



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2013**

History

Assessment Unit AS 1

[AH111]

MONDAY 3 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

Mark schemes are published to assist teachers and students in their preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

The Purpose of Mark Schemes

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of students in schools and colleges.

The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and the mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes, therefore, are regarded as part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all the markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

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 causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace.

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 produce a narrative account of the Pilgrimage of Grace. There will be little reference to the causes of the rebellion. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some comments on the main reasons why the Pilgrimage of Grace occurred, such as the concerns regarding religious change. The rebels protested against the dissolution of the monasteries. They viewed themselves as defending the old religion. 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 reasons why the Pilgrimage of Grace occurred. For example, after the dissolution of the smaller monasteries the people were fearful of what was to follow. There were rumours that greater reform would occur. There was also a dislike of Cranmer. Answers may also mention economic reasons why the Pilgrimage of Grace occurred. At this time there was an increase in taxation, as well as a poor harvest. 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 a variety of causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace. Ordinary people were concerned about the old religion and feared what was to follow. Rumours suggested that there would be a tax imposed on the taking of sacraments. There was also fear that landlords were going to increase rents. There were economic problems which were intensified by the bad harvests of 1535 and 1536 and also the continual problem of enclosures. Political causes were at the heart of the rebellion. Many of the leaders were unhappy about government intervention and, as gentry, feared for their positions and influence with the King. There was also great opposition to the rise of Cromwell in terms of his position and how he had achieved it. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing will be most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- (b) Explain the role played by the Duke of Northumberland in the Edwardian religious reforms of 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 observe that since Northumberland was a Protestant and as both he and Edward were of the new faith, they would establish a Protestant Church. 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 religious legislation Northumberland produced. In 1550 he set about creating a fully Protestant Church. He ordered the removal of all images, as well as the traditional vestments. In 1552 he established the second Edwardian Prayer Book which removed all

traces of Catholicism. The 42 Articles created Protestant doctrine. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing may be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little use of specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider the importance of Northumberland and his role in reforming the Church of England. Northumberland advanced Protestantism not because he was a great reformer but to advance his career. Since he had gained power because of support from the Reform faction, he had to deliver greater reform. He knew that Edward wanted a Protestant Church and that this would increase the power of the Crown. Unlike Somerset, the Prayer Book clearly defined the new Church doctrine. Transubstantiation was denied. Altars were replaced with communion tables. The second Act of Uniformity extended Protestant doctrine. 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 role played by Northumberland in Edwardian religious reforms. He was clearly working under Edward's instructions and introduced a clearly defined Protestant Church. This is reflected in his legislation such as the 1552 Prayer Book and the 42 Articles of 1553. Northumberland introduced Protestant doctrine, as well as the appearance of a Protestant Church. He also replaced conservative Bishops with reformers. Woodcuts were used to educate the masses in the new Church. A greater emphasis was placed on preaching and teaching. Northumberland played a significant role in the Edwardian Reformation, not for religious purposes but to strengthen his own position. He tried to exclude Mary and Elizabeth from the throne for political rather than religious reasons. 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 opposition Elizabeth I faced to her religious policies in England in the period 1559–1570?

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, the source tells us that Elizabeth faced opposition from outside and inside her kingdom.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, this source was written by Count Feria to Philip II in May 1559. Feria claims that, if the Pope knows what is happening in England, he may take action against Elizabeth. He also informs Philip that not everyone in England is happy with the changes she is making. Unlike Henry VIII, she does not have the full support of her people. Feria refers to opposition within Parliament and also in the country.

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, Count Feria is writing a private letter to Philip II. He has been given instructions to assess the situation in England and remind Elizabeth of the role Philip played in her accession. He is giving an eye witness account of the situation in England at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign in 1559. It is useful because it gives us an insight into how the situation is viewed by a foreign visitor. Feria has no reason to exaggerate the situation or mislead Philip. He is aware that there will be opposition from the Pope and many within England. The tone is informative. It suggests that he believes that all is not well for Elizabeth as she faces danger from foreign countries, as well as discontent from her Parliament and people.

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. Feria, as an ambassador, is a useful commentator since he is not only a frequent visitor to the Elizabethan Court but also has knowledge of the previous Catholic Court under Mary I. Therefore, as a private letter, the source provides an honest assessment of the situation in England. Feria can compare the atmosphere and popularity of both Queens. In 1559 Elizabeth had just inherited the throne. Many of Mary's bishops remained in office at this time. This is evident when he mentions that she had little ecclesiastical support. Elizabeth faced some opposition from Parliament. Marian bishops voiced their opposition from the Lords, while some Puritan members of the Commons felt that her settlement was not going far enough. Much of

the country was in a state of confusion and unsure what religious practices to follow. This may be due to the ambiguity of the Elizabethan Settlement. Philip is keen to assess the situation and wishes to bring England back to Catholicism. This is evident by his reasoning with the Pope, preventing Elizabeth's excommunication until 1570. The source does have limitations. It is at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign when her Settlement has not been finalised. She was aware of early opposition and acknowledged it when she revised her Settlement. It does not mention threats against Elizabeth, but merely suggests that the Pope and some within England are disgruntled about her actions. It does not mention any specific groups within Parliament or the Church who opposed her religious policies. Parliament was gradually becoming more confident in expressing its opinions. The clergy in Winchester were not necessarily typical representatives of the attitude of Church leaders throughout the country. Feria is an eye witness but since he is not privy to the hearts and minds of the English, he cannot necessarily make an accurate assessment of the opposition to Elizabeth I. In order to obtain a top Level 4 mark, relevant contextual knowledge must be included in the answer. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the Elizabethan Church Settlement was motivated by a desire for financial and political security.

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 give a narrative account of the Elizabethan Church Settlement. This will largely focus on the legislation of the settlement rather than its motivation. 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 Elizabeth's Settlement was more to do with financial and political security.

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 reasons behind the Settlement. Elizabeth was a Protestant and had a Protestant upbringing. She was greatly influenced by her mother, Anne Boleyn, and Catherine Parr. However, she was more concerned with internal security than the religious beliefs of her population. It was vital for her to establish herself and control her people. Elizabeth also wished to obtain the wealth a Protestant Church would bring. A variety of factors may be mentioned but there may be little focus on the question. 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 tells us that Elizabeth was facing some opposition to her Settlement but does not directly mention its motivation. Source 2 informs us that, since it was assumed that Elizabeth would reverse Mary's policies, her motivation is religious. Source 3 informs us that religion was also going to be a problem Elizabeth faced and, because of this, it is difficult to assess what her religious belief was.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary or later interpretations. For example, answers may mention that some contemporaries viewed Elizabeth as a Protestant and believed that this was what motivated her in her Settlement. Later interpretations believe that she was not motivated by religion.

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. The answer will focus more clearly on the question and deal in some detail with the financial and political reasons for the Church Settlement. Elizabeth was in a vulnerable position, a female monarch following the disastrous reign of another female, Mary I. Her legitimacy was in question. Since she needed internal security above all else, she placed political motivation above personal religious desires. She had learnt from

previous monarchs how a religious settlement could be used. She wanted to emulate the wealth Henry VIII had achieved from the Reformation. This is what motivated her to establish a Protestant Settlement. 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 highlights the threats Elizabeth potentially faced. A Protestant Church would upset the Pope, as well as Catholics in England. Source 2 states that Elizabeth saw the financial value of a Protestant Church, as well as the political benefits of no longer being under the power of the Pope. Source 3 states that, even though Elizabeth I is the daughter of Anne Boleyn, it is difficult to assess her religious outlook.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, many contemporaries believed that the Church Settlement was a reflection of Elizabeth's personal beliefs and many Catholics were unhappy with this. Later opinions have drawn attention to how complex the Settlement was and argued that it can be viewed as an instrument to increase political security.

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 a variety of factors which influenced Elizabeth's Church Settlement. As a Protestant it was obvious that Elizabeth I was going to produce a Protestant Settlement. There were few benefits to remaining Catholic. Mary's reign had been disastrous and marred by her persecutions. Reformers were waiting for Elizabeth's Church Settlement and she had a genuine sympathy for them. She disliked many aspects of the Catholic Church. However, Elizabeth was also well aware of the political benefits of a Protestant Settlement. It would increase her power, while religious uniformity would help to control her people. England would be its own powerful entity. At the heart of it, Elizabeth put the stability of the country before her personal convictions. Candidates may also refer to the lessons Elizabeth learnt from previous reigns and the need for a middle way. They may mention how she wished to follow in her father's footsteps and strengthen the English economy through her Settlement. A Protestant Settlement would provide her with the wealth of the Church. They may also link her Settlement with foreign relations and observe that, regardless of

Elizabeth’s own religious beliefs, she needed to ensure that no foreign invasion was launched. Candidates may conclude that Elizabeth established a Protestant Church Settlement but her motivation was political and financial rather than religious. Answers at this level will be consistently characterised throughout by clarity of meaning due to legibility, accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar; the style of writing is most appropriate; there is very good organisation and appropriate use of specialist vocabulary.

AO2(a):

SOURCES ([10]–[12]): Answers will fully evaluate the sources in the context of the enquiry, using this information to inform the response. Answers will interpret the sources with complete understanding and use them with contextual knowledge to provide a comprehensive assessment. Source 1 is useful as it is from a foreign commentator who believes that Elizabeth’s Settlement could produce much opposition inside and outside England. He says little about her motivation but implies that, since she did not want to create great opposition to her Settlement, she was motivated by a desire for political security. Source 2 highlights what Elizabeth regards as the advantages of a Protestant Settlement. She not only wanted to achieve popularity and power but was also motivated by financial considerations. By establishing a Protestant Church she would benefit financially. It implies that doctrine is of little concern to Elizabeth. Source 3 looks at Elizabeth’s personal aims and states that, while she had little interest in doctrine, she was much more concerned with the internal stability of England. The situation was complex and therefore religion could not be the only motivation for establishing a Protestant Church.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers may refer to the fact that there was discontent from some of Elizabeth’s Catholic and Protestant contemporaries. Catholics believed that she was motivated by religion and had gone too far, while some reformers argued that she had not gone far enough. Elizabeth herself showed little concern for religion but demanded uniformity to increase her political stability. She also wished to gain financially just as her father had done. Therefore she was motivated by political and financial reasons. Later opinion suggests that Elizabeth was not concerned with religion. Her main aim was internal security and political stability. [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 aims of Charles I's religious policies in the period of his Personal Rule (1629–1640).

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 aims of Charles I's religious policies. The meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some explanation of the aims of Charles I's religious policies. He appointed William Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury, reflecting a move away from Calvinism and towards Arminianism. Laud and Charles sought to diminish the influence of Puritans, beautify the liturgy and enforce uniformity in the English Church. 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 be more detailed and show a greater awareness of the aims of Charles I's religious policies in the period 1629–1640. Charles shared Laud's belief that worship should reflect "the beauty of holiness" and sought to make the worship of the Church of England more dignified. As a result, priests were instructed to wear surplices and improve church fabric. Charles also wished to give more prominence to the sacraments than to preaching, which explains the controversial "altar policy". This was in stark contrast to Puritan clergy who emphasised the centrality of Bible teaching over ceremony. Charles was determined to silence Puritan criticism and, indeed, to root out all opposition within

the Church. He sought to use the Court of High Commission to strengthen the Church's power to deal with internal opponents and to enforce uniformity on the Church. 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 aims of Charles I's religious policy in the period 1629–1640. He aimed to enhance the status of the clergy in England and strengthen their ability to impose discipline on the English people. Episcopal visitations were used to ensure full compliance with religious policy, priests were appointed as JPs and bishops were given senior positions on the Privy Council. Charles hoped to create a better educated clergy, working not only to increase the proportion of clergy with university degrees but also to eradicate Puritan influence in Cambridge and Oxford. He also aimed to reduce the control of the laity over the Church. He attacked the Feoffees and supported Laud's campaign against weekday sermons, which were sponsored by laymen. Candidates may also comment on Charles's desire to create religious uniformity across his three kingdoms. 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 search for a settlement with King Charles I between 1646 and 1649 was unsuccessful.

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 why the search for a settlement with King Charles I failed. The meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some explanation of the failure of the search for a settlement. Charles stubbornly refused to compromise in negotiations and demonstrated himself to be untrustworthy. This led senior officers in the New Model Army to seek alternatives. Together with some MPs, they forced a trial and execution. 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 be more detailed and show a greater awareness of the reasons for the failure to reach a settlement between 1646 and 1649. Charles refused to accept that he had been defeated and refused to engage in meaningful negotiations on the Newcastle Propositions or the Heads of Proposals. In particular, he was unwilling to sacrifice leading Royalists and was determined to preserve the Church of England. There were also deep divisions in parliament. The Presbyterians favoured a quick and generous settlement with the King but were unable to assert their will. Instead, the New Model Army, supported by political independents in parliament, seized the initiative and launched its own negotiations with Charles. The King's decision to sign the Engagement with the Scots, which led to the Second Civil War, precipitated a complete breakdown in the relationship between King and Army, rendering the search for a settlement effectively obsolete. 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 reasons why the search for a settlement with Charles I failed in the period 1646–1649. Charles appears to have embraced the notion of a martyr's death, which made him unwilling to negotiate seriously. This is reflected even in his reluctance to defend himself during his trial in 1648. This level of obstinacy made it difficult for his opponents to reach a settlement, despite their earnest desire to do so. This desire even existed among the officers and men of the New Model Army, but was eroded by Charles's willingness to fight a second war. Candidates might also explore the role played by the Levellers in making a

settlement more difficult. As their ideas of equality and republicanism spread among some sections of the rank and file, Cromwell was less able to make concessions to the King. The army was also committed to the idea of religious liberty, which the King was unwilling to accept, making a settlement even more difficult. Finally, by the Spring of 1648, many in the Army believed that Divine Providence had revealed its opposition to the continued reign of Charles I. He became “that man of blood” with whom negotiation was impossible. 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 English attitudes towards Spain during the reign of James I?

This question targets AO2(a): as part of the historical enquiry, 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 James I believed that peace with Spain was in the best interests of his country.

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 the English were weary of the “long and most cruel war” with Spain. The treaty also indicates that the delegates believed that they were engaged in a “holy task” and that peace between England and Spain was in God’s will.

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 authors of the source include leading members of the English Privy Council such as Robert Cecil and Thomas Sackville. Both men were well informed about English foreign policy and the impact of the war on royal finances, as Sackville was Lord Treasurer and Cecil was Secretary of State. The Treaty also represented the view of the English government and King James I himself. The religious language is of interest, as many devout Protestants were opposed to peace with Spain on religious grounds. It is also useful to note that the source makes explicit reference to the economic benefits of peace. As the source was written in 1604, it is

useful for ascertaining James's views on England's relationship with Spain at the beginning of his reign. The reference to the misery of war at the beginning of the source suggests that many in England shared the King's view that, at this stage, the war was no longer profitable.

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. In order to obtain a top Level 4 mark, relevant contextual knowledge must be included in the answer. The source was written by Englishmen and Spaniards and so may not accurately reflect the views of either the English people or even the English delegates. The English court was, throughout James's reign, deeply divided on policy towards Spain, but the source does not reflect these divisions. As it was produced in 1604, it might be held to accurately reflect James's attitude towards Spain at that stage, but James's attitude changed, particularly after the Spanish invasion of the Palatinate in 1621 and the collapse of marriage negotiations in 1623. As the source was a public document, the authors had good reason to obscure any divisions that might have existed between the delegates. Instead, the emphasis is on the benefits of peace and on James's conviction that peacemaking was his divinely appointed mission. This, however, may be intended to flatter the King and to serve as propaganda, and may not reflect the views of the English delegates or the majority of the English people. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which James I's foreign policy was a failure in the period 1603–1625.

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

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 may comment on the fact that war broke out in 1618 despite James's efforts to mediate, and he was unable to restore Frederick to the Palatinate. 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 as to the extent to which the foreign policy of James I was a failure.

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 James's failure to achieve some of his foreign policy objectives. 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 indicates James's strong desire for peace between England and Spain, and across Europe. In Source 2 the Venetian ambassador confirms that James still desires peace, stating that he had "a hatred of war" and preferred negotiations to conflict, but it is clear that the peace is now threatened. Source 3 gives a fuller analysis of James's foreign policy and praises the King's reluctance to engage in a religious war.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, many MPs favoured a more "Protestant" foreign policy.

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 James failed to prevent war from breaking out in 1618, although he did enjoy earlier success as a mediator. The negotiations to secure a Spanish Match, which provoked so much opposition in 1621, also failed, ending in the farce of the 1623 Madrid Expedition. After the return of Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham, James came under pressure to adopt an anti-Spanish policy. He acquiesced and allowed Buckingham to negotiate a series of anti-Habsburg alliances, including a deeply unpopular marriage treaty with France.

James's foreign policy ended in failure, with the Mansfeld Expedition having led to nothing more than an expensive and embarrassing debacle. 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 highlights one of James's most significant foreign policy successes. Source 2, however, which was produced in the context of a Spanish occupation of the Palatinate, reveals that the hoped-for benefits of peace with Spain have not all materialised. The ambassador is sceptical of James's chances of restoring Frederick to the Palatinate, and also mentions James's lack of funds. Source 3 argues that James's pro-Spanish, pacifist policy was rational but criticises him for his failure to follow it consistently.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, while English merchants, especially the London companies, were generally positive about peace with Spain in 1604, Puritans were deeply opposed to it. In 1621, MPs urged the King to break off negotiations with Spain, but James deeply resented their interference in foreign policy.

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 James I's foreign policy failed. His policy in Europe did fail, although this was not entirely James's fault. The Spanish Match also failed to materialise, but this was as much due to Spanish duplicity as English diplomacy. James, however, secured a significant number of foreign policy successes, particularly in the early years of his reign. The Treaty of London brought considerable commercial and diplomatic benefits, as did the Truce of Antwerp, although candidates may point out that the Truce did allow England's rivals to consolidate their power. James also succeeded in his ambition to use the marriage of his children to win influence in both Catholic and Protestant Europe. The marriage of Elizabeth to Frederick was a diplomatic coup, although it did entangle England in European affairs after 1618. James also achieved success as a mediator in the Jülich-Cleves dispute, which he helped to resolve by 1614. 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 provides the context for much of James’s foreign policy. He desired peace in “Christian Europe” and did play a significant role in preserving peace before 1618. Source 2 illustrates the impact of the Thirty Years’ War on English foreign policy. James now faced war in order to restore the Palatinate but lacked the funds or the will to achieve success. Source 3 praises James’s desire for peace but criticises his change of policy in the 1620s. Davies questions whether it was wise for James even to attempt to secure a restoration of the Palatinate, suggesting it was not in England’s national interests.

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 attitudes to English foreign policy. Contemporary opinion could be ascribed to any Member of Parliament, merchant or minister of James’s government, or to members of foreign governments. Answers may refer to the opinion of the Venetian ambassador, expressed in Source 2, which appears to contradict the impression, given in Source 1, that James was considering war in 1621. Answers may exploit the content of Source 3 to explain the interpretation that James’s foreign policy was inconsistent. Later interpretations may take the form of historians’ opinions on James’s foreign policy. Whig historians join Davies in criticising James and would go further, while more recent historians present a more positive analysis. Candidates should provide interpretations by way of appropriate comments that attempt to assess the extent to which James failed in achieving his objectives in foreign policy. [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 how the Tory Governments between 1815 and 1827 responded to the economic problems England faced.

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 will 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 response of the Tories to the economic problems England faced between 1815 and 1827. Answers at this level will be inaccurate or demonstrate superficial understanding. Meaning may not always be clear because of illegible text, inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and/or grammar, or the structure and organisation of ideas and points made within the response.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level 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 a limited account of the Tory response to England's economic problems. They may, for example, deal with their actions in relation to such problems as the need to improve trade and reform the banking system. 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. For example, there will be a competent awareness of the Tory response to economic problems. Answers will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors. Import duties were reduced on a wide range of raw materials and other goods, such as cotton, silk, linen, tea, books and glassware. The Reciprocity Act of 1823 removed restrictions on trade with Britain's colonies which were restricted by the Navigation Laws of the 17th century; they could now trade directly with foreign countries for the first time, instead of having all such trade having to pass through Britain first. The Joint Stock Banking Act of 1826 changed the banking system. Henceforth only the Bank of England could issue notes, and joint stock

banks could be established. The Bullion Committee of 1819 recommended the resumption of cash payments by the Bank of England, and the return to the gold standard was completed in 1822. 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 identify economic problems, as well as the Tory response. The Corn Laws impacted on domestic bread prices, even though they were introduced with the intention of protecting what was perceived to be the most vital economic interest in England, namely, agriculture. British merchants were hampered by numerous tariffs and long-standing restrictions impacted on their capacity to compete with foreign competitors. The end of war in 1815 presented the problem of how to raise money by some other means than income tax, which had been originally introduced to finance the wars against France. Reform of the Bank of England and the banking system was needed to ensure confidence in the financial system. Robinson as Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced £12 million of tax cuts. The Corn Laws were suspended during the economic crisis of 1825–1826. Income tax was abolished in 1816 and replaced by indirect tax. Huskisson believed that the fewer economic restrictions there were, the more successfully the nation's economy would develop. Hence the government reduced import duties by varying amounts on a wide range of raw materials. Trade restrictions on trade with Britain's colonies were abolished. 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 with appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

- (b) Explain the impact of the social and economic reforms of Peel's Second Ministry between 1841 and 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 **AO1(b)**.

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

Answers at this level will 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 make some vague comments about the social and economic

reforms of Peel's Ministry. 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 answers contain some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide a limited account of some of the social and economic reforms of Peel's Ministry. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation or grammar; at times the style of writing may be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis of the impact of the reforms of Peel's Ministry. Answers will begin to consider the importance of a range of factors. Such answers may refer to the Mines Act of 1842, which forbade the employment of females in mines, and of boys under the age of ten. However, the provision of only one inspector to enforce the terms of the Act was inadequate. Moreover, the Act said nothing about safety in mines and there continued to be regular explosions and disasters. There was also a Factory Act of 1844. Economically, there may be reference to Peel's free trade measures and the Bank Charter Act. This Act brought stability to the banking system and the issuing of bank notes. English currency now became more stable and London was regarded as the world's leading monetary centre. 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 show full awareness of both social and economic reforms, pointing out their impact. The promptings of Shaftesbury contributed to Peel's reforms to ease the disgraceful conditions in some factories, mines and industrial towns, so in this sense much of the credit can be attributed to the former. The Factory Act required dangerous machinery to be fenced. To boost trade, Peel's budgets of 1842 and 1845 swept away a large proportion of duties, leading to a trade revival, an increase in exports and a fall in unemployment. To offset the fall in government revenue by reducing tariffs, Peel re-introduced income tax in 1842. The Companies Act ensured tighter controls over the creation of companies which had to

be officially registered and issue regular accounts. However, the Act did not apply to railway companies which had special approval from parliament, and here bad practice continued. 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 with appropriate use of specialist vocabulary. [12]

12

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is it as evidence for an historian studying attitudes towards parliamentary reform in the early 1830s?

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 raised by the question. For example, they may refer to some of the arguments used by Russell to justify the Reform Bill.

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, Source 1 reveals the motives behind the Whig motion for parliamentary reform, and identifies some of the electoral anomalies which the legislation addresses.

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 comes from Russell, one of the most senior members of the Whig Party, which contributes to its value. Moreover, since he is introducing the bill in Parliament, Russell has to outline clearly all of its merits in order to persuade his audience. Russell's obvious commitment to the cause of parliamentary reform makes this source valuable for appreciating the pro-reform argument. Answers may reflect that Russell had in mind another audience outside parliament, namely public opinion. The content of the source adds credence to its value, as it summarises many of the pro-reform arguments. The Bill will add 500 000 voters to the franchise. These newly enfranchised voters, all of whom own property, will become more wedded to the constitution. Moreover, participation in the electoral process will provide an extra inducement for the rest of the community to work hard. The bill is needed to urgently restore confidence in the institutions of parliament which have "gone for ever". Additionally, the bill will address the question of those "large flourishing towns" which have no representatives in parliament.

Level 4 ([10]–[13])

Answers should 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. In order to achieve a top Level 4 mark, relevant contextual knowledge must be included in the answer. A key merit of the source lies in its authorship, since the bill is sponsored by one of its greatest advocates. The source outlines the merits of reform: increasing confidence in the constitution, widening participation of those of good conduct, as well as redressing long-established electoral grievances. Answers will also identify the limitations of the source. Firstly, it confines itself solely to the merits of the Bill. Critics also said that Britain's place in the world vindicated the strength of its existing institutions. In fact, this Bill only passed its second reading in the House of Commons by a majority of one, only to be defeated at the Committee stage. Moreover, the source is vague about how the "flourishing towns" in England are to be represented. Additionally, the means by which new voters could enjoy the franchise is implicit, rather than explicit. Russell links the entitlement to vote to the morals of the individual who is apparently hard working and law abiding. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 changed the parliamentary system in England.

This question targets AO1(b): 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 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. The answer may comment on the fact that the Parliamentary Reform Act brought some changes to the electoral system. 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 as to the extent of the changes brought about by the Parliamentary Reform Act.

AO2(b):

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

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. For example, there may be a vague account of some of the changes made by the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. 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. Source 1 suggests that the Reform Act will increase confidence in the constitution, and widen the franchise to a hardworking and deserving section of the community. Source 2 raises concerns about the long-term impact of reform. Source 3 presents a synopsis of what changed and what remained the same.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, the answer may include comments from Whig supporters.

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

KNOWLEDGE ([7]–[9]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are developed and substantiated. Answers may display an imbalance when assessing the impact of the Reform Act. For example, there may be a stronger focus on changes made by the Act with less comment on what remained the same. There were changes to parliamentary representation, as 56 boroughs lost both MPs. Thirty boroughs lost one of their MPs, while the double borough of Weymouth and Melcombe Regis lost two of its four members. Overall, 143 seats became available for redistribution. Most of these seats were redistributed to English counties and to the new industrial towns. The Reform Act made two further important innovations. First, all eligible voters had to have their names on the electoral register. Secondly, polling was limited to two days. The increased size of the franchise, together with the requirements for the registration of all electors, was a major stimulus to permanent party organisation at both a national and local level. Electors often needed help in getting onto the register and soon party agents were appointed to provide this service.

The Tories established the Carlton Club in 1832 and the Whigs, the Reform Club in 1836. F. R. Bonham was one of the earliest and most celebrated party agents, whose work contributed to the Conservative success in the general elections of 1837 and 1841. The electorate rose from just under 500 000 to 813 000 after the Reform Act. However, only one in seven adult males could vote. There were still significant discrepancies in the size of constituencies because property rather than population had been the principal feature of electoral recalculation in 1832. 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 indicates the changes which the Reform Bill was expected to deliver: reducing electoral expenses, restoring confidence in the constitution, and enfranchising those who had worked hard and contributed to the community. Source 3 is a retrospective view of how far these aspirations were realised. While the vote was given to the “respectable classes”, parliament and political life continued to be the preserve of the landed classes. Source 2 suggests that the Act will have an adverse impact on the political system by undermining the power of the Crown and paving the way for the near certainty of more reform in the future.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis of contemporary **and** later interpretations of this subject. For example, answers could provide the opinions that lobbied for some form of parliamentary reform – such as the middle class or the working class – or present the views of those critics who believed that any such reform was dangerous to the constitution.

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

KNOWLEDGE (10)–[12]: Answers at this level will consistently recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Explanation, analysis and judgements are very well developed and substantiated. Top level responses will provide a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the Parliamentary Reform Act on the parliamentary system in England.

Changes involved an increase in the franchise, as well as an alteration to voting qualifications, with a uniform qualification of £10 in the boroughs. All voters had to register, thus forcing parties to organise on a nationwide basis. More formal party organisation and structure, both locally and nationally, led to increased party discipline and a decline in

the number of independent MPs. In the long term, the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 ensured that patronage effectively came through the political party rather than through the great families. The £10 franchise benefited the rising middle class, who were now more wedded to the constitution and detached from the working class. The Act severely restricted the power the Crown had in influencing events at Westminster. In addition, the crisis over the passing of the Reform Act revealed the failure of the monarchy to deliver a majority in parliament at a time of political tension: William IV was forced to rely on Grey after Wellington's failure to form a ministry in May 1832. Put simply, a ministry could now survive without the support of the Crown and Lords but not without the support of the Commons.

Aspects of the parliamentary system remained unchanged. The South of England was still over-represented, while the North and Midlands were under-represented. The working classes were still unenfranchised. Bribery and corruption still continued. There was no secret ballot until 1872, so voting remained a public act for quite some time. The "influencing" of voters continued unabated. The aristocracy and land-owning classes continued to have an influential role in politics, since most middle-class men could not afford the cost of being an MP. There were at least 50 boroughs in England where members of the local gentry could nominate the MP. Up to 1858, county members had to possess a landed estate of £600. Politics was an expensive business, indicated by the fact that between 1832 and 1867, only 52% of elections were actually contested.

Answers should examine the extent of the impact of the Act and come to a reasoned conclusion. Good responses may reflect that the mere passing of the Act ensured that 1832 would be the first step towards democracy. 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 outlines Russell's aspirations for the Act, which are only partly achieved. The "respectable classes" in Source 3 correlate with Russell's wishes for those of hard work and good conduct. The limitations of the Act set out in Source 3 are highlighted by Russell's reference to "all the people" demanding reform. Peel's comments foretell a disaster which has some substance. The Crown was diminished, and the great majority of people did not prosper. Peel's fears for further reform are endorsed by Source 3's final comment.

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 Russell in Source 1 concerning the anomalies of the parliamentary system. Answers could also react to the interpretation given by Peel in Source 2 regarding his warnings for parliamentary democracy if the existing system was tampered with. Answers could also respond to the interpretation provided in Source 3 which provided a retrospective analysis of the implications of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. Answers may concur with these views, qualify them, or present a conflicting opinion. Answers should provide both contemporary and later opinions regarding the significance of the Reform Act. Contemporary opinion could come from any political figure or representative of middle class or working class sentiment on reform. Answers could indicate the expectations of these groups and their subsequent feelings when the excitement of the manner of the passing of the Reform Act had subsided and the realities of the Act's implications became apparent. Later opinion may come from historians' views, many of whom have debated the nature of what the Reform Act changed what aspects of the parliamentary system which remained unchanged, while others have reflected upon the significance of the manner of the passing of the Act. Candidates may provide **interpretations** on the impact of the Reform Act. [35]

48

Option 3

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 reasons for the failure of the revolutions which broke out in the German 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 reasons for the failure of the revolutions which broke out in the German 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 reasons for the failure of the revolutions in the German states in 1848. They may refer to the divisions among the revolutionaries and the fact that the armies continued to be loyal to the rulers of the German states throughout the revolutionary period between March 1848 and April 1849. However, there will be significant gaps and omissions. Answers at this level may have some lapses in meaning due to inaccurate spelling, punctuation and/or grammar; at times the style of writing will be inappropriate; there may be occasional defects in organisation and little specialist vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to consider a range of factors. They will explore some of the weaknesses of the Frankfurt Parliament. They may refer to the academic nature of the Parliament, observing that some 80 per cent of its delegates were graduates, while there were only four artisans and one peasant. The Parliament had little interest in meeting the economic grievances of the peasants and artisans even though they had played an important role in the revolutions of 1848. It took the Frankfurt Parliament almost a year to draft a constitution and in this time the revolution lost momentum. The Parliament was divided over many issues, the most

important of which was whether Austria should be excluded from the future Germany. Significantly, 74% of Catholic deputies opposed the exclusion of Austria, while 71% of Protestants supported it. There were also regional divisions among the deputies; the majority of those from Prussia and the North German states supported a “Little Germany”, while most of the South German states demanded the inclusion of Austria in Germany. Responses may also refer to the growing strength of the counter-revolutionary forces during the second half of 1848 and the refusal of the Prussian King, Frederick William IV, to accept the offer to become King of Germany in March 1849. 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. Responses may focus more closely on the shortcomings of the leaders of the Frankfurt Parliament such as Heinrich von Gagern, who was appointed Head of the Provisional Government in December 1848. Answers may observe that, as well as religious and regional divisions among the revolutionaries, there were also ideological differences between the Liberals and Radicals, especially in Southern Germany, where Friedrich Hecker briefly proclaimed the establishment of a republic in Constance in April 1848. Responses may also note that the rulers of the German states were able to regain control during the second half of 1848 by a dual strategy of making some concessions, while also employing coercive measures. For example, in Berlin public works schemes were introduced to help the unemployed, while, on the other hand, the Civic Guard shot peaceful demonstrators in October 1848. 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 reasons for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870.

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 reasons for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. 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 contain some coherent information about the reasons for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, providing, for example, a partial account of Bismarck's role in the outbreak of the war and some reference to the shortcomings of the political leaders of France. 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 are likely to present a more detailed discussion of the Hohenzollern Candidature, the immediate cause of the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, and the importance of Bismarck's editing of the Ems telegram. When Queen Isabella of Spain was deposed by a revolution in September 1868, there was no obvious candidate to replace her and in February 1870 the Spanish Government offered the throne to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. This offer had to be approved by William I of Prussia as he was the head of the Hohenzollern family. The King, recognising that Napoleon was alarmed at this development, wanted to withhold his agreement, but Bismarck persuaded him to change his mind. Fearing that France would be surrounded by hostile neighbours, Napoleon demanded that Leopold's candidature was withdrawn. William I agreed but refused to give the apology demanded by the French or confirm that he would never again support Leopold's candidature. On 13 July the King's secretary sent Bismarck a telegram from Ems which the Minister-President edited to make the King's rejection of French demands more uncompromising. France responded by declaring war on Prussia. Responses may also begin to explain some of the other reasons for the outbreak of the war such as the inept French diplomacy and the impact of public opinion on the actions of the political elites in France. 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 are likely to present a comprehensive assessment of the reasons for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War. They may refer to the meeting between Bismarck and Napoleon III at Biarritz in October 1865. Napoleon gained the impression from this meeting that, if France remained neutral in the Austro-Prussian War, it would receive part of the Rhineland. However, after Prussia's victory, Bismarck rejected this claim, suggesting instead that France might seek to expand its territory in Luxemburg. The Prussian Minister-President then referred to Luxemburg as German and provoked anti-French sentiments throughout the German states. The Luxemburg crisis provides the background to the conflict over the Hohenzollern Candidature. They may focus on the Ems telegram and analyse Bismarck's motives for editing it. They may observe that, prior to his editing of the telegram, Bismarck had secured promises of support from the South German states in the event of a war with France. Anti-French sentiments were widespread among the ordinary population of Baden, Württemberg and, to a lesser degree, Bavaria, and this persuaded their governments to support Prussia against France in 1870. Answers at this level will also discuss the responsibility of Napoleon III and his ministers for the outbreak of the war. They may refer to the impetuous and aggressive attitude of the French Foreign Minister, the Duke of Gramont, to Prussia and explain how France's diplomatic humiliation by Bismarck in 1866 led to pressure on its leaders to stand up to Prussia in 1870. 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 attitude of France in 1858 to Cavour's plans for the expansion of Piedmont in Northern Italy?

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. Constantino Nigra is sending the Prime Minister of Piedmont-Sardinia a secret telegram outlining the response of Emperor Napoleon III to Cavour's letter about close co-operation between Piedmont and France against Austria.

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 secret telegram on a highly confidential issue to Camillo Cavour from his trusted personal representative in Paris. Its usefulness is enhanced by the fact that official diplomatic channels have been ignored. The tone of the source is measured and restrained. It shows the positive response of Emperor Napoleon III to Cavour's plans for close co-operation between Piedmont and France. In particular, Napoleon appears to promise "French support for Piedmont in the event of a war against Austria", as well as the expansion of Piedmont in Northern Italy. He also endorses the proposal for the marriage of his nephew to the daughter of the King of Piedmont-Sardinia. Another strength of the source is that it shows the impact of public opinion on French foreign policy because Napoleon makes it clear that he would not go war unless a "plausible motive" was found.

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. In order to obtain a top Level 4 mark, relevant contextual knowledge must be included in the answer. Answers at this level may point out that France was a revisionist power in 1858 which was willing to support Piedmont against the custodian of the territorial status quo, Austria. Candidates may also use their contextual knowledge to point out that Napoleon III, like Cavour, enjoyed clandestine negotiations and both men were known for their conspiratorial personalities. In fact, they later held secret face-to-face negotiations at Plombières on 20 July 1858. However, the source also has a number of important limitations. Since the content of the telegram is based on a conversation between Cavour's personal representative and the Emperor's private doctor, who himself is reporting on Napoleon's response to Cavour's letter, there is ample scope for misunderstandings, misinterpretations and differences in emphasis. In other words, minutes of a face-to-face meeting between Cavour and Napoleon would have been a more reliable source of evidence than an intermediary's interpretation of what Napoleon's doctor reported. Another limitation of the source is its vagueness. Nigra himself admits that "the Emperor does

not provide any more details” and good candidates may observe that it makes no mention of Napoleon’s demand for Piedmont to hand over Savoy and Nice to France in exchange for French support in the war against Austria. A third limitation is that the source only represents the opinion of one person, albeit Emperor Napoleon III, and his views may not have been held by the political classes in France. [13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess the extent to which the unification of most of Italy by 1860 was due to the assistance Piedmont received from France.

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(a):** 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. It may make vague remarks about the unification of most of Italy by 1860. 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 about the extent to which the unification of most of Italy by 1860 was due to the assistance Piedmont received from France.

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 importance of the role played by France in the unification of most of Italy by 1860. 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 Emperor Napoleon III's apparent willingness to support Piedmont in a war against Austria in 1858. Source 2 confirms that Piedmont defeated Austria with the help of France in the war of 1859 but places emphasis on Cavour's diplomatic skills. Source 3 reinforces both of these points but also refers to the favourable international climate in 1859.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): Answers at this level will have some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations of the subject. They may refer to comments by Cavour or other leading contemporary Italian politicians about the importance of France in bringing about the unification of Italy or outline the views of historians about the expansion of Piedmont in the period 1848–1860.

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 the unification of Italy by 1860 was due to the assistance it received from France. Answers may make the point that the failure of the revolutions in the Italian states in 1848–1849 convinced Cavour that the unification of Italy could not be achieved without foreign help. He found in Emperor Napoleon III of France a supporter of Piedmont's expansionist policies. Napoleon regarded himself as a liberator of people living under foreign rule and was determined to weaken Austrian rule in Northern Italy. Answers may explore the growing co-operation between France and Piedmont from 1852 onwards, focusing on Piedmont's support for Britain and France in the Crimean War, Cavour's statesmanlike actions at the Paris Congress and the closer co-operation between Napoleon and Cavour following the failed assassination of Napoleon III by an Italian republican. This culminated in the secret meeting between Napoleon III and Cavour at Plombières in July 1858 and the decision to wage war against Austria. Answers will begin to discuss some of the other factors which contributed to the unification of Italy, such as Cavour's adroit diplomacy, Garibaldi's daring military exploits and the work of the National Society. 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, a secret telegram Cavour received

from his personal representative in Paris, suggests that Emperor Napoleon III is supportive of Cavour's plans for the expansion of Piedmont. He not only promises French support in a war against Austria but also agrees to the proposed marriage of his nephew to the daughter of King of Piedmont-Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel II. Source 2, a letter from a member of the Piedmontese Parliament in 1861, qualifies the proposition in the question by arguing that Cavour's diplomatic skills played a key role in the rise of Piedmont and the unification of Italy. Source 3 provides a retrospective view of the relative importance of the various factors which contributed to the unification of Italy. It argues that "Cavour's diplomatic skill would have counted for little if it had not been for the favourable international climate" and refers to the motives of the French for their support. It also alludes to the role played by Giuseppe Garibaldi.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([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 all three sources support the proposition to varying degrees. Source 1 implies that help from Napoleon III would be forthcoming, although negotiations were at an exploratory stage. Source 2, a letter from a member of the Piedmontese Parliament written three years later, confirms that Piedmont won the war against Austria with French support, while Source 3 confirms that France was willing to see the expansion of Piedmont and the unification of Italy because it wanted to thwart the power of Austria. Answers at this level may also question the validity of the proposition, discussing some of the other factors which contributed to the unification of Italy up to 1860. They may explore Cavour's diplomatic skills, the military success Garibaldi achieved in 1860 and the favourable international situation.

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 France was responsible for the unification of most of Italy by 1860. They will, in addition to discussing the importance of France in promoting unification, clearly assess the contribution of other factors, particularly the role played by Camillo Cavour. He was one of the leading European politicians of his day and answers at this level should give examples of his diplomatic skill. Responses will also discuss the military exploits of Garibaldi with his 1088 men (and one woman!) such as his victory at Calatafimi in May 1860. They may also explore the unusually favourable international climate in some depth. Responses at this level may also assess the importance of the Italian National Society. Founded by Giorgio Pallavicino and Daniele Manin, it aimed to bring about revolt

throughout Italy without implicating the Piedmontese Government. Answers may also discuss the reasons for Piedmont's leadership of the movement towards unification, focusing, in particular, on its economic strength. 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 the assistance Piedmont received from France was responsible for the unification of most of Italy up to 1860. Good candidates may use their contextual knowledge to observe that Napoleon III's offer to aid Piedmont in a war against Austria was conditional on France being ceded Savoy and Nice in return, an arrangement agreed in his secret meeting with Cavour at Plombières on 20 July 1858. Source 2 reveals some of Cavour's personal qualities, underlining his ability to assess and exploit a particular situation, and concluding that "as a diplomat he [was] a giant". It refers to some of his achievements in international politics such as "the expeditionary force he sent to the Crimea", his diplomacy at the Paris Congress and his attack on the Papal States in 1860. Source 3 sets out the debate about the relative importance of French aid in the unification of Italy, placing particular emphasis on the favourable international climate in 1859 when the war against Austria was waged. It focuses on the reasons for Russia's refusal to intervene, briefly refers to the negative attitude of Prussia towards Austria and explores Britain's support for the ambitions of Piedmont.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([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 French military aid was responsible for the unification of Italy up to 1860. Contemporary politicians and historians regarded the expansion of Piedmont up to 1860 as a triumph of Italian nationalism, carried out by key personalities such as Victor Emmanuel II, Garibaldi and Cavour. They acknowledged the role played by Emperor Napoleon III but argued that French support for Piedmont and the favourable international climate was due to Cavour's skilful diplomacy. These interpretations underlined the importance of personalities. However, revisionist interpretations have played down the role of individuals and the existence of Italian nationalism, preferring instead to focus on Piedmont's economic strength and the international rivalry between the great powers which worked to its advantage. [35]

48

Option 4

60

Option 5: Germany 1918–1945

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

- 1 (a) Explain why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability between 1919 and 1923.

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

Level 1 ([0]–[3])

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

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

Answers at this level recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some understanding, analysis and explanation. Answers will be more detailed and provide some reasons about why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability in the period 1919–1923 but with significant omissions. For example, they may outline some of the serious economic problems Germany experienced in the period 1919–1923 and refer to some of the terms of the Versailles Treaty. 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 evidence to explain why the Weimar Republic experienced political instability in the period 1919–1923. One factor was the effects of the Versailles Treaty, especially with regard to the clauses concerning reparations, war guilt, disarmament and territorial arrangements. This annoyed right-wing nationalists and identified the new republic from the outset with a dictated peace. A second factor was the Weimar Constitution which introduced proportional representation, thus ensuring that a polarised, divided society would be reflected in a multiparty *Reichstag*. All governments

would therefore be unstable, short-lived coalitions. Thirdly, the political instability of the first phase of the Weimar Republic occurred against a background of economic hyperinflation. Another factor was the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr in January 1923 after Germany defaulted on its reparation payments, resulting in passive resistance. 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 factors identified at Level 3 but in greater depth. For example, they may provide a more detailed explanation of the economic problems the Weimar Republic experienced in the period 1919–1923. In 1919 Germany was already on the brink of financial collapse. Its debt amounted to 144 million marks and its huge trade deficit was made worse by the loss of the Saarland and Silesia under the terms of the Versailles Treaty. Germany's economic problems were exacerbated by the size of its reparations' payments to the Allies; in fact, a figure of 132 billion marks was recommended by the Reparations Commission in April 1921. Answers may observe that the Weimar Republic was tainted from the outset by the "stab in the back" legend which claimed that its political leaders had betrayed the undefeated German army by surrendering unconditionally to the Allies. Responses at this level may point out that the Weimar Republic experienced political instability between 1919 and 1923 because it was a democracy with few democrats. In addition, key elements of German society opposed the Weimar Republic from the outset. The German army had a lukewarm or even hostile attitude to the Republic and General von Seeckt refused to use troops against the right-wing Kapp Putsch in 1920. Judges looked back nostalgically to pre-1914 Germany and the very lenient sentence Hitler received following the Munich Putsch of November 1923 reflected the hostility of the judiciary to the Weimar Republic. Similarly, the churches wanted a return to the authoritarian days of the German Empire. 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 how the Nazi regime used the arts and the media as a means of control 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 provide a superficial understanding of how the arts and the media were used by the Nazi regime as a means of control in the period 1933–1939. 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 on how the Nazi regime used the arts and the media as a means of control in the period 1933–1939 but with significant omissions. In 1933 Hitler set up the Ministry for Public Enlightenment and Propaganda under Goebbels to try to gain control over the media and all cultural activities. 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 offer a competent explanation of how the arts and the media were used by the Nazi regime as a means of control in the period 1933–1939. The Nazis attempted to use culture in the Third Reich as a form of propaganda by systematically spreading information to promote the views of the government with the intention of persuading people to think or behave in a certain way in accordance with the regime's ideological beliefs. As part of its policy of co-ordination – the process by which all institutions were made to conform to the policies of National Socialism – the Nazi state tried to gain control over the media and all cultural activities. Goebbels supervised a vast machinery for control of all aspects of the media. The Nazis established a Reich Chamber of Culture which was used to exercise control over all aspects of culture. Membership was compulsory for people involved in cultural activities. The Nazis exercised control through direct ownership of the media by controlling those working in it, by directing what to produce, and by prosecuting non-conformist activities. 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 comprehensively how the arts and the media were used by the Nazi regime as a means of control in the period 1933–1939. Candidates at this level may give specific illustrations of how the Nazis used the arts and the media as a form of control by discussing evidence from some of the following: radio, press, cinema, photography, paintings, sculpture, architecture, literature, theatre and music. With regard to the media, candidates could give the following examples. With regard to radio, Goebbels brought all broadcasting under Nazi control by the creation of the Reich Radio Company. The Nazi government made provision for the production of a cheap wireless so that the people had the means to receive its propaganda. By 1939, 70% of German homes had a radio. With regard to the press, the Nazis bought up numerous newspapers, so that by 1939 they controlled 66% of the German press. Goebbels recognised the importance of expanding the film industry, not only as a means of propaganda, but also as an entertainment form. Hitler's favourite film producer was Leni Riefenstahl. Her most famous films were *Triumph of the Will* about the 1934 Nuremberg Rally and *Olympia* about the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin. With regard to the arts, answers may refer to painters such as Arthur Kampf and Adolf Ziegler who reinforced Nazi stereotypes of women as mothers whose place was in the home. Answers at the top of this level should provide examples from both the arts and the media. 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 “Night of Broken Glass” of November 1938 in Germany?

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. A superficial assessment of the utility of the source will be displayed.

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, candidates will describe the consequences of the “Night of Broken Glass” in Bielefeld, according to vom Felde’s account in the extract.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They 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. Vom Felde’s account provides specific information concerning the consequences of the pogrom in Bielefeld, revealing that 37 synagogues, over 100 businesses and 110 private homes were destroyed; two Jews lost their lives during the disturbances and 406 were arrested and deported to Buchenwald concentration camp, where another four had subsequently died. He also reveals that public opinion was generally not in favour of the pogrom, especially the destruction of commercial property, although there was criticism from Christian Church leaders of the destruction of the synagogues. Few were concerned about the smashing of the windows of Jewish homes. Vom Felde suggests that the German people were aware that the pogrom was instigated by the Nazis and as a result the regime was being criticised. This is a frank, confidential report by a high-ranking Nazi official to the Gestapo in Berlin, written just over a fortnight after the pogrom. He is reporting what took place in a local area and the reaction of local opinion. The author, date, mode, motive, audience, content and tone could all be considered as major strengths.

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. In order to obtain a top Level 4 mark, relevant contextual knowledge must be included in the answer. The major weakness of the source is that it only provides information about one city, whereas the historian is concerned with the impact of the “Night of Broken Glass” throughout the whole of Germany. Historians would have to consult other primary sources from other rural and urban areas to assess whether vom Felde’s account was representative of the whole of Germany. From their contextual knowledge, candidates may be able to demonstrate the impact of the pogrom throughout Germany. At least 200 synagogues were destroyed, 10 000 businesses attacked, 20 000 Jews deported to concentration camps and at least 91 Jews killed. It is also known as the “Night of Crystal Glass” (*Kristallnacht*) because of all the smashed glass. It was Joseph Goebbels who initiated the pogrom. It was fully supported by Hitler and carried out by party activists. Despite Goebbels’ subsequent propaganda that it was due to the spontaneous actions of the German people, nearly all observers knew that the pogrom was the work of Nazi activists on orders from above.

[13]

- (b) Using **all** the sources, **and** your own knowledge, assess whether the “Night of Broken Glass” of November 1938 was the most important turning point in the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews in Germany in the period 1933–1939.

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 Nazi policies towards the Jews will be displayed. 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 Broken Glass” was a turning point in the Nazis’ development of the anti-Semitic policies in the period 1933–1939.

AO2(b):

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

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

AO1(b):

KNOWLEDGE ([4]–[6]): Answers will recall, select and deploy historical knowledge with a greater degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation, analysis and judgement. For example, there may be a limited account of Nazi policies towards the Jews in the 1933–1939 period with significant omissions. 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 gives some information about the impact of the pogrom in one city. Source 2 gives some information about the background to the

pogrom and reveals that one contemporary saw through Goebbels' propaganda. Source 3 provides evidence to support the proposition.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([3]–[5]): There will be some awareness of contemporary **or** later interpretations. For example, there may be historians' interpretations about the significance of the pogrom.

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 development of Nazi anti-Semitism in Germany in the period 1933–1939 in relation to whether the 1938 pogrom was the most important turning point in the gradual radicalisation of Nazi anti-Semitic policies. Candidates will produce a competent selection of evidence from the 1933–1939 period to illustrate the different aspects of racial discrimination and repression such as: economic boycott, legal discrimination in employment, the denial of civil rights with the Reich Citizenship Law of 1935, biological discrimination with the Law for the Protection of German Blood (The Nuremberg Laws), confiscation of Jewish property, the pogrom of the “Night of Broken Glass,” and emigration before the outbreak of war in 1939. Over half a million Jews in Germany before the outbreak of war were affected by measures of discrimination as Nazi anti-Semitism gradually increased. The Nazis also recognised that it was important to condition public opinion by a campaign to first marginalise, then dehumanise the Jews. There was a relentless propaganda campaign after 1933 conducted through posters, textbooks, radio and films that pilloried the Jew as alien, subversive and sub-human. 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 omitted. Source 1 gives information concerning the impact of the pogrom on Jews but also the reaction of public opinion in Bielefeld. Source 2 gives the reaction of a contemporary to Nazi propaganda after the pogrom and some information about the circumstances which were used to justify it. Source 3 provides an interpretation of an historian concerning the significance of the pogrom.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([6]–[8]): Answers will provide a satisfactory analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations of the subject. For example, the views of some contemporaries and some historians about the significance of the pogrom will be discussed.

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 whether the “Night of Broken Glass” of 9–10 November 1938 was the most important turning point in the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews in Germany in the period 1933–1939. This event was certainly the most violent act against the Jewish population in Nazi Germany before 1939. At least 200 synagogues were destroyed, 10 000 businesses attacked, 20 000 Jews sent to concentration camps and at least 91 Jews were killed as a consequence of the pogrom. The “Night of Broken Glass” was a turning point in that it signalled a more brutal attitude by the Nazi regime towards the Jews and represented the first example of systematic violence against Jewish people. As a result, many Jews realised that it was time to leave Germany before their persecution became any worse. Answers at this level will identify other possible turning points. For example, they may argue that the events of April 1933 marked a turning point when the first of what eventually numbered 400 Nazi racial laws discriminating against Jews was put into effect. Jews were categorised as “non-Aryans” and stripped of a large number of civil rights, including exclusion from a university education, posts in government, the civil service, the army, farming and certain professions. The Nuremberg Laws of 15 September 1935 represented an important turning point because they formalised anti-semitism into the Nazi state. The Reich Citizenship Laws deprived Jews of their German citizenship and political rights. Under the Law for the Protection of German Blood, marriage and sexual relations between Jews and Germans were outlawed. Alternatively, answers may argue that the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939 marked the most important turning point in the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews. In the short term it led to a further tightening of restrictions on Jews in Germany with the introduction of a curfew and in the longer term paved the way for the extermination of the Jews. If other events or particular years are put forward as important turning points, they should be judged on their merits. 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. Source 1 can be utilised to illustrate the impact of the “Night of Broken Glass” in 1938 on Jews in Germany: the destruction of synagogues, businesses and private property; the loss of life within the Jewish

community; and the deportation of many Jews to concentration camps. The source also indicates that Jews wanted to emigrate and this became Nazi policy before the outbreak of war in 1939. It also provides evidence that public opinion in Germany was far from supportive of the pogrom and was aware that the Nazi Party had orchestrated the episode. Source 2 can be utilised to give further evidence that a contemporary from the period was aware that the Nazis had initiated the pogrom regardless of Goebbels' propaganda. It also provides candidates with stimulus material concerning the background to the pogrom with the references to the murder of vom Rath by Grünspan in Paris a few days before the pogrom began. Source 3 refers to the discrimination and persecution of the Jews. It primarily offers an interpretation which suggests that the pogrom was a turning point in Nazi anti-Semitism. The limited opposition to the pogrom from the German people ensured that the Nazis could escalate their anti-Semitic policies which would become more extreme and more radical after 1938.

AO2(b):

INTERPRETATIONS ([9]–[11]): Answers will provide a good analysis and evaluation of contemporary **and** later interpretations. Answers should react to the views of the historian Evans in the particular extract given in Source 3. He supports the view that the “Night of Broken Glass” was an important turning point in the development of Nazi policies towards the Jews in Germany in the period 1933–1939. Many other historians would concur, maintaining that the year 1938 saw a significant radicalisation of Nazi policies towards the Jews. However, responses may argue that other events marked a more important turning point than the “Night of Broken Glass”. They may put forward the introduction in April 1933 of the first Nazi racial law, the Nuremberg Laws of September 1935 or the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939 which would eventually lead to genocide. [35]

Option 5

Total

48

60

60