreign policy in 1870. Source 3 presents a more complete picture of the degree of responsibility of the participants in the outbreak of the war.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATION ([9]–[11]): Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. Contemporaries generally believed that Napoleon III and his advisers were responsible for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. As Source 2 shows, the French political elites in turn blamed public opinion at home for exerting pressure on them to pursue an aggressive policy towards Prussia. Some historians have exonerated Napoleon personally from blame, accusing instead the Foreign Minister, the Duke of Gramont, of pursuing an aggressive and tactically inept policy. By contrast, contemporaries in 1870 generally regarded Bismarck as the innocent victim of French aggression. This was certainly the view of the ordinary population in the towns and cities in the South German states of Baden, Württemberg and, to a lesser degree, Bavaria, where anti-French sentiments compelled their governments to mobilise against France in July 1870. However, later interpretations indicated that Bismarck bears a greater responsibility for the outbreak of the war than contemporaries thought. In 1870 he had claimed that he was unaware of the Hohenzollern Candidature until 3 July of that year. However, in 1892, two years after he had resigned from office, Bismarck admitted that this was not true. In fact, he claimed that the changes he had made to the Ems telegram were designed to provoke war and good answers will debate his motives for editing the telegram. They may argue, for example, as Bismarck did in his memoirs, that the Franco-Prussian War was an excellent device for reducing suspicion of Prussia among the South German states. Other historians maintain that, although Bismarck tried to exploit the Hohenzollern Candidature to outmanoeuvre the French, his aim was to secure a diplomatic victory and he only went to war as a last resort. [35]

Option 4

48

60

Option 5: Germany 1918–1945

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Explain the political threats to the Weimar Republic from left and right in the period 1919–1923.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and, communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically reveal a superficial awareness of the political threats from left and right to the Weimar Republic in the period 1919–1923. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide an understanding of some of the left and right-wing threats to the Weimar Republic in the period 1919–1923 but with significant omissions. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will reveal a competent awareness of the political threats to the Weimar Republic in the period 1919–1923 from left and right with few omissions. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding,

explanation and analysis. Top level answers will reveal a comprehensive awareness of the political threats from left and right to the Weimar Republic in the period 1919–1923. There were numerous unsuccessful attempts by the extreme left to try to overthrow the Weimar Republic in the period 1919–1923 which candidates could refer to, but to illustrate such threats the specification only requires candidates to refer to two attempts: The Spartacist Uprising in 1919 and the “German October” in Saxony in 1923. The Spartacists had opposed the First World War and were deeply influenced by Bolshevism. They opposed the creation of a National Constituent Assembly during the German Revolution and wanted to take power by strikes, demonstrations and revolts. In January 1919 the Spartacists decided that the time was ripe to launch an armed rising in Berlin with the aim of overthrowing Ebert’s provisional government. On 5 January 1919 they occupied public buildings, called for a general strike and formed a revolutionary committee. After three days of savage street fighting the coup was easily defeated. The government had the backing of the army’s troops. The continuous revolutionary disturbances by the extreme left in the period 1919–1923 culminated in the “German October” in Saxony which had a SPD/KPD state government in 1923. Mass protests actually started in the summer of 1923 at the height of the Ruhr crisis, although the uprising did not actually come to a head until October 1923. A major wave of strikes and popular protests had encouraged the Comintern to organise a German October inspired by the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917. Reich troops overthrew the state government and suppressed the strikers.

The Kapp Putsch in 1920 was the first attempt by the extreme right wing to seize power from the constitutional government. The extreme right favoured the restoration of some sort of authoritarian, dictatorial regime. As a result of the demobilisation of the armed forces there were nearly 200 paramilitary units in Germany by 1919. In 1920 about 12,000 members of the *Freikorps* marched on Berlin and seized the main buildings of the capital virtually unopposed, where they installed a new government. The German army did not provide any resistance to this putsch. In spite of requests from Ebert to put down the rebellious forces, the army was not prepared to become involved with either side. The putsch collapsed primarily because, before fleeing Berlin, SPD members of the government had called for a general strike which soon paralysed the capital and quickly spread to the rest of the country. The rebels had little support in Berlin and even less elsewhere. After four days, it was clear that Kapp and his government exerted no real authority and they fled the city. The Nazis’ Munich Putsch took place from 8–9 November 1923. The developing crisis in Germany in 1923 due to the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr, passive resistance, hyperinflation and “The German October,” had convinced Hitler that the opportunity to seize power had arrived. The Nazis were far too weak on their own to stage any kind of political takeover. It was the need for allies which led Hitler into negotiations with Kahr and the Bavarian State Government and the Bavarian section of the German army under

Lossow. Kahr and Lossow blamed most of Germany's problems on the national government in Berlin and wanted to destroy the republican regime with a "March on Berlin" from Munich. Fearing failure, they decided to abandon the plan but Hitler wanted to press on. The Nazis took control of a large rally which Kahr was addressing in one of Munich's beer halls and declared a "national revolution." Under pressure, Kahr and Lossow appeared to co-operate, but General Seeckt, the chief of the Army Command who was suspicious of Hitler, used his powers to command the armed forces to resist the putsch. When the Nazis attempted to take Munich, the Bavarian police easily crushed the putsch. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- (b) Explain the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1945.

This question targets AO1(a) and AO1(b): the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and, communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner **AO1(a)** and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Answers may typically reveal a superficial awareness of the impact of Nazi policies towards women. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide an understanding of the impact of Nazi policies on women but with significant omissions. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and

substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will reveal a competent awareness of the impact of Nazi policies on women with few omissions. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

Answers at this level consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound understanding, explanation and analysis. Top level answers will reveal a comprehensive awareness of the impact of Nazi policies on women in the period 1933–1945. Nazi policies towards women were largely reactionary. The Nazis wanted to reverse many of the trends that had increased opportunities for women, such as increased female employment and a declining birth rate that was partly due to wider access to contraception. The Nazis had a clear vision of women performing what they considered to be their traditional role as homemakers and childbearers. In the racial struggle for survival, women had a vital role, to breed genetically pure Germans to ensure German supremacy. The Nazis also emphasised the role of the family as the “germ cell of the nation” and this had implications for the position of women in the state. However, Nazi ideology came into conflict with broader trends and other economic priorities. The early years of the regime saw the forcing of women out of employment and the encouragement of traditional family structures. However, during the war, because of the need for more workers and more soldiers, the government encouraged the utilisation of female labour. In 1933 the Law for the Reduction of Unemployment linked the fight to reduce unemployment with the introduction of Nazi policies towards women. Marriage loans were granted to women who gave up their jobs. This was soon followed by restrictions on women’s employment in the Civil Service. Divorce became easier in order to boost the birth rate by ending unproductive marriages. To help inculcate their values, the Nazis created a series of organisations for females. The National Socialist Women’s Organisation (NSF) was an umbrella organisation which co-ordinated existing women’s organisations to bring them into line with official ideology. It ran the Reich Mother’s Service which trained housewives and midwives. There were women’s sections in the Reich Labour Service and the German Labour Front. Prolific mothers were awarded medals in recognition of their contribution to increasing the birth rate. Nazi attempts to drive women back into the home were far from successful. By 1936 the economy was suffering from a labour shortage and the number of women in all types of jobs increased. By 1943 women aged between 17 and 45 were compelled to register for state allocated work to help the war effort. Nazi policies towards women were in some respects contradictory. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying the reasons for the introduction of the Four Year Plan in 1936?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate's ability, as part of the historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. It reveals that the aims of the Plan were to expand rearmament and autarky to make Germany as self-sufficient as possible in food and industrial production, to re-orientate the economy for war, to increase the production of raw materials so as to reduce the financial cost of importing vital goods, and to develop substitute products. The source also reveals the need to prioritise resources for the needs of rearmament rather than agriculture and to expand domestic production of natural and artificial materials so that the limited amount of foreign exchange available to the regime can be used to import vital raw materials needed for the rearmament drive. Hitler is asserting his authority – “I reject the view that we should restrict this rearmament” – within the regime to determine what the objectives of Nazi economic policy should be and makes it absolutely clear that by 1936 the priority was “to prepare for war in times of peace.”

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. Answers will not only discuss the content of the source but will also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The tone of the extract suggests a sense of urgency – “no limit to the extent or speed” – and “achieved with the same urgency” – on Hitler's part to achieve substantial and rapid rearmament. A private communication from the *Führer* himself in 1936 to a senior Nazi, who was given the responsibility of implementing the Four-Year Plan, reveals the objectives of the Four Year Plan. The mode, author, audience and date of the document, in addition to the content, make this a useful source to an historian.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. The word autarky does not appear in this extract but from their contextual knowledge candidates should identify that the

main goal of the Four-Year Plan was to try to achieve as much self-sufficiency as possible to increase rearmament to prepare for war. The source is also limited in that it does not reveal the background situation in 1936. From their contextual knowledge candidates should be able to clarify the particular circumstances in 1936 as to why Hitler was prepared to intervene so decisively in the development of the Nazi economy. By 1936 it became clear to Schacht that, as the demands for rearmament and consumption of goods increased, the German balance of payments would go into the red. He had therefore suggested a reduction in arms expenditure in order to increase the production of industrial goods that at least could be exported so as to earn foreign exchange. Such a policy was unacceptable to the Nazi leadership as Hitler wanted to expand rearmament to achieve his foreign policy objectives. Therefore, he had to intervene decisively and assert Nazi control of the economy through Göring. The choice between rearmament and consumer goods is sometimes summed up in the phrase “Guns or Butter.” The significance of the extract can be appreciated better in the context of the circumstances in 1936. The extract is limited in that it only gives the historian a partial insight into the reasons for the introduction of the 1936 Four-Year Plan. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1939 were successful.

This question targets AO1(b) and AO2: the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements **AO1(b)** and, the candidate’s ability as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways **AO2**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3]) AO2(a), ([0]–[3]) AO1(b), ([0]–[2]) AO2(b)

AO1(b):

KNOWLEDGE ([0]–[3]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation, analysis and judgement. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in the structure and organisation of ideas presented.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([0]–[3]): Answers will merely paraphrase the sources, and fail to utilise the source content to address the question.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([0]–[2]): Answers will reveal little or no awareness of contemporary or later interpretations of the subject.

Level 2 ([4]–[6]) AO2(a), ([4]–[6]) AO1(b), ([3]–[5]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a limited account of Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1939. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation with little specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([4]–[6]): Answers will begin to utilise the sources with regard to the question, using only the source content and lacking any contextual knowledge. For example, Source 1 reveals some of the aims of the 1936 Four-Year Plan. Source 2 reveals Schacht's criticisms of Göring's attempts to achieve autarky.

AO2(b):**INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]):**

There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, a contemporary comment on the effectiveness of Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1939.

Level 3 ([7]–[9]) AO2(a), ([7]–[9]) AO1(b), ([6]–[8]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. There will be a more competent account of the effectiveness of Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1939. Answers at this level will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is appropriate; there is good organisation with some specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([7]–[9]): Answers will analyse the sources in the context of the enquiry. There may be an imbalance of evaluation. Source 1 provides a constructive insight into Hitler's objectives concerning the 1936 Four-Year Plan. Source 2 provides a critique of Göring's ability to achieve the autarky envisaged in the 1936 Four-Year Plan. Source 3 is a useful guide to how the Nazis brought about an economic recovery in the 1933–1936 phase and the significance of rearmament in the 1936–1939 phase.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, there may be opinions regarding how successful Nazi economic policies were in achieving recovery and rearmament.

Level 4 ([10]–[12]) AO2(a), ([10]–[12]) AO1(b), ([9]–[11]) AO2(b)**AO1(b):**

KNOWLEDGE ([10]–[12]): Answers will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level answers will provide a comprehensive assessment of Nazi economic policies in the period 1933–1939. The most important challenge facing the Nazis on taking office was to reduce unemployment. The work schemes first used by Papen and Schleicher in 1932–1933 were extended by the Law to Reduce Unemployment of June 1933. These work schemes were part of an overall job creation plan. The so-called “Battle for Work” was extended by the government lending money to private companies so that they could create jobs. Five billion RM was invested in work creation schemes by 1935. In 1933, 25.9% of the work force was unemployed, but by 1936 it had fallen to 7.4%. The growth in state investment was a major factor in explaining why unemployment fell. In May 1933, Hitler appointed Hjalmar Schacht as President of the Reichsbank. One of his first acts was to increase state control of foreign trade. In the summer of 1934 he was made Minister of Economics. He introduced the “New Plan” in September 1934 which gave the government extensive powers to regulate trade and currency transactions. This New Plan was introduced in the face of a foreign exchange crisis which was the result of Germany importing more goods than it exported. In 1934 Schacht also proceeded to negotiate a series of trade agreements with countries in South America and south-eastern Europe which were aimed at preventing Germany running up a huge foreign currency deficit whilst still being able to procure essential raw materials. Schacht also created a policy aimed at encouraging the growth in demand in the economy. This was done by the introduction of Mefo Bills. These were bills issued by the government as payment for goods. They were then held by investors or banks and could either be exchanged for cash or held up to five years, earning 4% interest a year. Hitler’s main long-term objective was to create an economy which could support sustained rearmament. By 1936 the economy had recovered to such an extent as to make this possible. However, there were problems which potentially could prevent this happening. By 1935, Germany was still importing large amounts of foodstuffs such as butter and vegetable oil. But Germany also needed to import raw materials such as lead and copper to sustain rearmament. The crisis grew worse by 1936 as Germany used up its reserves of raw materials and was forced to buy raw materials with limited stocks of foreign exchange. The problem was

that Germany could not afford to import large quantities of food and raw materials for rearmament. The Nazis' solution was to cut imports and embark on a policy of greater self-sufficiency. In April 1936 Göring was appointed Commissioner of Raw Materials. This was to be partly achieved by manufacturing rubber and oil synthetically. The manufacturing company IG-Farben persuaded the Nazi regime that such a process was possible. The 1936 Four-Year Plan was based on the policy of autarky and gradually Göring took full control of the economy and targets for production were set. The policy of self-sufficiency was not a complete success. By 1938 Germany's balance of trade deficit had risen to 432 million RM. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Answers will interpret the sources with complete understanding and use them with contextual knowledge to provide a comprehensive assessment. Source 3 could be utilised to provide stimulus material for candidates discussing evidence of how the Nazis achieved an economic recovery, especially in the 1933–1936 phase. Candidates could also react to the interpretation of Overy, as an historian, suggesting that rearmament was only one of several elements responsible for the recovery by 1936. Overy also puts emphasis on construction and transportation. Source 1 demonstrates that 1936 marked a significant new stage in the regime's economic strategy to prepare the economy for war by expanding rearmament and achieving autarky. Source 2 reinforces the regime's quest for autarky and the role of Göring in trying to achieve the objectives of the Four-Year Plan. Schacht, as a contemporary from the era, also reveals his scepticism concerning the implementation of the Four-Year Plan and his low opinion of Göring's ability.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Candidates could react to the implications of the statements by Overy in this particular extract in Source 3 in relation to how successful Nazi economic policies were. According to Overy, the key factor in the economy’s recovery was the extent to which the state was prepared to intervene and manage the economy. There has been a debate about the extent to which the German economy in the period 1936–1939 was geared to rearmament and whether the economic problems the regime was experiencing by 1938 amounted to a crisis. Overy has been involved in this debate and has suggested that, while the German economy was restructured between 1936 and 1939 to prepare for war, the fact that the war took place in 1939 was not the result of a crisis in the economy. Answers may concur with Overy’s views, qualify them or disagree with them. It is more important that they debate the issues, consider evidence and substantiate a relevant line of argument. [35]

Option 5

Total

48

60

60