



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2012**

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

[AH111]

WEDNESDAY 6 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 Thomas Cranmer in achieving the Royal Divorce.

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 give a narrative account of the Royal Divorce with little reference to Cranmer's role. 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 begin to provide an account of Cranmer's involvement in achieving the Royal Divorce. They may mention his relationship with Henry VIII and how he was determined to achieve the divorce to please the King. The response may also mention his position as Archbishop of Canterbury. 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 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 complexity of Cranmer's role. They may look at his background at court and in European affairs. The response may look at his attempts to achieve an annulment and then focus on the legal proceedings which produced the divorce. 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 Cranmer's relationship with the Boleyn faction, as well as Henry VIII, and how this contributed to his role in the divorce. Cranmer realised that he must put his personal opinion to one side and achieve what Henry desired. This was the only way in which he could secure his position. Answers may mention his position as Archbishop of Canterbury and his firm acceptance of the Act of Supremacy. They may make reference to his position as ambassador to Charles. The response may also mention the actual divorce proceedings, including his attempts to achieve an annulment. It may then deal with the legal proceedings and judgement, as well as his acceptance of the new Queen Anne and his involvement in her marriage to Henry VIII. 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 measures taken by the Duke of Northumberland to solve the economic and social problems England faced in the period 1550–1553.

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 Northumberland but include little reference to his response to England's economic and social problems. 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 rule of Northumberland. They may mention some

of the measures he took to combat either England's economic or social problems but may not deal with both. 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 Northumberland's response to both England's economic and social problems in the period 1550–1553. The answer may address Northumberland's attempts to solve England's economic problems by ending the wars and discontinuing debasement. It may address the social problem of enclosures, as well as Northumberland's ending of the Vagrancy Act. 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 economic and social problems Northumberland faced and how he attempted to address them. They may mention how he brought an end to debasement and reduced expenditure and debt. He also ended the expensive wars. In the long term Northumberland attempted to alter the pattern of trade to improve the economy, as well as reform the financial system in an attempt to stabilise inflation and restore confidence again. In terms of social policy, he repealed the Vagrancy Act but was unable to end discontent towards enclosure. Answers may also mention that he left much reform for Mary I to continue with. 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 Rebellion of the Northern Earls of 1569?

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, they may mention that this source is from the proclamation issued by the Northern Earls. It states that the rebels are unhappy about the new religion and are prepared to use force to see the old religion reinstated. This answer deals mainly 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 an extract written by the leaders of the Northern Earls' rebellion. It is written in 1569 when the rebellion occurred and just after the arrival of Mary Stuart. Its purpose is to attract support for the rebellion and restore Roman Catholicism. Although the leaders of the rebellion are prepared to use force to achieve their aims, they maintain their loyalty to Elizabeth I throughout, placing the responsibility for discontent with her Council.

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, the source was written by the Earls of the North who were more concerned with their political power than the old religion. Elizabeth had started to interfere in the North and they were concerned that she would weaken their position. By 1569 her religious settlement was well established so it is questionable as to why they chose to rebel now. This may be because of the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots as an alternative Queen. They are not only addressing the ordinary people of England but also the nobility. They wish to attract the masses by religious means, whereas they seek support from the nobility through threatening their position. They also imply that foreign intervention will occur. The tone is respectful to Elizabeth but it is also a warning to her and her government. Spain and Rome were keen spectators in the affairs of England; as yet the Pope had not excommunicated her, but does so after this rebellion. The source is limited in that the Earls were attempting to use the common folk and were much too concerned with their own position. We are not told why it has taken 12 years for them to rebel and we are not told what sparked off this rebellion.

[13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess to what extent the Rebellion of the Northern Earls was a significant threat to Elizabeth I.

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 produce a narrative account of the rebellion of the Northern Earls with little reference to the threat it represented. 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 rebellion of the Northern Earls was a threat to Elizabeth I.

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, it may mention how the Earls were a political threat as they were the Queen's traditional support. Answers may also mention how the Earls were able to attract the support of ordinary folk by outlining the threat to the Roman Catholic religion. They may also mention the role of Mary Stuart and the possibility of her being an alternative Queen. This would prove to be a great threat. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation and 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. For example, Source 1 suggests that the rebellion was a significant threat as it is a proclamation from the Northern Earls. Source 2 shows that the rebels were able to march to Durham Cathedral and destroy elements of the new religion. Source 3 reveals that the Earls were reluctant to rebel and few supported them.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, contemporary opinion regarded the rebellion as a significant threat, while modern interpretations question the significance of this threat.

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. It might be noted that the rebellion was significant as it was not only a physical threat but also a political one. The rebels were able to march to Durham and attract support on their journey. They were the monarch's traditional support and helped her to govern the North. Without their help, she would be left vulnerable. Their attachment to Mary, Queen of Scots was significant as they had an alternative monarch and she would become the focus for further rebellions. However, the rebels were not very numerous and lacked passion for their cause. Elizabeth and her Council were always in control. 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 is written by the Earls and highlights their political and religious grievances. Source 2 is an eye-witness account of the rebellion and its progress; the rebels were able to claim and restore Catholicism to Durham Cathedral. Source 3 looks at the short- and long-term consequences of the rebellion. The Northern Earls were reluctant to rebel and gathered little support, yet they did place all Catholics under suspicion. The government now had reason to view the Catholic population as a threat.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, contemporary opinion believed that there was a

great Catholic threat and urged Elizabeth to take action. Modern interpretations believe that there was a threat but it was more to do with power and the dominance of the monarch.

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 how great a threat the rebellion of the Northern Earls posed. They will assess the political and religious threat it caused. It will deal with Mary, Queen of Scots and assess how significant her presence was. If the rebellion had been successful, a Catholic dynasty could have been produced. Answers may also mention the rumour of foreign intervention and how the Pope at this time was determined to excommunicate Elizabeth. This failed to materialise. 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. Source 1 highlights how the rebels were a political threat but does not give an indication as to how great a threat they were. Source 2 tells us of their progress and attack on the new religion. Source 3 speaks of the potential danger caused by Elizabeth’s Catholic population but it also tells us that her government was able to use this to take action against the Catholics. It also states how significant the timing of this rebellion was just before Elizabeth’s excommunication.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may refer to contemporary opinion such as Elizabeth’s Council and Elizabeth herself. She did not believe the threat was as great as first perceived and was hesitant to take action. Modern interpretations believe that Catholicism was a present force but the length of her reign lessened the danger. [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 the effectiveness of James I's policies towards Catholics in the period 1603–1625.

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 make some vague remarks about James I's policies towards the Catholics. 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 of the details of James I's religious policies towards Catholics. The use of recusancy fines alongside his general tolerance of Catholics 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 may 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 effectiveness of James I's religious policies. His policies towards Catholics veered between persecution and appeasement. After the Gunpowder Plot in 1605, James was compelled to introduce harsh penal laws and an Oath of Allegiance to appease his Protestant Parliament. However, he was intentionally complacent in their enforcement, particularly the collection of recusancy fines. He also allowed the Catholic Howards to become the most influential faction at Court, although their dominance was to be short-lived. He continued to actively seek a Spanish, Catholic marriage for his son, Charles,

although this policy was to end in farce and humiliation for the Stuarts. As a result of his moderate religious policies he faced no further, major Catholic opposition during his reign. 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 effectiveness of James I's policies towards the Catholics. James attempted to compromise in his religious policy throughout his reign and was generally successful. While, at times, his actions were anti-Catholic, or at least pro-Puritan, he was careful to balance his policies, as is evident in his introduction of the Book of Sports and the 1622 Directions to Preachers. Indeed, he believed that the Puritans represented more of a threat to his position than the Catholics. James viewed the Catholic Church as infirm rather than evil, calling it the "mother church". His reluctance to persecute Catholics is, therefore, understandable, given his background and beliefs. Even when anti-Catholic sentiment intensified in his later Parliaments, as religious wars raged in Europe, James maintained his moderate stance and refused to become the Protestant champion. 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 royal favourites in the period 1603–1629. [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 at this level will be inaccurate and provide a superficial explanation of the impact of royal favourites in the period. 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 explanation of the impact of royal favourites between 1603 and 1629. Both James I and his son Charles were heavily influenced by their closest advisers. The two major royal favourites of the period were Robert Carr, up until his downfall in 1615, and his replacement, George Villiers, the Duke of Buckingham, who was to dominate politics under James and Charles until his untimely death in 1628. 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 recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will be more detailed and show greater awareness of the impact of royal favourites. Their standing with the monarch made them the potential source of favour and patronage in their own right, and as such they became the object of much political manoeuvring and faction, and, at times, hostility. Both Carr and Villiers benefited financially from their position and rose to become Earl of Somerset and Duke of Buckingham respectively. They also wielded considerable political influence. Both men were noted for their striking good looks and Buckingham enjoyed a particularly close relationship with James, even if it was not homosexual, and soon held a stranglehold over the King's favour and patronage. 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 both the Earl of Somerset and the Duke of Buckingham. Somerset was closely associated with the Howard faction and was instrumental in moving James towards the Spanish match. He lost his position due to his implication in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, although he was undoubtedly the victim of the hostility of the anti-Howard faction at Court. Buckingham, in particular, monopolised the Court and Government. Under James, he was instrumental in the promotion of Lionel Cranfield, yet also engineered his impeachment, when Cranfield opposed his plans for war. He began the promotion of William Laud and dominated foreign policy in the King's later years,

pressing for war with Spain after his disastrous trip to Madrid with Charles. He was responsible for negotiating Charles's marriage to the French princess Henrietta Maria and by the time of James's death had made himself indispensable to the new King. The early years of Charles I's reign are dominated by Buckingham's catastrophic foreign expeditions to Cadiz and La Rochelle. Buckingham's attempts to push England to the forefront of European affairs had been humiliating and financially ruinous. His death in 1628 was widely celebrated, even if Charles was heartbroken by the loss of his closest friend. 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 impact of the collection of Ship Money during the Personal Rule of Charles I?

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. For example, Source 1 reveals that Burghe believes that Ship Money is now "well accepted".

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 that, while Burghe thinks the country is "calm", he also acknowledges that Ship Money is perceived to be a "burden".

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. For example, the source is written by a renowned academic who is able to present his personal analysis of the situation in England in 1637, three years after the introduction of Ship Money. He provides some insight into the situation at the Royal Court and in the wider country. Although the letter's recipient is a member of Charles's Government and Burghe may have intended to try to influence him, the source is likely to contain Burghe's honest appraisal of the situation as he sees it since it is a private letter. Burghe also provides a comparative analysis with the extent of taxation in other countries in

Europe. Although Burghe acknowledges that people are now paying “high sums”, he argues that they “seem content to pay them”. His comment that “given time, everyone will accept the situation” suggests that many have not accepted it. Indeed, by 1637, opposition to Ship Money was growing.

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, the source is written by a royalist supporter of Charles I who is inclined to underplay the extent of opposition to the King’s controversial financial policies. Writing in 1637, Burghe is only able to convey the reactions up until that point and remarkably omits mention of the high profile and controversial court case against Ship Money taken by John Hampden in that very year. Burghe is only able, or willing, to provide a limited analysis of the situation. His prediction of the permanency of Ship Money is perceptive; however, far from being willing to “accept the situation”, opposition to the tax only intensified with time and by 1640 refusal to pay had become commonplace. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the collection of Ship Money was responsible for the growth of opposition to Charles I’s Personal Rule.

This question targets AO1(b): the candidate’s ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements; **and AO2:** 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.

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, the answer comments on the fact that Ship Money caused the growth of opposition to Personal Rule. 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 Ship Money was responsible for the opposition to Charles I.

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 growth of opposition to Charles I. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation and 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. For example, Source 1 suggests that Ship Money was “well accepted” and did not cause significant opposition. In Source 2, D’Ewes notes that there was a “slow payment of the tax”. Source 3 gives a fuller analysis of the opposition to Ship Money and Charles I’s wider financial policies.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations. For example, the legality of Ship Money was challenged in court by John Hampden.

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. It might be noted that Charles I’s collection of Ship Money caused considerable tension. Ship Money was an extraordinary tax and Charles I’s decision to collect it when the country was at peace was hugely unpopular. In 1635 he extended it beyond coastal counties, as was the custom, compelling the entire country to pay, and he collected it every year. The extent of the opposition he faced is evident in the widespread refusal to pay the tax towards the end of his Personal Rule. It was, however, only one of a series of unpopular revenue raising policies, including the distraint of knightships, forest fines, monopolies, wardship and the extension of impositions. 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, for example, one source may be neglected. Source 1 suggests that Ship Money was of little significance in creating opposition to Charles. Burghe describes the country as “calm” and that, with time, “everyone will accept the situation”. In Source 2 D’Ewes argues that, despite his best efforts, it is impossible to collect the amount due because people were unwilling or unable to pay. Source 3 argues that collectively Charles I’s financial policies “gave rise to much discontent” and suggests that it was Ship Money which did the “most damage”. Smith does acknowledge that the Laudian changes to the church, Charles and his ministers’ failure to keep in touch with the mood of the country and the “growing disillusionment of the gentry” also played their part in the growth of opposition.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject; for example, five of the twelve judges in the Hampden case actually found against the King. In Source 3 Smith argues that, while the financial achievement of Charles I’s government “looks very impressive”, he would pay a huge “political cost” for his controversial policies.

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 Ship Money was the most important factor in the growth of opposition to Charles I. Good responses may explain how Ship Money brought to a head wider concern about Charles I’s money raising methods under Personal Rule. The relationship between the King and his Parliament had broken down in 1629 with many of the issues unresolved. Under Personal Rule, Charles had been compelled to finance his government without Parliament and his methods had stretched the legality of his prerogative financial devices. Religion also contributed to the growth of opposition to Charles I. At the same time, Charles chose to entrust Archbishop Laud with reforming the Church. The introduction of Arminian style changes provoked considerable opposition, culminating in the prayer book revolts in Scotland. Charles I’s policies in both Scotland and Ireland generated widespread concern in England.

Charles also faced criticism for the closed and Catholic nature of his Royal Court which only fuelled the belief that he was pursuing a Catholic, absolutist agenda. 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 with some 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 discuss how Source 1 highlights the apparent widespread acceptance of the policy of Ship Money. The source also infers that some opposition does exist by noting that discontent is expressed “in private” and that the tax is perceived to be a “burden”. In Source 2, D’Ewes suggests a range of reasons to explain why some people are refusing to pay Ship Money rather than arguing that the non-payment is a specific form of protest. He does note that having to fund recent “military campaigns” had caused “considerable distress”. Source 3 notes that Ship Money was the most “notorious” of Charles I’s money raising initiatives, although all played their part in creating opposition. Smith also argues that there were a number of other factors which contributed to the criticism of Personal Rule, most notably Laud’s changes to the church.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may refer to contemporary opinion to illustrate the growth of opposition to Personal Rule. Contemporary opinion could be ascribed to any Member of Parliament, merchant or minister of his government. Answers may exploit the content of Source 3 to explain the interpretation that Ship Money was of crucial importance in increasing the criticism of Charles I’s government. Later interpretations may take the form of historians’ opinions on Ship Money, any of his other revenue raising methods or the other factors that caused the growth of opposition, and may be utilised to support or challenge this interpretation. Candidates should provide interpretations by way of appropriate comments which attempt to assess the extent to which Ship Money was the most important reason for the criticism of Personal Rule. [35]

Option 2

48

60

Option 3: England 1815–1868

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Explain why the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 was so significant.

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.

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 Parliamentary Reform Act. 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 points of significance about the Parliamentary Reform Act. For example, there may be details about the changes to the franchise. 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 with 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 effects of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. Franchise extension embraced the newly emerging middle class in society. The requirement for voters to register inaugurated an era of party organisation, with party managers (such as Bonham for the Conservatives) emerging. Party agents and the employment of solicitors were essential in order to validate or challenge the authenticity of voters at the revision courts. From the mid-1830s onwards, the Whigs and Tories established their own "registration societies". Bonham in fact became the first professional party manager. The Tories formed the Carlton Club in 1832, while the Whig Reform Club emerged in 1836. 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 examine in a more convincing way the significance of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. It has been calculated that nearly 653 000 men had the right to vote in 1833 compared with 440 000 before the Act was passed. The Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 marked the first reform of the electoral system, and was the forerunner of the Acts of 1867 and 1884. The years after 1832 saw the emergence of growing party allegiance and discipline. The manner of the passing of the Parliamentary Reform Act was important, coming as it did in the midst of great excitement and fears of revolution. Public opinion was a factor which Westminster had to consider in the future. 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 why the Chartists failed to achieve their aims by 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, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements.

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 and superficial about the chartist movement. 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 will 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 failure of Chartism. For example, there were shortcomings in the Chartist leadership. The aspirations in the Charter were unrealistic, and too ambitious for that time. 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 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 a range of factors regarding the failure of the Chartist movement. The Chartists contributed to their own failure by declaring too many aims in their Charter. There were six aspirations in all. Moreover, some of the Chartists' aims were too ambitious for the political climate in which they operated. For example, an annual parliament was one demand, at a time when the parliamentary convention allowed for duration of seven years. The demand for payment of MPs was understandable, since their wish was to accommodate more working class representation at Westminster. Chartism suffered from other problems. There was no clearly identifiable leader. The movement was dogged by quarrels over tactics. Peel's government from 1841 to 1846 faced down the Chartist movement with a skilful mixture of firmness and social and economic reforms. Answers will be characterised by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling 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 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. Answers will be well informed about the reasons for the failure of the Chartists to achieve their aims. The problems associated with the Charter, leadership shortcomings and the response of government will be discussed. Peel's social and economic reforms in the 1840s confronted what contemporaries called "The Condition of England Question". In the process, Peel was also attempting to undermine the validity of the sort of grievances which would have sustained a movement such as Chartism. Both the Conservatives and the Whigs were prepared to use, in proportionate fashion, those instruments of the state necessary to curb any Chartist violence. For example, there was the Rural Police Act of 1839, as well as the nationwide system of railways, which were well utilised. No doubt Peel's experience as a former Home Secretary in the 1820s under Lord Liverpool contributed to his assessment of how to respond to Chartist activities. The Chartists failed to win the support of the middle classes. Parliament and the establishment were unwilling to make the kind of drastic concessions associated with the recent Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. Chartism was weakened by regional differences, which took the form of leadership rivalry and disputes over the priority of aims. 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 problems facing the Tory Party in the period 1827–1830?

This question targets AO2(a): the candidate’s ability, as part of an historical inquiry, 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. For example, answers may reflect that the source is useful because it provides evidence of the problems caused by the Catholic emancipation campaign in Ireland.

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 that O’Connell’s victory in the Clare by-election has raised the stakes in his emancipation campaign. The government must respond. The campaign in Ireland is described as having “such extraordinary power”, with the potential to bring about “open rebellion” if the issue is not addressed.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They 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 source’s content conveys a sense of urgency regarding the issue of Catholic emancipation, which the government would be ill advised to ignore. Phrases such as “extremely formidable” and “put to death thousands” indicate a sense of imminent crisis. Moreover, while the source may not reveal a feeling of admiration for the emancipation campaign, there is a sense of respect for its potency. The comment that “their success is inevitable” is remarkably candid in its analysis. The letter is, of course, a private communication, which contributes to its graphic nature and frankness. Moreover, it is feasible that Anglesey is seeking to advise the Tory cabinet as to its course of action. Additionally, since the letter was written by the Lord Lieutenant who was based in Ireland, its content takes on a more authoritative mode, since he would be more appreciative of the political realities and atmosphere which the emancipation crisis had created. The value of the source is enhanced by the fact that Anglesey’s letter must have had some impact, since Wellington did agree to acquiesce to O’Connell’s demands rather than risk bloodshed in Ireland.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations will 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, audience and tone. The source has several limitations. It does not explain why the question of Catholic emancipation was so controversial as to prompt the kind of warnings in this letter. Moreover, the letter does not reveal anything about how O'Connell mobilised his campaign (although its dynamism is implied); nor does it inform the reader about the extent of his support in Ireland. Additionally, the source says nothing about the significance of O'Connell's victory in the Clare election – that his subsequent refusal to take his seat in parliament would push Ireland to the brink of widespread violence. Answers may reflect that there is no mention of the seriousness of the scale of the compromise facing Peel and Wellington. As upholders of the status of the Established Church, making concessions to Catholics was most unpalatable, and for the leaders of the Tory Party, a scenario that was unthinkable. The source makes no reference to the other reasons for divisions in the Tory Party: parliamentary reform, personalities and repeal of the Corn Laws. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess to what extent Wellington was responsible for the divisions in the Tory Party between 1827 and 1830.

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 inquiry, 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, there is reference to the fact that upholding the established church was a key principle for the Tory Party, so that anyone seeking to grant Catholic emancipation would cause conflict within the party. Meaning may not always be clear due to lapses in legibility, spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or flaws in 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. For example, Source 1 suggests that the emancipation question has reached a crisis point, while Source 2 indicates that Wellington and Peel have had to rethink their policy.

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 role played by Wellington in causing Tory divisions. 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. For example, Source 1 provides details of how serious the emancipation question was for peace in Ireland, while Source 2 indicates how the decision to give way caused great political difficulties for Peel and Wellington. Source 3 reveals how the Tory Party was weakened by several sources of conflict, of which Catholic emancipation was but one.

AO2(b):

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

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. Evidence will be produced about the role of Wellington and other factors which contributed to the divisions in the Tory Party. It might be noted that the climax of the O'Connell campaign came amidst a period of turmoil in the Tory Party following the departure of Lord Liverpool in 1827. Canning, his successor, was pro-emancipation, which conflicted with the political sentiments and instincts of many of his cabinet colleagues. In 1828, the incapable Goderich had departed, only to be succeeded by the Duke of Wellington as Prime Minister. The contemporary perception that the Duke would resolutely confront O'Connell was shaken by Wellington's reluctance to risk a civil war in Ireland. His military background made him more aware of the realities of conflict than his hardline colleagues. Hence, a mixture of personality clashes and the pressure of a key decision on emancipation coalesced.

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, for example, with some emphasis being given to one or two sources, and another source being neglected. Source 1 conveys a sense of urgency which is quite acute. While Wellington is not mentioned by name, the source clearly indicates the atmosphere of crisis in which he had to operate. Source 2 reveals some of the reactions to the response of Peel and Wellington from parliament, the cabinet and the King himself. Croker indicates how isolated Peel was becoming from his parliamentary colleagues, while Wellington was preparing a drastic ultimatum for his cabinet. The phrase, “sudden summons” to the audience with the King suggests that the question of emancipation was urgent, crisis was imminent and action had to be taken. The word “summons” implies a terse command from a disapproving monarch. Source 3 draws attention to the wide-ranging causes of conflict within the Tory Party. Here, the roles played by the “Ultras” and the supporters of Canning are mentioned. Personalities and ideological clashes are in evidence, factors that cannot be wholly attributable to Wellington.

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 key members of the Tory Party, such as Canning, Peel or Wellington. Historians’ interpretations could include opinions on the impact of the emancipation crisis on the Tory Party, or reflections on the problems facing the Tories following Liverpool’s departure in 1827.

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 problems facing the Tory Party between 1827 and 1830, identifying the role played by Wellington in relation to other factors, such as the departure of Lord Liverpool, parliamentary reform, the Corn Laws and the role of the Catholic emancipation crisis.

Lord Liverpool’s successor, Canning, was pro-emancipation; his stance brought him into direct conflict with Tories who believed it to be their duty to uphold the position of the Established Church. Almost half of the cabinet, including Peel and **Wellington**, resigned rather than serve

under Canning. A mixture of ideology and personalities was evident here. Tory “Ultras” were shocked when Peel and **Wellington** reversed their views on emancipation following O’Connell’s victory in the Clare by-election of 1828. Nearly 40 Ultra MPs were determined to oppose **Wellington** at every possible opportunity thereafter. Thus, emancipation brought about tension between Peel, **Wellington** and key members of the Tory Party. However, the stubbornness of the “Ultras” cannot be overlooked.

Parliamentary reform also divided the Tories. In 1828, **Wellington**, as Prime Minister, found himself in conflict with some cabinet members – the most important of whom was Huskisson – over the redistribution of two parliamentary constituencies. **Wellington’s** attitude prompted the resignation of Huskisson and the other cabinet ministers who sympathised with him. Later in November 1830, when **Wellington** informed parliament that the Tory government would resist any moves for parliamentary reform, Tory “Ultras” joined with the Whigs in voting him out of office on a vote of confidence. **Wellington’s** lack of political tact was most obvious in this episode.

There were also tensions over the Corn Laws of 1815. “Liberal” Tories, such as Canning and Huskisson, favoured a relaxation of corn duties, while the majority of the Party argued that the Corn Laws should remain intact in order to maintain the unique position of agricultural interest.

Personalities played their part. Many Tories loathed Canning because of his earlier criticism of Castlereagh and his own social background. Goderich was incapable of providing leadership. **Wellington’s** style was uncompromising and intolerant of dissent. His inability to achieve consensus within his cabinet played a role in Tory divisions. However, the failure of Lord Liverpool to resolve (instead of postponing) the crisis of emancipation played a role, as did the personality of Canning.

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 explore the extent to which the sources support the proposition regarding the reasons for Tory divisions. **Source 1** suggests that the question of Catholic emancipation is a serious one, and that compromise should take the form of giving in to O’Connell’s demands. While Anglesey makes no comment about specific tensions within the Tory administration, the circumstances of the Clare by-election undoubtedly forced the government to reflect on an issue

which it would not otherwise wish to confront. Anglesley’s proposed solution of giving way to O’Connell would have created difficulties for any Tory Party leader at this time. **Source 2** makes the link between the role of **Wellington** and Tory divisions more explicit. Croker appreciates that Peel will have difficulties explaining his change of heart to his colleagues. Significantly, “only the Whigs cheered him” in the House. **Wellington** had to use the “threat of resignation” to secure cabinet support. The fact that **Wellington** believed that he was “ready to resign his post” after this meeting reveals the tension at the very heart of government. While **Wellington** and Peel contributed to divisions, they were motivated by the urgency conveyed in Source 1, while the “Ultras” remained implacable. **Source 3** provides a retrospective view, weighing up the other causes of Tory divisions. **Wellington’s** clash with Huskisson reflected poorly on his leadership. To emancipation is added the divisions over parliamentary reform. Only personality clashes are omitted. Thus all three sources, in differing ways, combine to suggest that it was the crisis of emancipation, the response of **Wellington** and the refusal of the Tories to compromise which brought divisions to the surface.

AO1(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Contemporary opinions could be noted from any member of the Tory cabinet, such as Peel or Wellington. Later interpretations may take the form of historians’ views about the source of Tory divisions. Or, more likely, candidates may suggest which of the aforementioned issues was the most/least damaging to the Tory party in this period. [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 the aims of those who took part in the revolutions which broke out in the Italian states in 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 the aims of those who took part in the revolutions which broke out in the Italian states in 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, explanation and analysis. Answers will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the aims of the participants in the revolutions in Italy in 1848. They may refer to the fact that, at least in Northern Italy, most who took part in the revolutions wanted to see Austria driven out of Italy. But they may also make the point that there were huge variations in the aims of the revolutionaries between the different Italian states. 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 begin to give a balanced and substantiated explanation of the aims of the participants in the revolutions in Italy in 1848. The most important unifying factor was opposition to Austrian rule and in the spring of 1848 Piedmont, Naples, Tuscany and the Papal States co-operated against the common enemy. Nationalist sentiments were expressed by many of the leaders of the revolutions and were supported by intellectuals and some

members of the nobility. The other important demand was for the establishment of liberal constitutional government. For example, Mazzini aimed to depose the existing rulers and replace them with an Italian republic espousing the principle of equality and having a written constitution, including universal suffrage. For Mazzini the Papacy was the main enemy. In Piedmont, the main concern of Charles Albert was to annex Lombardy. In Venice, where Austrian rule was widely hated, a republic was declared under the leadership of Daniele Manin. In Sicily, on the other hand, the liberals, backed up by popular support, rebelled against rule from Naples rather than Vienna, while those who took part in the unrest in Rome at the end of 1848 demanded an end to rule by the Papacy. 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 may observe that many who participated in the revolutions were motivated by economic considerations. Economically motivated riots among the working classes occurred intermittently in 1847 and 1848 in the port of Livorno. The workers in Rome who broke industrial machinery and the rioters who caused disturbances in a number of other Italian cities in 1847–1848 demanded more and cheaper food. In Rome they also advocated higher taxes on the rich to combat poverty. In the Papal States, workers demanded public workshops as a remedy to unemployment. However, the majority of Italians were residing in the countryside, where there was less support for the revolutions. Some, such as the peasants in Lombardy who rebelled against Austrian rule, were politically motivated but most were influenced by local concerns such as land ownership or grazing rights. In Tuscany peasants demanded a reduction in the number of days they had to work. 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 importance of Cavour in achieving the unification of Italy.

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 Cavour's role in achieving the unification of Italy. 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 importance of Cavour's role in achieving Italian unification, referring perhaps to his negotiations with the French at Plombières. 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 may discuss the importance for the unification of Italy of Cavour's economic reforms in Piedmont in the first half of the 1850s. They may make the point that Cavour realised after the failure of the revolutions in 1848 that the unification of Italy could not be achieved without the support of at least one international power and may refer to Piedmont's support of Britain and France against Russia during the Crimean War. Although Piedmont made only a small military contribution to the defeat of Russia, Cavour was able to publicise the negative effects of Austrian rule on Piedmont's economy at the Peace Settlement in Paris in 1856. Answers may also explore Cavour's negotiations with Napoleon III at Plombières in 1858 when the French King promised military support against Austria in return for Nice and Savoy. They may also observe that Piedmont gained Lombardy in the Treaty of Villafranca (July 1859) which concluded the war fought by France and Piedmont against Austria. Answers may also make the point that Cavour did not become convinced about the desirability of Italian unification until the second half of the 1850s. 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 at this level may give additional examples of Cavour's skilful diplomacy, especially after he was reappointed as Prime Minister of Piedmont in January 1860. They may focus on the skill with which he dealt with Garibaldi. For example, Cavour wisely accepted the support of the National Society and allowed Garibaldi to bring together a group of volunteers in 1859. While Cavour was unable to stop Garibaldi's famous expedition to liberate Sicily, fearing that King Victor Emmanuel secretly supported it, he took decisive action when Garibaldi was set to attack Rome. Recognising that this would prompt the intervention of the Great Powers and lead to conflict with France, whose troops were in Rome to protect the Pope, Cavour, with the agreement of Napoleon III, invaded part of the Papal states to intercept Garibaldi. 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 changing balance of power between Austria and Prussia between 1849 and 1859?

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. A report written by the Office for Trade and Industry in Württemberg in December 1851 argued that Württemberg should remain a member of *Zollverein* and reject the opportunity to belong to a rival Customs Union under Austrian leadership.

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 source is especially useful since it is a private, confidential

report from the Office of Trade and Industry in Württemberg to its Finance Ministry; it was not written for public consumption and it can be reliably inferred that the report represents the true opinions of its authors. The tone of the source is measured but persuasive. An important strength of the source is that it shows the growing economic power of Prussia in the early 1850s. It notes that Prussia has the natural advantage of “a rich supply of raw materials” and refers to the rapid expansion of its coal and steel industries, as well as its railway network. The source also suggests that Prussia’s growing economic strength is a key factor in the changing balance of power between Austria and Prussia. It reveals that Württemberg is not willing to abandon Prussia in favour of Austria because of the “important economic benefits” it gains from its membership of the *Zollverein*, while joining a Customs Union led by Austria would lead to “huge economic problems”. By underlining Prussia’s economic strength and the extent to which even a medium-sized state such as Württemberg depended on it, the source suggests that Prussia’s leadership of the *Zollverein* was certainly one reason for the changing balance of power between Austria and Prussia in the 1850s. The source shows that tactical reasons also influenced the author of the report to support a renewal of the *Zollverein* Treaty because Württemberg would enjoy more influence in it than an Austrian-led Customs Union.

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 source has a number of important limitations. Since it is a report from the Office of Trade and Industry in Württemberg to the Finance Ministry, it is viewing the issue of the *Zollverein* in narrow, purely economic terms and it is not clear whether Württemberg’s Prime Minister or its King supports this point of view. Moreover, the negative attitude of the Office for Trade and Industry in Württemberg towards Austria’s overtures to set up a rival Customs Union under its leadership in an attempt to weaken Prussian influence in Germany is not necessarily representative of the other thirty-six German states. A third shortcoming of the source is that, while it underlines Prussia’s economic strength, it makes no direct comparison with the Austrian economy. Fourthly, it says nothing about the political and military balance of power between Austria and Prussia. The date of the source is a further shortcoming. It was written at the end of 1851 and cannot therefore provide an insight into the relationship between Austria and Prussia in the period 1852–1859. To sum up, support from the Office for Trade and Industry in Württemberg in 1851 for the state’s continued membership of the *Zollverein* suggests that, from an economic perspective, the balance of power between Austria and Prussia is changing in favour of Prussia after 1849 but a historian would need to consult other sources to confirm this view. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which economic factors were responsible for the unification of Germany by 1871.

This question targets AO1(b): the candidate's ability to demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements; **and AO2a:** the candidate's ability, as part of an historical enquiry, to analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination and analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

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

AO1(b):

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. Answers at this level may be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding.

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 reasons for the unification of Germany by 1871. There will be frequent lapses in meaning due to shortcomings in legibility with some defects in organisation and 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. For example, Source 1 shows that Prussia's economic strength made the other German states dependent on it economically and through the *Zollverein* gave it experience of leading the other German states. Source 2 refers to the importance of the railway network in achieving

Prussia's military success over Austria in 1866 but also makes it clear that "non-economic" factors were also important. Source 3 also underlines that, while economic factors played a major part in German unification, Otto von Bismarck also played a key role.

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 way in which German unification took place or outline the views of an historian about the events leading to unification in 1871.

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

AO1(b):

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 extent to which economic factors were responsible for the unification of Germany by 1871. They may note that Prussia had excellent natural resources which provided the basis for its rapid industrialisation. In particular, the Ruhr, which it gained in 1815, had rich coal deposits and by 1870 it produced 23.3 million tons annually, more than three times the output of Austria. Another key economic factor was the establishment of the *Zollverein* in 1834. Eighteen states belonged to it and, crucially, Austria was not a member. The removal of tariff barriers promoted economic development and contributed to an increase in iron, steel and textile production, especially in Prussia. Good responses may establish a link between Prussia's strong economic growth and its military victory over Austria in 1866. For example, Prussia's superior railway network (in 1870 it had some 19 000 kilometres of lines, double that of Austria) contributed significantly to its success. It had five railway lines to transport its troops and military equipment southwards, while Austria had just one line from Vienna to Bohemia. Prussia also had superior weaponry and its needle-gun inflicted heavy casualties on the Austrian army. Answers may begin to explore the importance of Bismarck's role as Minister-President of Prussia, giving examples of his diplomatic acumen. 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; for example, one source may be neglected. In Source 1 a report by the Office of Trade and Industry in Württemberg underlines the importance of preserving the *Zollverein* under Prussian leadership for economic reasons. According to the report, the "loss of our commercial links with Prussia... would have very harmful effects on our trade and industry".

While Baroness Spitzemberg in Source 2 also supports the proposition by referring to the importance of Prussia's railway network in explaining its victory in the Austro-Prussian War, she also mentions that weaknesses in Austria's military leadership contributed to its defeat. Source 3 presents a more balanced view of the reasons for the unification of Germany. It focuses on economic factors, and in referring to the economic benefits of the *Zollverein* and the part Bleichröder played in financing Prussia's wars in the 1860s, reinforces the arguments put forward in Source 1. In addition, the source draws attention to Prussia's mineral resources in the Ruhr. However, it also observes that non-economic factors, such as the crucial role played by Otto von Bismarck, also contributed to German unification.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATION ([6]–[8]): Answers at this level will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. They may note that contemporaries such as the officials in Württemberg who drew up the report advocating continued membership of the German Customs Union under Prussian leadership undoubtedly believed in the primacy of economic considerations (Source 1). Similarly, Baroness Spitzemberg recognised the importance of Prussia's railway network to its victory in the Austro-Prussian War. Answers may note that Austria's leading politicians also recognised the importance of the *Zollverein* because they tried to set up a rival organisation to thwart Prussian ambitions. Answers at this level will also question the validity of the proposition, discussing the key role Otto von Bismarck played in the unification of Germany.

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

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 the extent to which economic factors were responsible for the unification of Germany. They will, in addition to discussing the economic factors promoting unification, clearly assess the contribution of Prussia's political and military leaders. In terms of political leadership, Bismarck was the leading European politician of his day and answers at this level should give examples of his diplomatic skill. For example, they may discuss Bismarck's efforts to secure French neutrality in any conflict with Austria and show how Bismarck achieved this in his meeting with Louis Napoleon at Biarritz in October 1865. Prussia's military leaders were also of a very high calibre. Helmuth von Moltke distinguished himself as Prussian Chief of General Staff and played a very important part in Prussia's military success in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. Answers may also discuss the role of General Albrecht von Roon, Prussian War Minister from 1859 and 1873, in modernising the Prussian army. They may also refer to the uniquely favourable international climate in the 1860s and the extent to

which nationalist ideas brought about the unification of Germany. 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 the extent to which economic factors were responsible for the unification of Germany in 1871. Answers at this level may observe that Württemberg’s decision to support a Prussian- rather than Austrian-led Customs Union underlines the importance it attached to economic considerations. After all, 65 per cent of its population was Catholic and it would have therefore been expected to side with Catholic Austria rather than the predominantly Protestant state of Prussia. Answers may make the point that Source 2 supports the proposition more than is evident at first sight. While it draws attention to Prussia’s military superiority over Austria, it should be borne in mind that its superior power and weapons, in particular the needle-gun, was in itself a result of its economic strength. Source 3 sets out the debate about the relative importance of economic factors and answers at this level may place the debate in context, referring perhaps to Bismarck’s famous “blood and iron” speech to the Prussian Parliament on 29 September 1862.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATION ([9]–[11]): Answers at this level will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. Answers at this level will discuss fully the extent to which economic considerations were responsible for the unification of Germany. Source 3, a retrospective assessment, from an historian, argues that, while economic considerations undoubtedly contributed decisively to the unification of Germany, the rise of nationalism and, in particular, Bismarck played a key role. Answers may discuss not just the economic but also the political significance of the *Zollverein*, since some historians play down its political importance, while others argue that it was very important because it gave Prussia experience of leading the other German states. Answers may also discuss in some depth the importance of Bismarck in achieving German unification, referring perhaps to the relative importance of his diplomacy and willingness to go to war. While contemporaries underlined the importance of Bismarck’s contribution to unification, later historians have produced a more balanced assessment, maintaining that he was fortunate that the international climate in the 1860s was favourable to his ambitions. [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 why the Nazis rose to power between the Wall Street Crash of October 1929 and Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on 30 January 1933.

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 offer a superficial awareness of why the Nazis rose to power between October 1929 and January 1933. 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 why the Nazis rose to power between October 1929 and January 1933 but with significant omissions. Answers may illustrate the effects of the depression but give insufficient evidence to illustrate the increase in Nazi electoral support and omit to discuss the significance of political intrigue under President Hindenburg. 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 with regard to why the Nazis rose to power between October 1929 and January 1933 with few omissions. Answers may illustrate the effects of the depression and the increase in Nazi electoral support but give insufficient evidence to illustrate the significance of political intrigue by right-wing members of the elite. The economic depression undermined the Weimar Republic. Some 50 000 businesses went bankrupt between 1930 and 1932, while five major

banks closed down. American loans and investments were withdrawn, while there was a general decline in world trade. In March 1930 the SPD-led coalition government under Müller collapsed. The depression brought instability to the Weimar Republic and was one of the main reasons the Nazis grew to be the largest political party by the summer of 1932, the year in which unemployment peaked at 6 million. 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 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 provide a comprehensive assessment of the reasons for the Nazis' rise to power between October 1929 and January 1933. The acute economic distress resulting from the onset of the depression after October 1929 coincided with a sharp rise in support for the Nazi Party, both in urban and rural areas. Through his excellent oratory and charisma, Hitler was able to exploit the dissatisfaction of the masses with the Weimar Republic. His attacks on the terms of the Versailles Treaty, and denunciation of the "November Criminals" who had signed it, enjoyed widespread support among the German electorate, as did his promise of strong government and a restoration of Germany's national pride. Hitler's attacks on "race enemies" such as the Jews also appealed to significant sections of the German people, as did his tirades against Marxists and Bolsheviks. The Nazis were able to project their slogans at mass rallies through an effective propaganda machine established by Goebbels. Answers may also refer to the ways in which the Weimar Constitution contributed to the decline of the Weimar Republic between October 1929 and January 1933. The voting system, based on pure proportional representation, encouraged the representation of a large number of political parties in the Reichstag which were often unwilling to work together at times of national crisis. President Hindenburg also played a key role in the decline of the Weimar Republic. By allowing successive chancellors to dissolve parliament and rule by emergency decrees under Article 48 of the constitution, Hindenburg accustomed the German people to authoritarian government and thus paved the way for the rise of the Nazis. Answers should also discuss the political intrigues involving right-wing conservative politicians, particularly von Schleicher and von Papen, which accelerated the decline of the Weimar Republic and eventually persuaded Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor on 30 January 1933. 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 impact of Nazi racial policies on the lives of Jews in Germany in the period 1933–1939.

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 concerning the impact of Nazi racial policies on the lives of Jews. 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 concerning the impact of Nazi racial policies on the lives of Jews but with significant omissions such as the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 or Crystal Night in 1938. 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 impact of Nazi racial policies on the lives of the Jews such as the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 and Crystal Night in 1938 but may fail to discuss measures in 1933 such as the economic boycott or the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service and the policy of emigration in 1939. 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 provide an in depth explanation of the impact of Nazi racial policies on the lives of Jews in Germany in the period 1933–1939 to illustrate how persecution developed. Over half a million Jews in Germany before the outbreak of war were affected by measures of discrimination as Nazi anti-Semitism gradually increased. In April 1933 there was an official boycott of Jewish shops and professions, followed by the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service which excluded Jews from the civil service. The Nuremberg Laws of September 1935 removed German citizenship from Jews and forbade marriages and extramarital relations between Jews and German citizens. The violent pogrom of Crystal Night in November 1938 was followed by the compulsory closure and sale of Jewish businesses by the end of the year. By January 1939 the Reich Central Office for Jewish emigration had been created and it is estimated that half of the Jewish population had left before the outbreak of war. 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 Hitler’s attitude towards the SA between January 1933 and July 1934?

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. Hitler gives an account of the background to the “Night of the Long Knives”.

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. According to Hitler, there was substantial evidence several months before the purge of the SA that its leaders wanted a “second

revolution” and that Röhm was involved in a plot against the Nazi state, prompting Hitler to eventually use terror to suppress a potential uprising due to SA demonstrations in Berlin and Munich. The source gives the perspective of the Nazi regime as it is from the *Führer* himself just over a fortnight after the purge. As a public speech broadcast potentially to the whole nation, its purpose was to not only justify Hitler’s actions concerning the SA, but, especially due to the tone of the statements at the end of the extract, to warn everybody that this dictatorship would not hesitate to use terror to ensure its survival. The source is valuable as it gives the perspective of the Nazi dictator towards the SA.

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 source has several limitations. Firstly, it only gives the Nazi leader’s view about the motives of the SA and therefore could be considered as one-sided. Other sources would need to be consulted to assess whether Hitler’s account could be relied upon, especially from an SA perspective as to whether there was a conspiracy in 1934. Secondly, the address has an element of propaganda about it in that Hitler was going to great lengths to justify his actions to the German public. There may be elements of exaggeration in the speech in terms of the threat posed by the SA as it is doubtful whether it was going to revolt. From their contextual knowledge candidates could clarify what the SA meant by the phrase “second revolution” as Hitler neglects to explain it. While some elements of the SA had anti-capitalist views, others expected the organisation to become the basis of a new German army. Hitler was not prepared to fulfil its demands for fear of antagonising right-wing elements, including the German army and President Hindenburg. Some candidates may point out from their contextual knowledge that Hitler had publicly announced to the SA in the summer of 1933 that there would not be a “second revolution” and that this is another limitation of the source in that its focus is on the year 1934. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess to what extent the “Night of the Long Knives” was the most important factor in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship between 30 January 1933 and 2 August 1934.

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. A superficial awareness of the process by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934 will be revealed. 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 “Night of the Long Knives” was the most important reason for the creation of the Nazi dictatorship in the period 1933–1934.

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 will be a limited selection of evidence to illustrate the significance of the Röhm purge. The SA, led by Ernst Röhm, wanted and expected the Nazi leadership to go further with a “second revolution”. On 30 June 1934 Hitler ruthlessly ordered SS squads to purge the SA which removed a powerful and embarrassing threat to his position. In so doing, he gained support from the army generals, although it was the increasingly influential SS who did the killing. The purge highlights the use of terror. When President Hindenburg died on 2 August 1934, Hitler was able to concentrate his authority by combining the offices of both President and Chancellor. There will be frequent lapses of meaning due to shortcomings in legibility and grammar, with some defects in organisation and 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 gives some information concerning the course and significance of the purge. Source 2 reveals that the army was supportive of the Nazi leadership’s actions during the purge. Source 3 gives information concerning the significance of the purge.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations, such as opinions about the importance of the Röhm purge.

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 will discuss the “Night of the Long Knives” in greater depth and discuss the significance of other factors such as legal means to a limited extent. The SA’s “Second Revolution” envisaged social and economic reforms and the creation of a “people’s army” merging the army and the SA. The ambitions of the SA fundamentally alarmed the conservative forces in Germany. Big business and the army wanted to tame the SA to preserve their own interests. The army was the one organisation that could unseat Hitler from his position of power. Political realities dictated that Hitler had to retain the backing of the army. When it became apparent that President Hindenburg did not have much longer to live, it seems that Hitler’s hand was forced by the need to secure the army’s backing for his succession to Hindenburg. On 30 June 1934, Hitler eliminated the SA as a political and military force. Röhm and the main leaders of the SA were shot by members of the SS, although the weapons and transport were actually provided by the army. Some estimate that 200 people were murdered. The purge secured the army’s support and when Hindenburg died in August, this support was vital in enabling Hitler to take on the role of President as well as Chancellor. The army itself suggested the wording of a new oath of loyalty to its new supreme commander. The oath was to Hitler the person, not to a constitution. Terror had been an important element in the Nazi Party’s efforts to retain political control. Hitler was now a dictator with absolute power. Other factors may be discussed by limited references to the Enabling Law. 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, for example, one source may be neglected. Source 1 gives some information on the background and the importance of the “Night of the Long Knives”. Source 2 illustrates the army’s support for Hitler during the “Night of the Long Knives”. Source 3 is a useful guide to some of the reasons as to why the “Night of the Long Knives” is an important reason in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship in the period 1933–1934.

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 the importance of the Röhm purge in the creation of the Nazi dictatorship in the period 1933–1934.

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 process by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934, not only discussing the significance of the “Night of the Long Knives” in the summer of 1934 in some depth but also discussing other factors such as the legal basis for his dictatorship and the policy of co-ordination in the period before the Röhm purge. This can be done chronologically or thematically. The legal basis of the Nazi dictatorship was based on the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State in February 1933 and the Enabling Law in March 1933. The former was a decree, signed by President Hindenburg in the aftermath of the Reichstag fire, that suspended important civil rights. The Enabling Law was passed by the Reichstag and gave Hitler the power to issue decrees without the approval of the Reichstag. Examples of co-ordination could include the abolition of trade unions in May 1933 when workers were incorporated into the German Labour Front (DAF), the Law against the Formation of Parties in July 1933 which made Germany a one party state and the Law for the Reconstruction of the State in January 1934 which abolished the local federal state governments and centralised power in Berlin. 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. Source 1 can be utilised to reveal the background to the “Night of the Long Knives”. Hitler provides evidence that the SA desired a “second revolution” which was causing tension between the Stormtroopers’ leadership and the Nazi leadership. It also refers to two SA demonstrations in Berlin and Munich which prompted Hitler to authorise the purge on 30 June 1934. It also reveals that Hitler is quite prepared to use terror as an important means by which the regime will maintain power and deal with opposition. Source 2 can be utilised to reveal that the army was grateful that the SA as a rival institution had been suppressed and should stimulate candidates to discuss the role of the

army before, during and after the purge. Source 3 provides substantial evidence for candidates to support the proposition in the question. Layton stresses that the outcome of the purge was advantageous for Hitler as not only had he suppressed the left within his own movement, but his actions accommodated right-wing institutions such as the army which would now be loyal to the regime. Layton also puts emphasis on how the purge increased the significance of the SS within the regime, in particular as the regime’s main instrument of terror. Hitler was able to retrospectively legalise his actions during the purge and his personal position as a dictator. The elimination of the SA had pleased the army so it did not object when Hitler merged the offices of President and Chancellor on 2 August 1934 after the death of Hindenburg.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers could react to the interpretation of Hitler in Source 1 concerning the threat the SA posed to the Nazi regime and the necessity of using terror to eliminate that threat. Answers could also react to the implications of the statements by Layton in this particular extract in Source 3 in relation to the significance of the “Night of the Long Knives” in the process of the Nazis creating a dictatorship in the period 1933–1934. They can concur with Layton’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. Layton gives credibility to the proposition in the question by stressing the significance of the Röhm purge. However, candidates would be expected to weigh up the significance of this factor in relation to others, such as the “Legal Revolution” and the co-ordination of groups and institutions which were also important factors in the process by which the Nazis created a dictatorship in the years 1933–1934. Other historians would suggest that, to understand how the dictatorship was created, it would be necessary to appreciate that it is a combination of all the factors. Others argue that the use of terror, revealed in the “Night of the Long Knives” in 1934, was more significant than the use of legality, through a measure such as the Enabling Law in 1933, or a policy of co-ordination, such as that of the workers through the creation of the German Labour Front in 1933.

[35]

Option 5

Total

48

60

60