

## **Mark Schemes for the Units**

---

**June 2009**

**3835/7835/MS/R/09**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## **CONTENTS**

### **Advanced GCE History (7835)**

### **Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3873)**

## **MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS**

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
AS/A2 History    Syllabus-Specific Marking Instructions	1
2580    Document Studies 871 – 1099	20
2581    Document Studies 1450 – 1693	24
2582    Document Studies 1774 – 1945	34
2583    English History 1042 – 1660	48
2584    English History 1780 – 1964	67
2585    European History 1046 – 1718	82
2586    European and World History 1789 – 1989	107
2587    Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	122
2588    Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	124
2589    Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	133
2590    Themes in History 1066 – 1796	149
2591    Themes in History 1763 – 1996	163
Grade Thresholds	183

# AS/A2 History Syllabus-Specific Marking Instructions

AS/A2 HISTORY

June 2009

## SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Examiners should refer to OCR's *Instructions for Examiners* for more detailed guidance.

### 1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

All candidates must meet the Assessment Objectives set for History by the QCA. Although these Objectives are expressed and weighted separately, the assessment seeks to secure coherence and unity in the candidates' understanding and interpretation of History as a discipline. The Objectives are thus not disaggregated when marking, and AO1 pervades AO2.

### 2 THE ASSESSMENT OF SCRIPTS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BANDS

Every answer should be marked bearing in mind the AOs and the following explanatory criteria:

- (a) the **relevance**, accuracy and quantity of factual knowledge;
- (b) evidence of the exercise of **informed historical judgement** and **awareness of historical context**;
- (c) **effectiveness of presentation**: the ability to communicate arguments and knowledge in a clear, orderly fashion with maximum relevance to the question set. All Units require responses in continuous prose, and therefore include the assessment of quality of written communication (including clarity of expression, structure of arguments, presentation of ideas, grammar, punctuation and spelling). Candidates' quality of written communication is not assessed separately but pervades AO1.

The proper application of the AOs and the explanatory criteria will mean, for example, that a long answer crammed with detailed knowledge will not be rewarded highly if the knowledge is not effectively applied and the answer shows a lack of historical judgement. Conversely a convincingly argued, highly relevant and perceptive answer may be well rewarded although based on less overtly expressed knowledge.

**Examiners should seek the advice of Team Leaders about unusual approaches to a question.**

### 3 GENERIC MARK BANDS

The generic Bands are the most important guide for examiners and apply to all answers. Examiners assess which Band best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify for a Band. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'.

**Units 2580-2582:** For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.

Mark each answer individually. Do not be swayed by impressions gained from marking other answers in the script or other candidates from the same Centre or scripts from another Centre.

#### **Units 2580-2586**

Examiners will remember that they are assessing AS Level (not A Level), usually the work of 17 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably four other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

#### **Units 2587-2593**

Examiners will remember that they are assessing A2 Level, usually the work of 18 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably two other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

**Units 2590-2591:** Provisionally award the top mark and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Mark each answer individually. Do not be swayed by impressions gained from marking other answers in the script or other candidates from the same Centre or scripts from another Centre.

### **4 QUESTION-SPECIFIC MARK SCHEMES**

Question-specific mark schemes are secondary, supporting the Generics. They do not specify the 'correct' answer required for individual questions. Rather, they indicate possible points that candidates might make. They offer a broad guide to what may be encountered and are therefore the guide for moderating the actual generic mark up or down within the appropriate Band or (if the history is particularly strong or weak) into the next generic Band up or down. When appropriate, suggestions are made about Bands for different approaches; in some cases, limits are indicated. Examiners must use their judgement but, **if in doubt about a particular answer, they must consult their TL. The most important principle for examiners is the primacy of the Generics.**

Answers need not be long to merit high marks. Reward answers that are direct but concise. Reward selection of relevant material and appropriate comment rather than paraphrases. Quotations should only be rewarded if used to substantiate relevant points made in the candidate's own words.

### **5 ASSESSING STRUCTURED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS GIVEN IN NOTE-FORM**

Answers are marked individually. Questions in Units 2580-82 have sub-parts; each must be marked individually, without reference to the others.

Answers which are very largely in continuous prose but which are completed by significant notes may be awarded marks in one Band lower than that normally awarded. Purely note-form answers which show sound relevance, structure, understanding and sufficient knowledge can be awarded marks up to the top of Band III. In every case, examiners must make a note both at the end of the answer and on the front page of the script.

### **6 POSITIVE MARKING**

**Examiners must be positive in marking what is written**, without being influenced too much by omissions. Marks must represent what a candidate has accomplished, not what her/she has failed to do. Even the most successful answers may have omissions which could have been rectified had more time been allowed. **Examiners must not 'penalise'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (e.g. for accuracy and relevance).

**Question-specific mark schemes alone indicate any omissions that will affect marks awarded or any ceilings to be applied.** Mark positively by rewarding what has been written.

When things go wrong, it is usually because an undue severity creeps in when omissions and errors are looked for (marking negatively).

## **7 USE OF THE FULL RAW MARK RANGE**

**Examiners use the full mark range** to reward work appropriately, to enable candidates to be ranked in order of merit and avoid bunching, and to ensure that raw marks convert appropriately to UMS after grading. This is an invitation neither to be generous at the top nor to under-mark at the bottom.

## **8 MARKING SCRIPTS**

All mark must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'ReI' written in the margin indicates there is some significant irrelevance;
- 'N' or 'D' in the margin indicates an excessively narrative or descriptive section;
- Occasional brief notes in the margin should indicate sound points or knowledge;
- Ticks are of little value, and can seriously mislead. They should be avoided.

**Each page should indicate that it has been read. Good practice will avoid a sequence of pages with nothing but ticks (or crosses).**

**A brief comment summarising the main qualities of an answer should be written at the end, together with the Band and the mark. The best way to do that is to quote briefly from the appropriate Band.**

**The Mark Band and the appropriate numerical mark should be recorded at the end of each answer (e.g. Band IV – 45). The total marks for answers should be ringed in the right-hand margin at the end of each question. All marks for sub-questions should be recorded un-ringed in the right-hand margin. They should be repeated at the end and the total shown as a ringed mark in the right-hand margin at the end of the question (e.g. 5 + 15 + 45 = 65, with 65 in a circle).**

**Do not alter a mark other than by crossing it out, inserting the correct mark and initialling it.**

### **Comments on scripts**

The comment at the end of an answer should reflect its qualities as defined by the Mark Bands so quote from them. Comments help you to arrive at a fair mark and indicate to senior examiners how your mind has been working. Marks and comments must be substantiated unequivocally from scripts.

Examiners should use a professional, business-like and straightforward style. Always use:

- reference to the assessment objectives and/or Mark Bands;
- reference to creditable points and major gaps which affect assessment;
- reference to 'the answer' or the third person, not 'You...'.

Always avoid:

- derogatory terms e.g. 'rubbish', 'shoddy', even though examiners may consider such terms to be justified;
- humour, interjections or jokes;

Ignore poor handwriting. If it is illegible, send the script to your TL. Candidates must not be marked down.

It may be appropriate to make general comments about matters such as:

- use of time and/or length of answers;
- presentation and use of language;
- rubric infringements;

Do **not** make:

- comments on how you perceive teaching may have been carried out;
- reference to answers by other candidates, e.g. 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, e.g. 'should have revised more fully';

## **9 RUBRIC INFRINGEMENTS AND INCLUSIONS FROM CENTRES**

If a candidate answers more questions than the specified number, all answers must be marked. The highest marks for the number of questions allowed must be used to constitute the script's total mark. The marks of the surplus answers should then be reduced to 0 and an explanation written on the script's front page.

If a candidate fails to answer sufficient questions, write an explanatory note on the front of the script. If several candidates from one Centre infringe rubrics, the PE and Subject Officer should be informed.

Centres are responsible for requesting special consideration for individual candidates. Such cases are dealt with directly between the Centre and OCR. Requests for special treatment sent with scripts must be ignored in your marking and forwarded directly to OCR.

Notes such as 'Out of time' written on scripts (by invigilators or candidates) must be ignored.

## **10 OVERALL**

**Mark consistently, periodically refreshing yourself via the standardisation scripts and the Generics.**

**Pace your marking, follow a regular timetable and avoiding the need to mark many scripts in limited time or when fatigued.** If difficulties arise, inform your TL at once so alternative arrangements can be made.

**Return mark sheets and scripts promptly.** Failure to do so will jeopardise the issuing of results.

Contact OCR with admin problems and your TL on marking issues. Examiners must never contact a Centre.

**Our secondary educational system is built around external assessment.  
Students, parents, teachers, FE and employers all depend on volunteers to mark the exams.**

**Thank you very much for being an examiner.**

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2580-2582

AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

- In Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- In Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see Marking Instructions #5].
- Remember that you are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit.
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin answers **without an introduction**.
- The quality of English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to use a lower Band.
- Glosses in [ ] exist to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme.” (Code of Practice 2005, #4.17).

### Question (a)

#### BAND/20: Comparison

**NB Contextual knowledge is NOT required for (a), but credit should be given for any which is used relevantly and effectively.**

- I (18-20) The response provides a genuine comparison and/or contrast about most of the qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. Areas of agreement and/or disagreement are discussed. The argument shows judgement. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[‘genuine comparison and/or contrast’ means both content (area of agreement and/or disagreement) and provenance. The list of qualities is not exhaustive & they do not all need to be discussed. A judgment ‘as evidence’ or on the relative extent of support is expected]*

- II (15-17) The response provides an effective comparison and/or contrast. The judgements are supported by appropriate references to internal evidence. The answer is relevant but the answer lacks completeness and the full range of the available comparative criteria. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[‘internal evidence’ means appropriate references to both content and provenance (the introductions and/or attributions)]*

- III (12-14) The response provides a comparison and/or contrast but makes limited links with the Sources. The answer is relevant, but the organisation of the answer is uneven. The quality of the answer is satisfactory rather than sound. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[‘limited links with the Sources’ means either too much focus on content or on provenance so the comparison is uneven. Where ‘the organization’ is uneven, the comparison will be confined to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph]*

- IV (9-11) The response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comments are largely sequential and with few points of internal analysis or discussion of similarities and/or differences. The answer is largely relevant. The organisation of the answer is limited.



The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

*[Sequencing prevents comparison. Band IV is to be used if there is some element of sequencing but there are a few points of internal analysis (comparative provenance) and/or a few comments on the similarity/difference in content]*

- V (6-8)** The response provides a very basic answer to the question and can identify some points of agreement and/or disagreement. The comparison and/or contrast is mostly implicit. There may perhaps be significant irrelevance. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain frequent errors.

*['very basic answer' means sequencing is especially prevalent. The answer will, however, identify one or more very basic points of comparative content or provenance, even if only implicitly]*

- VI (3-5)** The response is very limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There may be very basic paraphrase which lacks a genuine attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- VII (0-2)** The response is extremely limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There is no attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The answer is irrelevant. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

### **Question (b)**

#### **BAND/40: Context**

- **Answers using Sources but no own knowledge may not be put in Bands I or II.**
- **Answers using own knowledge but no Sources may not be put in Bands I to III.**

- I (36-40)** The answer contains a good balance between analysis of all four Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge which is used appropriately and effectively in relation to the question. (This independent knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.) There is a clear judgement on the question. There may be some indication about the limitations of the Sources or what may be required to add to their completeness and explanatory power. The strongest answers **may** offer views on the general consistency and completeness of the Sources as a set, as well as individually, but this is **not** a pre-requisite for Band I.

*[Band I answers are likely to use their own knowledge to extend and enrich the quality of source evaluation]*

- II (30-35)** The answer contains a fair balance between analysis of at least three of the Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge, although the comment may not be complete or fully developed, and the judgement on the question may not be entirely convincing. There may be some imbalance between discussion of the Sources and use of external analysis. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*['own' knowledge should be focused on the key issue of the question]*

- III (24-29)** The response attempts to address the Sources and deploy independent ('own') knowledge, although the balance between them may be uneven. The argument is

fairly clear, but the comments may not be fully sustained and the overall judgement may be incomplete. The organisation of the answer is uneven. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[‘attempts to address the Sources’ means Sources are largely used for reference and illustration of an argument rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument (the characteristics of Bands I and II)]*

- IV (17-23)** The response shows a clear imbalance between source analysis and use of independent (‘own’) knowledge. These aspects are not linked effectively into an argument. The Sources are discussed sequentially; a basic argument is provided, but overall judgement on the question is very limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

*[‘clear imbalance’ does **not** mean completely unbalanced between use of Sources and own knowledge. It means **more** imbalance than in Band III. Sources discussed sequentially are unlikely to establish a sense of different views, but ‘grouping’ might coincide with Source order (A and B v. C and D) - examiners are to watch if this is the case]*

- V (11-16)** The response provides little comment on the context of the key issue. There is some evidence of knowledge of the key issue, but the relevance is implicit with a limited attempt to analyse the Sources. The argument lacks a coherent structure. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some frequent errors.

*[There is likely to be a clear imbalance here between Sources and own knowledge. Although there will be little comment on the context of the key issue there will be **some**, just as there will be some awareness and evidence of the key issue. Sources will largely be used for reference and illustration of an argument (i.e. rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument). Judgement will be skeletal if present at all]*

- VI (6-10)** The response shows serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent (‘own’) knowledge. The attempt to address the question will be very limited, and the argument may be fragmentary, and there may be serious irrelevance and frequent errors of fact and understanding. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- VII (0-5)** The response shows extremely serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent (‘own’) knowledge. There is no attempt to address the question. There is no argument. The answer is irrelevant. At least most of the fact and understanding are wrong. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2583-2586:

### AS PERIOD STUDIES

#### NB

Examiners are reminded that

- for answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.
- they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Generic Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #3].
- they are marking out of 45. OCR's computer will double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.
- the quality of the English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- if a candidate discusses the wrong topic (e.g. evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II when the question was on William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award up to the top of Band VI.

#### Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation

Perspective means an understanding of the variety of history involved in the question (e.g. political, religious, social.)

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (e.g. analysis, assessment, comparison).

Time is limited so candidates may begin their answer directly, without an introduction.

- I: 36-45     The response evaluates the key issues and deals with the perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

At the higher level (40-45), responses will effectively justify why one factor is the most important or the main factor and will also explain why other factors are less important. There will be a sense of judgement in relation to the factors shown by discrimination between them in terms of type and nature of the factor. How factors are linked to each other will also be addressed.

At a lower level (36-39), responses will justify why one factor is most important but the explanation of why others are less so will be less effective. There will be some attempt to classify and draw links between factors.

II: 32-35 The response is mostly successful in evaluating the key issues in the question convincingly and relevantly. It develops most of the relevant aspects of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The answer will deal with several factors and come to a judgement as to which was most important (i.e. how far...? or to what extent...? will be addressed). However, the reasoning will often be patchy and may be confined to a lengthy conclusion. Similarly the establishment of links between factors and their classification may not be extensive and, at the bottom end, hardly present at all.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

III: 27-31 The response is reasonably successful in evaluating key issues and in dealing with perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is reasonably successful in showing a good level of understanding. The answer may be descriptive or narrative in approach but the argument depends on some analysis. This analysis, whilst showing some understanding, might be undeveloped and lack sound and substantial support. The quality of recall, selection and accuracy of historical knowledge, applied relevantly, is mostly sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The organisation is uneven but there is a sustained argument.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The response will recognise the need to deal with a number of factors *and where the question demands* it may well provide some very limited argument why one factor was more important than others. A list of factors will be dealt with and explained effectively but the explanation of most important but the linkages *and any necessary explanation of most important* will be slight and undeveloped. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

IV: 23-26 The response has some success in discussing some key issues and in dealing with some of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer might be descriptive or narrative in approach but there is some implicit analysis. The analysis might show relevance and some understanding but the points might be undeveloped and explained generally. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points, omitting some key issues, or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The organisation might be uneven but the answer pursues an argument. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

V: 18-22 The response discusses some key issues in the question but only at a very basic level. The answer might include a series of valid and relevant but largely unsupported points. There might be significant omissions. The answer shows some adequacy in its level of understanding and is descriptive or narrative in approach. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is limited but is mostly communicated in a competent manner. The organisation is uneven. There is some irrelevance but most of the answer focuses on the question. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some frequent errors.

- VI: 10-17 The response does not discuss the key issues in the question and shows little understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is inadequate in its level of understanding with poor description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge is thin or significantly inaccurate. There is significant irrelevance. The answer is communicated in a competent manner and the organisation of the answer is very poor. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII: 0-9 The response fails to discuss the key issues in the question and shows no understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is completely inadequate in its level of understanding. Historical knowledge is either absent or completely inaccurate or irrelevant. There is no organisation to the answer. The writing shows very major weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

### Units 2587-2589: HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Examiners are reminded that

- in Bands I-III they should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- in Bands IV-VII they should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down
- are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5].

Answers require some broad understanding of historical debate, but never depend on any reference to the views of particular historians (pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit - as in any AS/A2 Unit). **Demonstration of a broad understanding of historical debate does not involve anything very sophisticated: even hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the top Bands.**

## PASSAGES QUESTION

NB

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge may not be put in Band I.
- Answers which use own knowledge but make no use of the Passages may not be put in Bands I or II.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- Glosses in [ ] have been added to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme.” (*Code of Practice*, #4.17).

### BANDS I-VII/45: Contextual Evaluation

- I (36-45) The response **focuses very sharply on the key issue** in the question, using good and very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. Contextual knowledge is used **very appropriately and effectively** in relation to the question. (This contextual knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.). The answer **contains a very good balance** between Passage and contextual evaluation in **reaching a judgement** about the issue. There is **clear and substantial evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved by comments on the validity of the arguments in the Passages using the other Passages or own knowledge (**not** all the Passages need to be evaluated). The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[‘A very good balance’ means that evidence for the final judgement is drawn both from the Passages and from contextual knowledge but not that the whole response must be equally balanced between use of the Passages and contextual knowledge. Own knowledge need not be extensive or exhaustive as long as it provides supported evaluation of the views in the Passages. The Passages need not necessarily all be evaluated, although the main views expressed in them should be. The degree to which this is done successfully may help to decide where in the Band the answer should be placed.]*

- II (31-35)** The response **focuses on the key issue** in the question, using very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. The quality of the contextual comments and some aspects of the internal analysis of the Passages, whilst sound, will be **less rigorous** than in Band I. There is a **fairly clear and fairly full evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved and a **judgement is reached**. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[Answers in this Band are likely to be less well developed in some way. The Passages may be less well used, one view may be barely evaluated, the judgement may be based mainly on the Passages or contextual knowledge may not be equally well linked to the Passages. The Passages should be the main focus of the answer and there should be some supported evaluation, but it does not need to be lengthy.]*

- III (27-30)** The response **considers the interpretations** in the Passages and deploys some contextual knowledge. The argument is clear, but comments will be **thinner** and overall **judgements less effective** than in Band II. The organisation of the answer is **uneven**. There is a **reasonable degree of evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing is generally fluent and historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

*[Answers may consider the views in the Passages in general terms without much detailed reference. The judgement may be incomplete or not made at all or all the factors/arguments may be seen as equally valid/important. There may be quite limited use of contextual knowledge, or it may not be wholly relevant to the key issue, leading to incomplete, unsupported evaluation. The argument should be mostly clear.]*

- IV (22-26)** The response shows **considerable imbalance between** Passage evaluation and contextual knowledge. A **basic argument** is provided. The Passages may be largely used to **illustrate the argument** put forward and not as the focus of the answer. There is **some attempt at evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

*[Imbalance means a response where the contextual knowledge is the main focus and the Passages are glanced at in passing, often to confirm the arguments put forward from own knowledge. Alternatively there may be some interpretation of the Passages which is linked to the key issue but no real evaluation. Some confusion may creep into the argument.]*

- V (18-21)** The response shows **some evidence of knowledge** of the key issue, but may make **little use** of the Passages. The answer **lacks coherent structure** but the direction of the attempted argument is **mostly relevant**. There is **little evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer contains frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[Answers may describe the Passages, perhaps with little reference to the key issue or to the interpretations in the Passages. The argument may not carry much conviction or be made clearly. Contextual knowledge may not be well related to the key issue or indeed to the Passages. Evaluation will probably be slight.]*

- VI (10-17)** The response shows **serious weaknesses in knowledge** and ability to handle contextual questions. The argument may be **fragmentary**. There may be **serious irrelevance**. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[These answers are not likely to be focused on the key issue and the argument may be impossible to follow. There may be misunderstanding of the Passages.]*

- VII (0-9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding. There is no attempt to answer the question. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## ESSAY

### NB

- **Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.**
- **The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.**
- **Some topics by their very nature are less strongly focused around historical debate. Question-specific mark schemes will provide the necessary guidance on this.**
- **Answers require some understanding of broad schools of historical debate, but NEVER depend on any reference to the views of particular historians; pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit, as in any AS/A2 Unit.**
- **Demonstration of an understanding of broad schools of historical debate need NOT involve anything very sophisticated: hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet in full the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the high Bands.**

## BANDS I-VII/45

- I (36–45)** *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions.* The response is **focused clearly** on the demands of the question, even if there is **some unevenness**. The approach is clearly **analytical rather than descriptive** or narrative and, in particular, there is a **clear and evident** (but not necessarily totally full) **evaluation** of the historical debate bearing upon the topic which is **carefully integrated** into the overall approach. The answer is fully relevant. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material - the degree of that support will help to distinguish between answers higher and lower in the Band. The impression is that a **good solid answer** has been provided. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (31–35)** The response is **focused clearly** on the question but there is **some unevenness in content**. The approach is **mostly analytical and relevant**. The answer is generally structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. However, the answer will **not be equally thorough throughout**, for example evaluating the relevant debate less well. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.



- III (27–30)** The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt** to provide an appropriate argument and factual knowledge. The approach contains **analysis or explanation but it may be inadequately supported**. There is a reasonable grasp of the elements of the debate which bears upon the topic, and this is to a degree integrated into the overall approach. The answer is mostly relevant. The answer may **lack balance and depth** in factual knowledge. Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.
- IV (22–26)** The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly**. The approach may depend more on **some heavily descriptive or narrative sections** than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. There **is some knowledge of the historical debate** which bears upon the topic, but this may be **'bolted-on'** to the other material. Alternatively, the answer may consist largely of **description of schools of thought** that is not well directed at the specific question and is not well supported factually. Factual material may be used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly** the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (18–21)** The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer** but there is little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of a question. The approach **lacks analysis and explanation** and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, **is not linked effectively to the answer**. There may be **some hints of the historical debate** which bear upon the topic, but it will probably be poorly understood. Alternatively, there may be **extensive description of schools of thought** that is only slightly directed at the specific question. The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (10–17)** The response is not **properly focused on the requirements** of the question. There may be many **unsupported assertions**. The argument may be of very **limited relevance** and there may be **confusion about the implications** of the question. There will be **no sense of the historical debate** on the topic. The answer may be largely **fragmentary and incoherent**, perhaps only in brief note form. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0–9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding of the general topic and of the historical debate on it. There is **no attempt to answer** the question. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

### UNITS 2590-2591: THEMES IN HISTORY

#### NB

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Generic Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- For all answers, examiners should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down according to the particular qualities of the answer [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- Candidates who do not address most of the 100 or so-year period required may not be given a mark in Band I for that essay, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The quality of English is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

The topics are based on Themes covering an extended period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period) with the emphasis on continuity, development and change over time (ie. on breadth of understanding rather than on depth of knowledge). The emphasis is on links and comparisons between different aspects of the topics studied, rather than on detailed analysis.

To support the emphasis on breadth and over-view (rather than depth), candidates are given in the exam a factual chronology for their Theme.

#### **BANDS I-VII/60: Essay**

- I (48–60) *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions. There may be some unevenness, but the demands of the question (e.g. causation, evaluation, change and/or continuity over time) are fully addressed.* The answer demonstrates a **high level of ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. The approach is **consistently analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. The **argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. Ideas are expressed fluently and clearly. At the lower end of the Band, there *may be some weaker sections but* the overall quality nonetheless shows **the candidate is in control of the argument**. The answer is fully relevant. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (42–47) The answer demonstrates clearly the **ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **good awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question, but** there is **some unevenness**. The approach is **mostly analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. **Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. The answer is fully relevant. *The impression is that a good solid answer has been provided.* Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (36–41) The answer demonstrates clearly an **attempt to synthesise some elements** to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **reasonable awareness of change**

**and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument supported** by appropriate factual material. The approach **mostly contains analysis or explanation but may lack balance and** there may be some heavily **descriptive/narrative** passages **and/or** the answer may be **somewhat lacking in appropriate supporting factual material**. The answer is mostly relevant. The writing is generally fluent and usually uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

- IV (30–35)** The answer demonstrates an **uneven attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is an **adequate awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly, but the structure of the argument is poor**. The approach **depends more on heavily descriptive or narrative** passages than on analysis or explanation (which may be limited to introductions and conclusions). Factual material, sometimes very full, is used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly the requirements of the question**. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (24–29)** The answer demonstrates a **limited attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **limited awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer but the approach lacks analysis or explanation and** there is **little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question**. The structure of the answer shows **weaknesses in organisation** and the treatment of topics is **seriously unbalanced**. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (12–23)** The answer demonstrates an **unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails to reflect the synoptic nature of the Module. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The **answer is not focused** on the requirements of the question and may be of **very limited relevance**. Any **argument** offered may be **fragmentary and incoherent**, and any **assertions** made may be **unsupported** by factual material. There may be serious irrelevance and/or serious weaknesses in knowledge. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0–11)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails completely to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. There is **no attempt to answer the question**. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

### UNITS 2592 & 2593:

### INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

#### NB

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best-fit', not a 'perfect fit' [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Examiners should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Candidates must either use and evaluate primary and/or secondary source material relevant to their question, and/or must explain and evaluate interpretations of the topic(s) studied. The importance of this is reflected in the weight given to AO2. Investigations which offer no interpretation or evaluation of sources and/or historical interpretations (ie. they fail completely to address AO2) may not be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The Investigation does not require high-level research or specialist resources (such cannot be expected at Advanced GCE).
- The quality of the English (grammar, punctuation and spelling) is never to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

#### NOTES (Unit 2592)

1. **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on an historical period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
2. **WORD LIMIT:** The target length is 2,500 words. **The maximum permitted is 3,000 words (excluding only the footnotes & bibliography).** If that limit is exceeded, examiners must stop reading at 3,000 words and base their entire assessment on the first 3,000 words offered. Watch for footnotes that evaluate sources &/or carry on the argument of the Investigation and, intentionally or not, thus circumvent the limit. **If any such footnote text takes the Investigation's total length beyond 3000 words then it must be included in the word-count after all and the excess material must be excluded from the assessment.** In such cases, please write an explanatory note on the front of the script [Do not check the actual length unless you are suspicious].
3. **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Candidates **must use footnotes and provide a bibliography.** No set form or location for either is prescribed; a list at the end is fine. The absence of either or both, or the inadequacy of either or both, must never be the sole criterion to pull an answer into a lower Band, but will be taken into account within the examiner's overall judgement.
4. **HANDWRITTEN INVESTIGATIONS** are valid.

#### NOTES (UNIT 2593 Open Book Exam)

- 1 Candidates have less time to write-up their Investigation than those who enter Unit 2592, so the following points of difference will be applied:
  - (a) Unit 2593 Investigations will be **shorter** and contain **less supporting detail/fewer examples. The range of evidence** marshalled to support arguments **will be narrower.** That said,
  - (b) **The qualities of evaluation and analysis required will be just the same.**
- 2 **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on an period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
- 3 **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Footnotes are optional. A bibliography is required. This may be pre-prepared (typed or hand-written), taken into the exam and attached to the script with a tag.

## **Bands I-VII/90: Essay**

- I (72-90)** The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve in A Level.

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.

**The Investigation uses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic which is integrated into the overall approach.** The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question** (eg. causation, change over time, evaluation). The Investigation reflects a very high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach is consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative.** The argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material. **The answer is fully relevant.** The impression is that a good solid answer has been provided.

At the lower end of the Band, **there may be some weaker sections, but the overall quality still shows that the candidate is in control of the argument.** The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- II (63–71)** **The Investigation uses critically a reasonable range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically a range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic.** The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question but there is more unevenness than in Band I answers.**

The Investigation generally reflects a high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. **The approach is mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer is fully relevant.** Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- III (54–62)** **The Investigation uses a range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, but with some significant gaps and possibly with a limited critical sense.** The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument** and factual knowledge. The Investigation reflects a competent level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach contains analysis or explanation, but there may be some purely descriptive or narrative passages that are not linked directly to analysis or explanation. The answer achieves a genuine argument, but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge.**

Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily, but some parts may lack full coherence. **The answer is mostly relevant.** The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate. *Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.*

- IV (45–53)** **The Investigation uses largely uncritically a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, and this may be 'bolted-on' to the other material.** The response indicates **an attempt to argue relevantly.** The Investigation reflects an adequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach depends more on descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to**

**introductions and conclusions.** The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains some careless errors.

- V (36–44)** The Investigation refers to a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. These may be poorly understood and used uncritically, and may be 'bolted-on' to the other material. The responses offers some elements of an appropriate answer, but there is little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The Investigation reflects a very basic level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach lacks analysis and explanation and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, is not linked effectively to the argument.** The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is seriously unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling, but contains frequent errors.
- VI (19–35)** The Investigation refers only occasionally, and without any critical evaluation, to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. The response is not properly focused on the requirements of the question. The Investigation reflects an inadequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The argument will be of very limited relevance and there may well be confusion about the implications of the question.** There may be many unsupported assertions or a commentary which lacks sufficient factual support. **The answer may lack coherence as an extended essay, being largely fragmentary** and perhaps incoherent. The Investigation may rely heavily on a 'scissors and paste' approach. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-18)** The answer demonstrates a completely unsatisfactory attempt to meet any of the demands of the Unit. **There is** no reference to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. **There is** no attempt to discuss any of the key issues in the question. **There is** no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. **The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.**

## 2580 Document Studies 871 – 1099

### 1 The Reign of Alfred the Great, 871-899

#### (a) Study Sources A and C

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the methods adopted by Alfred in fighting the Vikings.**

**[20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources refer to events fifteen years apart and so are separated by the military reforms undertaken during the 880s. The widespread nature of the military activity in C should be noted, pointing to both Viking and West Saxon and allied mobility. Both feature substantial Viking threats, though Source A revolves around a key event in the survival of Wessex and Alfred's reputation as a strong leader while C features resistance to the Vikings in a different context. The language and tone of such can be commented upon, not least in A. Source A focuses upon gritty determination, bold tactics, pressure on the Vikings, forcing them to make peace and offer hostages while Source C focuses upon combined operations involving trusted ealdormen and their forces. Both Sources feature sieges of Viking strongholds, forcing surrender in A and a battle in C. In Source A Alfred engages in some diplomacy, albeit from a position of strength. Asser in A can be viewed as sympathetic to Alfred and the author of the A.S.C. in C can be also regarded as favourably inclined, but both Sources can be treated as reliable.

#### (b) Study all the Sources

**Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred's success as a King depended entirely on his military skills.**

**[40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

All the Sources refer to military activity with A and C especially prominent, referring to the decisive recovery of 878 (A), to ending the phase of bitter warfare of 871-8, and to 893 (C), after the important military reforms of the 880s. The widespread nature of the military activity in C should be noted, pointing to both Viking and West Saxon and allied mobility. The latter (burhs, fyrd, a navy, rotational service) can be supported from topic knowledge. By 892-6, the second phase, Wessex at least was far stronger and robust in defence and indeed offence. Sources B and D refer to other factors: B to the importance of the recovery of London and the alliance with Ealdorman Aethelred and Mercian elements; D to political skills and the place of cultural renaissance, seen by Alfred as integral to Wessex's survival and regeneration. Again, topic knowledge can support B and D: political alignments; ealdormen and thegns' loyalty; Alfredian Renaissance, embracing the Church as a means of unity, support and learning, in turn linked to political and governmental needs. And both A and C, in different ways, point to forms of diplomacy being used. Military skills were essential; Alfred had to be a warrior king, though more prominently so in 871-8 and 892-3; but he was a king whose political skills and attachment to religion and learning were assets in his appeal and growing strength as a powerful ruler, fighting Viking attacks to something

of a stalemate at very least. 'Entirely' needs good engagement, with argument and counter-argument around the set of Sources plus supporting knowledge.



**2 The Normans in England 1066-87****(a) Study Sources A and B**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for opposition to Norman rule in England.**  
**[20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The two Sources date from the twelfth century but can be viewed as both reliable and useful. Both point up opposition, more so in Source **B**. In **A** English opposition is seen as 'courageous' but 'too weak' while in **B** such opposition, led by important men, was boosted by Danish support, so increasing the dangers to the Normans. Whereas **A** suggests opposition faltered and weakened, with the leaders seeking peace, **B** shows much more fierce, determined opposition. Source **A** refers to events in 1068 when opposition did crumble but Source **B** refers to events a year later, with a resurgence of resistance, suggesting the strength and scope of such. In **A** opposition is native-based, in **B** native English opposition is aided by a major external force.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that William I's control of England depended mainly on castles.**  
**[40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Castles feature in Sources **A** and **B**. Supporting knowledge as to range (possibly 500 or so) and type (motte and bailey, stone) can be used: a spine was formed down and across much of England, both in key areas of the South-East and in potentially restless areas of the Midlands and the North. Sources **C** and **D** relate to other factors, with some links of **C** and **D**. 'Mainly' needs good engagement, arguing and counter-arguing from the Sources and knowledge. Norman rule and control did depend upon the periodic deployment of force and all the Sources reinforce this, above all Sources **A**, **B** and **C**. Source **D** points up the uses made of the Church and its military role. Source **A** points up the important role of castles and Sources **B** and especially **C** point up the use of terror tactics, the infamous 'harrying'. Source **A** suggests that Norman control was aided by the failings of English resistance while Source **C** especially suggests the sheer force of personality that drove on William I and led to severe measures. Own knowledge can be adduced: opposition was uneven but strong c. 1068-70; Danish aid was deployed in 1069; William I swiftly erected a string of castles and entrusted lands and settlement plans to loyalists, some mentioned in Source **A**. That settlement included progressive colonisation and the imposition of knight service (Source **D**). The Church had an important role at several levels as shown in **D**. 1070-2 proved a turning point, evidently, in William I's attitude to the occupation and rule of England. He abandoned any meaningful cooperation with remaining English nobles, redistributed their lands and extended consolidation via massive tenurial and territorial changes, reflected later in Domesday Book and here, to a degree, in Sources **A** (the beginnings) and **D** (knights' fees, feudal tenure here linked to church lands).

**3 The First Crusade and its origins 1073-99****(a) Study Sources A and B**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the ways in which the Popes tried to gain support for Holy War. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources feature Papal leadership and appeal, separated by 20 years. The goal of Holy War is evident. Of course, Gregory VII's appeal in **A** led to little response while Urban II's in **B** led to massive responses. Language and tone can be commented upon – emotive, powerful, appealing to religious loyalties and core faith elements. Both Sources refer to appeals from the east and to the threats to Constantinople (and the Byzantine Empire). Both focus upon the 'tyrannical violence' (**A**) and 'sword, pillage and fire' (**B**), with many slain or held captive. But while **A** focuses strongly on religious appeal and motivation, **B** adds in issues of land, overpopulation, internecine strife. The ways and means used, via language and appeal, need to be assessed. Both Sources come from reliable authors, either the Pope himself (**A**) or an eyewitness (**B**), and both suggest the power of language, rhetoric, emotional appeal, calling upon the faithful to go to liberate lands in the East, above all the Holy Land. Comment can be made upon the effective use of language in both Sources.

**(b) Study all the Sources.**

**Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Holy War was motivated mainly by the threat of Muslim expansion. [40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Muslim expansion is featured in Sources **A** and **B**, albeit explicit and implicit. Own knowledge can support that expansive drive and the takeover of the Holy Land and threats to the Byzantine Empire. Other factors are raised in the Sources, so setting up argument and counter-argument. Sources **A**, **B** and **D** point to religious fervour, zeal, emotion, either prior to the Crusade (**A** predates the Crusade by some way) or on Crusade (**D**) while Sources **C** and parts of **B** and **D** point to non-religious factors, over-population, land hunger, civil strife, plunder, indeed **C** provides a range of motives. The language of the Sources can be used in evaluation here, all are powerful in their own ways. Topic knowledge can be adduced to support Sources **A**, **B** and **D**: for example religious fervour on pilgrimage, the People's Crusade, events at Doryleum, Antioch and Jerusalem. But also knowledge can support Sources **B**, **C** and **D**: for example, evidence of population pressures, feudal-knightly-familial obligations, lordship 'pull', weather and climate, socio-economic pressures, the seizure of valuables once towns and cities were seized (Antioch and Jerusalem being the best known examples). The combination of Sources and selected knowledge can advance both argument and counter-argument here: **A**, **B** and **D** set against **C** and some of **B** and **D**. Religion may well have sustained the Crusade from origin to completion but other factors did intrude, not least, at times, noble ambitions (eg Bohemond, Stephen of Blois) and blood lust and love of fighting/violence (**D**).

## 2581 Document Studies 1450 – 1693

### 1 The Wars of the Roses 1450-85: The Rift Between Edward IV and Warwick

#### (a) Study Sources A and B

**Compare these Sources as evidence for Warwick's reaction to the rise of Elizabeth Woodville and her family.**

**[20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources agree that the rise of the Woodvilles was met by hostility from Warwick. The two Sources are, however, describing different (successive) stages in their rise. Source A focuses on the marriage with Elizabeth Woodville in 1464 and therefore explains the hostility of Warwick as resulting from the fact that it undermined his negotiations with France. Source B, describing events in 1466, relates Warwick's displeasure at the cornering of the marriage market by the Woodvilles and the appointment of Rivers as Lord Treasurer. It is much more descriptive and factual than Source A. Only in the case of the marriage of Anne, daughter of the Duke of Exeter, to Sir Thomas Grey does it explain why Warwick was displeased. Source A, on the other hand, not only refers to the context of the French marriage negotiations but suggests that Warwick may have already harboured hostile feelings towards Edward before the Woodville marriage. This difference may be accounted for by both the nature of the Sources – one a narrative, the other an account by an early Tudor historian – and their dates: A writes from hindsight, B was written before Warwick's attempted coup in 1469. The two Sources are therefore complementary. As a pair they support each other's view of Warwick's reaction to the Woodvilles.

#### (b) Study all the Sources

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Edward IV had only himself to blame for the breakdown of relations with Warwick in the later 1460s.**

**[40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Sources A and B support the proposition, C and D do not. This is therefore a case where sequential discussion of the Sources could produce a sound answer if appropriate links between A/B and C/D are made. Sources A and B both show how the Woodville marriage and the subsequent advancement of the Woodvilles alienated Warwick. Source A also refers to the way Edward undermined Warwick's negotiations with France – an aspect of the relationship which can be developed by own knowledge of how Edward's pro-Burgundian and anti-French policies later in the 1460s further alienated Warwick. Own knowledge can also be used to explain Source B: the real problem about the various Woodville marriages was that Warwick had two daughters to marry off. Source A does, however, hint that the fault might not be entirely Edward's, suggesting Warwick had 'hostility' towards Edward before the Woodville marriage. Apart from this last point, which is speculation on the part of Polydore Vergil, both of these Sources are largely factual and apparently trustworthy. Source C suggests that Warwick was more to blame than Edward:

he was over-ambitious, and defied Edward over the marriage of his daughter to Clarence. Since the writer was personally acquainted with Edward, he was presumably well-informed, but also, for the same reason, it is not surprising that he advances a view hostile to Warwick. However, it is a view supported by the modern historian in Source D, who provides a balanced analysis, acknowledging Edward's mistakes but placing the blame ultimately on Warwick for being unwilling to play second fiddle to Edward.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

## 2 The German Reformation 1517-30: Luther and the Peasants' War, 1524-26

### (a) Study Sources A and C

**Compare these sources as evidence of peasant grievances in 1525. [20]**

#### Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Sources **A** and **C** both refer to princely extortion – rents in **A**, 'extort money' in **C**. Both Sources complain about the princes' claim to private ownership of game, birds and fish, implying punishments for poaching. On the other hand, unlike **A**, **C** refers to princely 'perversion of justice' and implicitly to lack of peasant rights to common or pasture land: princes claim to own the 'grass of the field'. **A** complains of unpaid labour, serfdom and a lack of liberty, but uses a peaceful, deferential tone: 'we humbly beg', and is written by more moderate peasants assembled together. However, **C** adopts a more aggressive and emotive style, and claims the 'power of the sword' for the whole community. The first article in Source **A** has a religious aim, and the whole document claims that peasant grievances are based on the Bible, 'God's Word'. A willingness to compromise characterises **A**, for if peasant grievances prove contrary to Scripture, they will be withdrawn, whereas **C** makes no mention of religion as a basis for peasant grievances and is totally uncompromising.

In **C** Müntzer is an individual radical preacher with his own grievances, untypical in his extremism. Müntzer makes an insulting personal attack on Luther, implying Luther has let the peasants down in not seeking redress of their grievances more forcefully. On the other hand, **A** is written by moderate, God-fearing peasants.

In February the peasants at Memmingen were moderate in expressing their grievances in the Twelve Articles, whereas in March 'false prophets', such as Thomas Müntzer, were inciting a more violent approach in some areas, tainting the whole peasant movement and assuming leadership of it.

### (b) Study all the Sources

**Using all four Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Luther changed his attitude towards the peasants during 1525 mainly for religious reasons. [40]**

#### Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Within the set of Sources are various reasons for Luther's change of attitude towards the peasants: concern for the true interpretation of the Bible and God's Will, the desire for peace and social justice, political conservatism, the need for princely support and revenge for personal slights. As a set, all the Sources refer to religious reasons for Luther's change of attitude. His concern for the true interpretation of the Bible is evident in **B** and **D**, and this gives him a religious reason for turning against the peasants. In **A**, the peasants ask for religious change in their first article, which Luther accepts as valid in **B**. The Scriptures are cited as their source of authority in **A**, in articles 3, 4 and 12. In **B**, Luther instructs both peasants and princes to abide by Christian law and maintain peace. Here, he sees the peasants as being led astray by false prophets and ranting churchmen and attempts to instruct them in the ways of peace. In **D**, however, Luther condemns the peasants for

having lied about their scriptural inspiration, as they have resorted to violence. He had instructed the peasants to avoid violence and obey God's law, in **B**, but they had ignored him, and listened instead to Müntzer's incitement to violence. This suggests Luther sees the peasants as having interpreted his ideas on liberty, in his 1520 pamphlets, in a physical rather than a spiritual way. Luther's concern for social justice colours his attitude in **B**. Source **A** is a humble entreaty that princes amend the social ills of the peasantry, but when supported by **C**, we see that Luther's attack on the Church has unleashed violent political and social unrest. In **B**, Luther sees the justice of the moderate complaints in **A**, and hopes to keep the support of both peasants and princes. However, he fears he might be seen as an instigator of political rebellion. His politically conservative opinions that the princes should be obeyed, wield the 'power of the sword' and be judged only by God are mentioned in **C**. Müntzer in **C** concurs with the peasants that the princes have perverted justice, and condemns Luther personally for his weak attitude, seeing Luther as a sycophant, seeking princely support. This radicalisation of the peasants endangers Luther's life, after his narrow escape from execution as a heretic at Worms. This escape had been thanks to the intervention of Frederick the Wise, who died in May 1525. Only when the peasants have acted violently in **D**, incited by radical preachers such as Müntzer, in **C**, does Luther reject the peasants and openly support the princes, who alone can ensure his Reformation is not hi-jacked by extreme elements and themselves take on the leadership of it. Müntzer's personal slights on Luther in **C**, whom the peasants have listened to in preference to Luther's advice in **B**, have struck at Luther's opinion of himself as the centre of a moderate Reformation movement and he fears isolation. Hurt pride at Müntzer's insults partly explains the anger of his reaction in **D**, violently contradictory to his earlier ideas on spiritual liberty and equality. Luther's volatile temperament might be mentioned by some candidates. A supported judgement should be reached on the **main** reason. Candidates may use Source **A** to contextualise Luther's initial sympathies but it cannot be used to assess his change in attitude later in the year. Consequently reference to it is not expected.

**3 Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58: Popular Protest and Rebellion in 1549****(a) Study Sources A and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for Somerset's handling of unrest and rebellion.**

**[20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The two Sources present a different picture of Somerset's attitude and actions towards the commons and popular discontent. However, these two letters are written almost two months apart against a background of growing turbulence and rapidly changing events. Enclosure commissions had been working since 1548 and riots had continued from spring onwards. Full rebellion began in the West Country in early June and later in that month in East Anglia. Both continued into August. Candidates should also be aware of Somerset's increasingly difficult position in the Council (Source A mentions this) and could argue that he was forced to take forcible action. It may also be worth pointing out that Source A is a letter written to Somerset, whilst C is written by him. In A Paget criticises Somerset for his 'gentleness' and 'softness' towards the commons and there is implicit criticism that no clear religious settlement has been made. Somerset's approach has caused the commons to get above themselves. It is clear from C that Somerset has taken severe action against both sets of rebels and, in East Anglia, has commissioned his principal rival, Warwick, to crush the rebellion (and praises him for it). The persistence and seriousness of rebellion is pointed up ('continued their rebellion so stubbornly') and Somerset's view of the rebels (and perhaps his true feelings towards the commons and their discontent is demonstrated by such phrases as, 'the slaughter of one thousand rebels' and 'vile persons'.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the disorder in 1549 was mainly the result of class conflict between the gentry and the common people.**

**[40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

There are elements of support for the proposition in all four of the Sources but D, in particular, and, in some respects, A provide opportunities for framing a counter argument. From own knowledge candidates may point out that the Western Rising had strong religious as well as class issues and there is a reference to religious unrest in Source A. Source A demonstrates the outlook of a member of the ruling class (Paget) in assigning a subordinate place in society to the commons and deploring that they are acting above themselves. On the one hand the Source seems to demonstrate the benevolence of Somerset. On the other hand, it might be argued, Somerset had supported the commission enquiring into enclosures (and Hales) only because he wanted to conceal a more serious cause of inflation (debasement) and thus continue the war against Scotland. Source B records events which certainly support the proposition in the question but authorship is an important issue here and own knowledge will be required for corroboration. Source C demonstrates what might be seen as a typical response of the ruling classes towards social disorder – violent suppression and the language used provides good evidence for these attitudes. Source D provides opportunities for support of the proposition (the small

farmer – or Husbandman – blames the gentry for engrossing and rack renting with consequent price inflation) whilst the Knight's speech provides a counter argument. Broadly speaking the Knight suggests other explanations for the social distress of the period; price inflation which affects the gentry as well as the commons. From own knowledge candidates should be able to suggest explanations for price inflation apart from the perceived greed of the gentry. Smith himself, elsewhere in his writings, recognised the effects of an increase in coin in circulation – caused acutely in this period by debasement and there are hints that he understood the demographic explanations.



**4 The English Civil War 1637-49: The Origins of the Second Civil War****(a) Study Sources A and B**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the aims of the Army for political and constitutional reform. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

There is some common ground between the two Sources and at Putney representatives of the commanders were present as well as the Army agitators and Levellers. What also brings the Sources together is that they both identify an unease with the existing constitutional and political state of the kingdom. The Sources should also be seen in the context of a widening breach between Parliament and the Army across a range of issues – the disbandment of the Army, arrears of pay and other soldiers' grievances, the extent of religious toleration and the status of the existing Parliament. There is a clear indication in A that some of the grievances are grievances of soldiers but the main thrust is what should be done about the Long Parliament (purging, dissolution, provision for future Parliaments). There is a reference, however, to the rights of 'the people'. This theme is taken up more strongly in B where the very radical demand is made for a wide extension of the franchise, specifically by Rainborough and implicitly by Saxby. Speaking for the Grandees, Ireton opposes such a demand.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Second Civil War was made possible only because of the divisions among those who had fought against the King in the First Civil War. [40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

All the Sources show some evidence of divisions within the wide coalition which had fought against the King in the First Civil War. During the war itself divisions had already revealed themselves, and candidates should be able to comment upon this from their own knowledge, and include such matters as: religious divisions and the question of religious toleration; disagreements about how the War could best be won and how to treat with the King; a widening split between, broadly, the Army and Parliament; disagreements between those who wanted a more radical outcome to the War and those who were concerned about social order and the rights of property. With victory these divisions surfaced more clearly. Source A reveals the disenchantment of the Army with Parliament and the Army puts forward proposals for the present and future Parliaments. The Source mentions the issue of 'disbandment' and from own knowledge candidates will link this with grievances connected with arrears of pay and indemnity. Source B reveals the divisions between the social, religious and political radicals and the more conservative Grandees. Source C is key since the invasion of England by the Scots triggered the Second Civil War. The Scots had clearly fallen out with their former allies and the Source shows religion to be at the centre of the dispute. Candidates with wider knowledge of The Engagement may point out that part of its stated intention was to suppress a whole range of practices and sects including Independents, Anabaptists, Separatists and Seekers. Source D can be used to demonstrate the divisions between those who sought a settlement with the King.

Candidates should be prepared to extend the argument by evaluating the importance of other explanations for the outbreak of the Second Civil War. These might include the stubbornness and duplicity of the King as illustrated by his escape from Hampton Court, his negotiations with various parties whilst at Hampton Court and Carisbrooke and his final rejection of the Four Bills. A further explanation to be advanced is the continuing royalist support; the Scottish invasion in early summer 1648 coincided with risings in South Wales, Essex and Kent.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will strike a good balance between all the Sources, be aware of their limitations and use 'own knowledge' and advance an informed and reasoned judgement. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**.

Answers using only own knowledge will have a ceiling of **Band IV**

**5 Louis XIV's France 1661-1693: The French Economy: Prosperity and Poverty****(a) Study Sources C and D**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the development of Paris and Versailles in the reign of Louis XIV.**

**[20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Source C does not mention Versailles but certainly presents a favourable view of the way Paris has developed during the reign of Louis XIV and makes a clear connection between 'its progress across the board and the absolutism of the government. The city is 'beautiful and magnificent', it is more 'populous' than London and the houses of the nobility display signs of great wealth. Comment on the authorship of Source C should be helpful in evaluating it. Source D presents a very different picture and points to royal neglect of the city of Paris. As a result, perhaps, 'Paris is inferior to many cities all over Europe'. By contrast effort and resources have been lavished upon Versailles but the results are, to say the least, disappointing. It is important to comment upon the authorship of Source D. Saint-Simon was a noble, he lived at Versailles and is a well-known critic of the Versailles system.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Louis XIV was responsible for inflicting poverty and suffering upon his subjects rather than promoting their prosperity.**

**[40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Across the Sources as a set, there is plenty of material, complemented by own knowledge, to support either of the two propositions suggested by the question. Furthermore, candidates need not come down on one side; a synthesis is perfectly possible based, perhaps, on an assessment of poverty/prosperity with reference to chronology (point in the reign), region, sector of the economy, class. It is interesting that the two foreign observers (the Venetian in A and the Englishman in C) take a very different, and more favourable, view from the two aristocratic Frenchmen who are the authors of B and D. Candidates will know that both of these were critics of the King's ministers, of royal policies and of the court at Versailles. Both were well placed to view and judge events at first hand. Source A is especially concerned to deal with the economic development of France. It has particular reference to the work of Colbert and concentrates upon manufacturing and, to a lesser extent, trade. It omits to say how widely these benefits are disseminated. Source C describes a thriving capital city and there is a hint of widespread prosperity in the comment upon the populousness of Paris. From the remarks on the beauty and magnificence of Paris candidates might draw the inference that public buildings have impressed the observer and that this is the achievement of the Crown. The most striking comments, however, deal with the wealth of the nobility. In Source B, by contrast, Fenelon draws attention to the impoverishment of France as a result of heavy taxation, high expenditure and protracted foreign wars. The people suffer from poverty and even starvation whilst employment, commerce and agriculture are in a state of ruin. Source D is largely concerned to criticise the neglect of Paris and the resources lavished upon Versailles. The

cost of the court reflects a similar point made in Source B. Not only has the Versailles project used vast resources but it has caused great human suffering.

## 2582 Document Studies 1774 – 1945

### 1 The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-1792: The Problems of the Monarchy by 1792

#### (a) Study Sources A and B

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems facing France at the end of 1791 and in the first half of 1792. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Content: A looks at the whole of France and mentions problems of peasantry and persecution of non-juror priests; B talks more about problems of investors and businessmen. Both refer to lawlessness (anarchy A and murders B). Both talk about inflation. There is a link between the non payment of taxes in A and the failure to pay interest in B – government finance is clearly a problem. In A a war is likely; in B the war has started with disastrous results.

Nature – A is written when the new Constitution has only just been formed whereas the writer of B may be coloured by their royalist attitudes to problems of disorder created by opposition to the monarchy. B is a few months later after the war predicted by A has become a reality. B is from a native source; A is from a foreign observer, presumably with a different political viewpoint. However neither is a radical viewpoint and implicit in both is a fear for law and rightful authority. (B wants security and A dislikes Anarchy). Both are useful for showing the problems of operating a constitution when there are serious problems still unresolved in both the countryside and in Paris.

#### (b) Study all the Sources

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the war which began in April 1792 was the most important factor in undermining the Monarchy. [40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

The debate is whether the war was the main factor in undermining the Monarchy or whether longer term problems were more to blame. All four mention the war – A as a way to escape problems; B as likely to add to problems with rebellious troops and foreign invasion. C reflects the King's own fears – as it happens justified; D mentions the peril and blames Louis for being the focus of the aims of the foreign armies.

Own knowledge could point to the defeats, the defection of leading figures which encouraged violent scenes – the Brunswick manifesto which ignored the plea of the King in C; the national call to arms and the violent acts of August and September committed in the context of fears for French security.

On the other hand, there are long term problems revealed here. Both A and B reveal financial and political problems; there was the unpopularity of the émigrés referred to in A and C. By implication they are getting out of control. D refers to longer term resentments in Paris of the King's behaviour since 1789 and the short-term constitutional problems of the use of the veto.

Candidates might expand the tensions between the provinces and the capital about the religious issue; the growth of the Jacobins referred to in C; the influence of the Paris commune and continuing popular disturbances which would climax in August but had their origins before the war – indeed since July 1789.

A and B are from essentially conservative sources and A is a foreign observer; C is remarkably astute but does actually show that the problems of war might have been avoided with better judgement from the émigrés and the King of Prussia and Emperor of Austria. D is a radical source that might not have been typical of all of France, or indeed all of Paris. The King had weathered the hostility of previous crowds in the Tuileries the military defeats, combined with the power of the radicals in Paris and the mobs were too much.

## 2 The Condition of England 1832 – 53: The Chartist Leadership

### (a) Study Sources C and D.

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the reasons why the Chartist land plan failed (1843-51).** [20]

#### Focus: Comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Similarities: Both **C** and **D** comment on the divisiveness of the Land Plan within Chartist ranks and amongst the leaders. Wilson in **D** comments on 'dissatisfaction within,' Cooper in **C** being a good example given the 'fierce quarrel' between himself and O'Connor. The basis of this was Cooper's belief that the land Plan failed because O'Connor was fraudulently using shareholders' money to keep his paper, The Northern Star, afloat. This is supported by Wilson's comment in **D** about investigation by the Courts and Parliament of the Plan which helped to discredit both it and O'Connor.

Differences: Whilst Cooper in **C** blames O'Connor, Wilson in **D** provides a wider context for failure and seems to exonerate O'Connor. He refers to 'many difficulties', citing press hostility and establishment investigation (legal obstacles) as well as the 'settlers' being 'townies' unused to commercial farming. He implies the sacrifices were worth it and failure was mainly because it was 'ahead of its time' and not given a chance by government and other Chartists.

The provenances are very different. Although both are written from hindsight (the 1870s and 1880s) by active Chartists who were aware of its ultimate failure, they disagree over the reason why. As a northern Chartist Wilson might be expected to be sceptical of rural land schemes, yet he provides a balanced overview ('within and without') with a calm tone, in contrast to Cooper in **C** who is clearly embittered (thrown out of the NCA, with Parliament exonerating O'Connor of the fraud he accused him of). His own paper had folded and some candidates may know of his imprisonment (1843- 45) and disillusion with O'Connor's physical force Chartism, (although the latter is not to be expected). His tone is unrepentant and he makes it personal - O'Connor tried to obtain his support for a 'Plan' although he is right that it did bring 'ruin and disappointment to many'. As a result good candidates could point to Wilson in **D** as providing the better evidence for failure.

### (b) Study all the Sources

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Feargus O'Connor's leadership harmed rather than advanced the Chartist cause in the period from 1838 to 1852.** [40]

#### Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

O'Connor's leadership is and was a controversial issue and the Sources take a variety of views on the extent to which he harmed or advanced the Chartist cause. Lowery and Cooper (**B** and **C**) are anti O'Connor, Wilson in **D** largely pro and keen to put him into the context of the sheer difficulties Chartism faced, whilst Harney in **A** is mixed (or more balanced?) in his approach. Lowery (**B**) and Cooper (**C**) are convinced that he harmed the Chartist cause. Cooper's views on O'Connor's alleged fraudulence in the land Plan

corroborate Lowery's assertion that he was 'untrustworthy' and would pursue whatever was immediately popular. However, Lowery was a moral force Chartist with a temperance instinct which would disapprove of O'Connor's 'physical force', especially his inflammatory use of language referred to in **B** in the factory districts. Cooper remains embittered at his own failures (as a journalist and in his personal relationship with O'Connor over the Land Plan). Both **B** and **C** could be seen to be exaggerating. It is possible to see O'Connor's oratory as an asset, one of Harney's 'qualities' for an effective and popular leader ('eloquence'). He clearly attracted large crowds. Some candidates may use Harney's views on what constituted effective leadership as a peg on which to hang their answer. Sources **C** and **D** both refer to O'Connor's land Plan. Whilst Cooper in **C** considers it ill founded and fraudulent, Wilson in **D** comments on its effectiveness as a tactic. Own knowledge may see it as a crucial link in a lean period between the 2<sup>nd</sup> Chartist Petition (and the Plug Plot Riots in 1842) and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Chartist Petition of 1848 and beyond. It arguably maintained focus, involvement (**D**'s 'thousands') and enthusiasm ('cheerfully making great sacrifices' in **D**). Wilson (**D**) gives credit to O'Connor for 'grappling with the Land question' and reminds us what Chartism was up against (government, press and law). His is effective and balanced evidence as he reminds us that, despite the enthusiasm, many 'settlers' were unsuitable. Own knowledge could extend this – Brontiere O'Brien criticised O'Connor for encouraging private landowning when a nationalised and socialist 'land for all' should be the aim. Harney in **A** is a very useful source given its relative balance. On the one hand O'Connor fulfils much of Harney's criteria for leadership. He looked the part, was a great orator (a source of jealousy?) and he believed they could have fared worse without him. The credibility of Harney's evidence is underlined by his dislike of the physical force O'Connor appeared to stand for. He certainly observes that it may go down well at meetings (O'Connor's speciality) but in practice was unproductive, as Newport and the Plug Riots demonstrated. Candidates could also pick up on another controversial aspect of O'Connor's leadership – his dominance of the Chartist newspaper, *The Northern Star*, run and owned by him. Cooper in **D** considers it a vehicle to promote O'Connor's ambition and dominance, maintained fraudulently in the late 1840s. However it could be argued it provided unity for a disparate cause and Harney in **A** dismisses Engel's charge that O'Connor would only allow his own views to be aired. Cooper's evidence is to be doubted on matters of journalism. Own knowledge can broaden the debate. O'Connor was inventive in finding new tactics to keep Chartism 'healthy'. He was enormously popular and ensured, prior to 1845, an appropriate focus on the vote. His language was that of all radicals before he collapsed into insanity in 1851. Yet he fell out with virtually all the other Chartist leaders, especially Lovett (who championed Moral Force and whose methods in the long term saw more success in achieving Chartist aims). He lacked the courage ('cowardice' in **B**) to see through the Kennington Meeting in 1848.



**3 Italian Unification 1848-70: Garibaldi and Rome****(a) Study Sources A and D****Compare these Sources as evidence for support for Garibaldi.****[20]**Focus: Comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Some candidates may place greater emphasis on the similarities or the differences depending on their interpretation of the content of the sources. The sources appear to agree on more points than they differ. Both sources indicate that Garibaldi's forces were volunteers. In **Source A** the author explains he had 'no intention of enlisting' yet finally did so because he 'could not resist him' and **Source D** is more explicit in using the word 'volunteers' twice. Similarly, both sources emphasise the amateur nature of Garibaldi's forces. **Source A** suggests many were artists with no military training, a point confirmed in **Source D** which admits they did not know how to handle a gun and they would 'dismay anyone with experience of war'. Although **Source A** is less than specific about the type of people attracted to the Garibaldini the implication is that all sorts ('thousands') were which is verified by **Source D** that refers to 'men and women of all social ranks'. A clear sense of commitment to the cause is conveyed in both. In **Source A** the narrator admits to religious zeal and we are told he stayed with Garibaldi for the next 11 years. In **Source D** they are described as 'heroic'. The sources seem to differ on the motives of his men. In **Source A** the charisma of Garibaldi is clearly a factor whereas in **Source D** 'patriotic fervour' is stressed.

Comments on the provenance of the sources might sensibly focus on the typicality of the sources and their dates. It might be argued that the author of **Source A** exaggerates Garibaldi's qualities out of loyalty to him or as a way of explaining his actions in joining him. However, the evidence of other Garibaldini confirms that the views expressed in **Source A** were fairly typical. The eulogising of Garibaldi in **Source A** might also be explained by the context of the events. The defence of Rome in 1849 was a genuinely heroic act of defiance against overwhelming odds against a force (the French) recognised as an enemy of the Italian cause. The author of **Source D** might also be regarded as a reliable source given the balanced comments offered about Garibaldi's forces. Reference to the exploits of Garibaldi in previous campaigns might be made which would support the observations of **Source D**. Indeed, cross-reference to Source C could be made, for example, to highlight the failure of his forces to excite rebellion.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Garibaldi's failure to secure Rome for Italy between 1849 and 1867 was due to his own limitations as a military commander.**

**[40]**Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Some sources might be interpreted in more than one way. On balance, and taken at face value, **Sources B** and **C** are more likely to be seen as supportive of the view whereas **Sources A** and **D** might be used to counter the view expressed in the question. Candidates who pair these sources in this way can present a sound response. However,

as the comments below indicate there is scope for a variety of structures to answer this question and the more sophisticated responses may use the sources in a less formulaic fashion.

The case for Garibaldi's failure to take Rome because of his limitations as a military commander rests on two main charges. Firstly, it could be argued that Garibaldi was too cautious as a military commander. Candidates might point to **Source B** and the fact that Mazzini urged an attack on Rome and Garibaldi, himself, acknowledges the strength of his own forces. Similarly, in **Source C**, Garibaldi refuses to take the initiative and rejects conflict with the forces opposing him. However, those who evaluate the content of these sources may dismiss Mazzini's advice as idealistic and typical of a man whose military exploits were limited and largely unsuccessful (attempted revolutions in the 1830s, for example, and his over optimistic confidence in the strength of Italian patriotism). Furthermore, Garibaldi's explanation for his reluctance to advance in 1860 can be vindicated given the reality of Neapolitan forces to his rear and the strength of French forces in Rome, and in 1862 because of his understandable reluctance to challenge the forces of Victor Emmanuel on whose behalf he was acting.

Secondly, it could be argued that Garibaldi failed to secure popular support. **Source C** makes this clear as the uprising anticipated by Mazzini was not realised and **Source D** states that Garibaldi failed to initiate revolt in Rome despite his efforts to do so. Contextual knowledge could be added to explain these points. The Brigands War in Naples could be mentioned as the background against which Garibaldi launched his attempt in 1862 which was regarded by many as an unwelcome distraction from more pressing concerns of law and order. It could also be claimed that Garibaldi was not universally popular in the south because of his reluctance to challenge the power of the landlords when he liberated Naples in 1860. The reticence of those in Rome to revolt in 1867 can be explained by fears of a repetition of the experience of 1849 and urban apathy. Only the really well informed will be able to elaborate on the measures taken to raise revolt in Rome. However, some will, no doubt, be able to expand on the reference to the French in **Source D**. In September, French forces withdrew from Rome but, following Garibaldi's attempt to instigate rebellion in Rome, Napoleon sent a strong force back to Rome and defeated Garibaldi at Mentano.

A counter argument can be constructed. It is clear that Garibaldi was an inspired leader. **Source A** can be trawled extensively to demonstrate this. **Source C** testifies to his popularity as 'crowds' turned out to his meetings in Sicily, and the sympathy of the navy is implied. **Source D** could be used in this respect showing the extent of the support enjoyed by Garibaldi as it refers to 'bands of volunteers'. Own knowledge could be supplied to indicate the numbers who did join his army. 'The Thousand' of 1860 swelled to several thousand in Naples and in 1867 over 3,000 comprised his army. Another point in defence of Garibaldi could be made by stressing the inadequacy of his forces. Garibaldi's men were volunteers lacking military training. **Source D** is explicit in this respect claiming that they did not know how to handle guns and that they were unconvincing as a force. Clearly, the artist in **Source A** did not have military experience and presumably that was true of the thousands like him who joined up. Some candidates will be able to elaborate on the composition of Garibaldi's forces: those who fought for him in 1867 were less dedicated and more disorganised than those in 1849 and 1860. However, some candidates might argue that despite these points of weakness the sources indicate some positive points about Garibaldi's men. **Sources A and D** testify to their idealism. Knowledge of the aims and objectives of the Garibaldini (in 1849 inspired by Mazzini and in 1867 by a desire to complete the unification of the state) would inform answers. Furthermore, Garibaldi's men enjoyed considerable military success which suggests they were an effective fighting force. Candidates have scope here to recall the campaign of Garibaldi through Naples. **Source B** highlights the defeat of the Neapolitans at the Volturno, which was a major achievement. Garibaldi's men are described as fighting heroically in **Source D** and the implication of

**Source A** is that the men were utterly loyal and prepared to fight for Garibaldi something candidates can elaborate on by reference to the events in Rome in 1849 and the subsequent retreat of the Garibaldini across Italy. In addition, candidates can point to the opposition of the Italian government and the French, stressed in **Source C**, the opposition of the latter being implicit in **Source D** and even **Source B**.

**4 The Origins of the American Civil War 1846-61): Northern Opposition to Secession****(a) Study Sources A and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the role of the Southern States in the economy of the United States. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Essentially the Sources are in agreement about the importance of the South to the US economy. They both draw attention to the contribution of exports from the South to the nation's economy. Source A is more specific, saying that cotton exports account for more than half the total. They also agree about the importance of Southern trade to (Northern) shipping. In other respects the two accounts are complementary. Source A draws attention to the products the North obtains from the South, particularly cotton for New England cotton factories. Source C on the other hand argues that it is Southern exports which pay for imports to the US. These different emphases can be explained by the provenance of the Sources. The Northern newspaper (Source A) is concerned to spell out what the North will lose if the South secedes, while the Southern paper (Source C) focuses on the scale of the South's contribution to the national economy. More important, however, is the fact that newspapers from the two sections agree overall on this issue.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the main reason why the North opposed secession was to uphold the principle of democracy. [40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources fall into two groups. Sources B and D support the proposition, while Sources A and C suggest that the main reason why the North opposed secession was fear of its economic consequences. Sources B and D are both from the North and therefore may be regarded as authentic expressions of views current in the North. Both argue that secession would mean that the American system of government had failed, with implications, according to Source B, for the future of democracy everywhere. Note that Source B uses the word 'rebellion' rather than secession. The fact that Source D is from Lincoln himself makes it particularly important, though of course he was leading (persuading) as well as expressing Northern opinion. Candidates may add from own knowledge that he also argued that secession was illegal under the Constitution. Source C, on the other hand, says that the North opposes secession because the Union allows it to exploit the South, though, as a Southern Source, it may be over-stating its case with words such as 'plunder'. Source A, however, makes much the same case, arguing that the Union must be 'preserved at almost any sacrifice' for its economic benefits to the North. The fact that these two Sources come from opposite sides of the sectional divide enhances their value as supports for the view that the economic issue was the crucial one. Candidates may wish to introduce the question of slavery into their answers. However, although abolitionism may have been the hidden agenda for some in the North, it is difficult to argue that it was a major reason for opposition to secession. Indeed Lincoln in 1861 was anxious to reassure the South that he had no plans to abolish slavery. All these arguments played

a part in forming Northern opposition to secession. The Sources are all authentic expressions of Northern opinion (or in the case of Source C a Southern view of Northern opinion), so candidates may validly reach different conclusions about the balance to be struck between them.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

**5 The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93: The First Home Rule Bill****(a) Study Sources B and D**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for Gladstone's motives in introducing the Home Rule Bill in 1886. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

B has Gladstone pursuing office at all cost and falling into a trap set by Parnell – the motive is to gain the votes of the Home Rule Party in the commons and gain office. D has a powerful defence based on reality and hope for the future. Coercion has not worked and cannot be relied on. What is needed is a more idealistic policy to preserve peace and the unity of Empire – these themes do not appear in B which is far more critical – mice are limited single minded creatures; D shows Gladstone as humane and thoughtful, driven by logic, not by Parnell offering a bait. D offers statistical justification which the mouse cannot offer.

In terms of provenance we have a critical satirical view in a humorous magazine whose intention is to exploit a situation to poke fun. In D we have a very serious plea at the end of a long debate on a bill which encountered not only bitter opposition from the Conservatives but also heavy criticism from Gladstone's own party, some of whom were all too ready to see Gladstone's personal ambition, as reflected in B as more compelling than the idealism and logic he deployed in his speech. Both are public documents, but the audience is very different – the House of Commons in D requiring logic and committed oratory; the sceptical reading public of late Victorian England, politically aware and not very sympathetic to concessions to Ireland that Gladstone could not even persuade his own party to support.

**(b) Study all these Sources**

**Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that opposition to Home Rule legislation in 1886 was unjustified. [40]**

Focus: judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected

The debate reflects heated contemporary discussion. Critics argued that Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule was insincere (B), that concessions to terrorism and obstruction were immoral; that the empire would be weakened; that the actual arrangements for Home Rule would not work (a line taken by Bright), that consequences would be unforeseen, threatening our economy and security (C); that Ulster would be threatened (A)- (the Orange argument cynically taken by Lord Randolph Churchill) Candidates may know that elements of the Catholic church did not approve, fearing the revolutionary aspect of Irish agitation and disliking Parnell's Protestantism. On the other hand, Gladstone justified it by referring to the redundancy of previous policies and considering successful federal structures in other parts of the world and, indeed, the Empire. There were still ties to the mainland and he was not offering complete independence.

Three of the sources are critical and only one (D) offers a justification. A offers two arguments – the ‘knife into the heart of the empire’, playing on Gladstone’s well known anti-Imperial reputation ( not borne out by facts) and also the ‘Orange Card’ that for Ulster protestants ‘Home Rule is Rome Rule’ Neither is compelling and candidates might refute them. B is perhaps more telling. Having dismissed Home Rule in the early 1880s, Gladstone had a dramatic conversion and contemporaries were quick to see this as having more to do with the balance of power at Westminster than moral revelation. There are opportunities to explain the political situation in 1885-6. The cartoon is obviously opinionated. Bright’s views centred on surrendering to terrorism and not being able to control the freer Ireland because Parnell and the Home Rulers were untrustworthy and at heart disloyal. There might be problems with defence and with free trade, a particular cause of Liberals like Bright. This illiberal Liberalism might come in for some justified scorn from candidates, showing a remarkable amount of prejudice, given Parnell’s disassociation from the League and obvious belief in legality and property since Kilmainham.

Gladstone makes a good case in itself – but given the passions in Ireland, the ongoing economic problems and the divisions between Ulster and the south, the vision of peace and unity may be hard to accept. What is more convincing is the failure of Coercion – Gladstone was essentially stepping away from the continuing need to sacrifice liberal principles in view of problems in Ireland.

In terms of provenance these are all sources from those with a distinct view point to put over, three from active politicians and one from a magazine eager to make a political point.

## 6 England in New Century 1900-18: Women's Suffrage 1906-18

### (a) Study Sources A and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for views on women being given the vote.  
[20]

#### Focus: Comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for.' The headings and attributions should aid evaluation, and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

There is a clear difference between **Source A** (Webb) and **Source C** (Wright). Webb is in favour of women being involved in politics, while Wright is most definitely not. Webb bases her views on contemporary developments in society which increasingly have made female spheres of influence and interest important concerns of government. Therefore, women should be represented in parliament, and play a role in the affairs of state. Wright, however, maintains that men and women are essentially different (psychologically and physiologically), and that this renders women fundamentally unsuited to political involvement.

In terms of provenance, Webb, a well-known Fabian socialist and social commentator, represents a growing belief in the importance of state intervention, and therefore the involvement of all citizens in this process. She is writing in 1906 at the start of a new Liberal Government which seems to promise ambitious social and political reform. However, by 1912, when Wright comments, the Liberals are in trouble, and it is obvious that opposition to reform is still strong. Sir Almroth Wright, writing in *The Times*, represents the views still held at the time by some eminent doctors. To many, this analysis of the nature of women appeared intellectual, scientific and therefore unarguable. To his opponents, his arguments appeared insulting and extreme.

### (b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the campaign for equality of suffrage for women stood a good chance of success from 1906 to 1918.  
[40]

#### Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge

Successful answers will need to make use all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge, and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

**Source A** (Webb) suggests that there is growing pressure to give women the vote. Webb herself has become convinced that female concerns are becoming increasingly important in both society and government. She also says that women in general are becoming more aware of the need for the involvement in politics. Millicent Fawcett, the leader of the NUWSS, tended to use similar arguments to Webb's throughout her long campaign for women's suffrage. In **Source D**, Fawcett (as reported in the NUWSS minutes) is optimistic that some sort of victory on suffrage is in sight. Candidates might support this with reference to World War One, and the contributions of women to the war effort which may have helped their cause. However, it is clear in **Source D** that serious political obstacles to full equality still remain. It might be pointed out that Lowther (hostile to women's suffrage in 1913) was still Speaker in 1917. However, although personally against female suffrage, Lowther did try to set up a balanced committee to find a solution to the problem. Nevertheless, serious compromises were always likely. Critics of the Report of the



Speaker's Conference pointed out at the time that many female munitions workers would be excluded from the vote by such compromises. Indeed, in the 1918 Act only women aged thirty and over were given the vote.

**Source B** (Gladstone) offers only partial support to the assertion. Most of the Liberal members of parliament, and a majority in the Liberal Cabinet (Churchill, Lloyd George etc), support women's suffrage. However, it is clear that Asquith (the Prime Minister) is opposed. Other opponents included Gladstone himself (the Chief Whip), and the recipient of his letter, Grey, both of them alienated by suffragette militancy. Gladstone also suggests that party divisions make legislation unlikely at this stage. Reference could be made by candidates to the positions and attitudes of the main political parties. Perhaps also to the events of 1913 when Lowther, the Speaker of the House, played a leading part in blocking an amendment to a suffrage bill which would have given some women the vote.

In **Source C**, Wright, employing a studiously intellectual approach, illustrates how opposition to women's suffrage was still strong in 1912. Candidates might be able to cite other kinds of anti-suffrage argument from the period. The background is the increasingly violent militancy of the WSPU, and Wright refers to this in his argument.

**7 Nazi Germany 1933-45: Propaganda and Indoctrination, 1933-39****(a) Study Sources B and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the success of Nazi methods of indoctrination.**

**[20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

In terms of provenance, source **B** is from an SPD agent, a political opponent, reporting to his superiors in exile. **C** is a Nazi government report. The irony is that **B** appears to be affirming the success of Nazi methods of indoctrination while **C** laments the lack of success.

**B** focuses on the Nazi tendency to organise people, to give a sense of belonging. It implies a certain success in that people seem to be resigned to 'not having a private life'

In **C**, after five years of Nazi rule a sense of general well being is given, suggesting some success for Nazi methods. Clearly though, a fundamental aim of indoctrination; to prepare people for a possible war, has failed

**B** suggests a degree of successful brain washing: 'not to think at all', whereas **C** implies that people are in fact thinking for themselves.

Valid comments can be made about the reliability, dating and honesty of both sources.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that propaganda and indoctrination enabled the Nazis to transform Germany between 1933 and 1939.**

**[40]**

In terms of grouping, **A** clearly implies successful propaganda, indoctrination and establishment of 'national unity'. This obviously should be qualified by evaluation since by this date Goebbels had the national press under control. However, in a different way, the message in **A** can be supported by the comments made by the SOPADE agent in **B** writing at approximately the same date. Some qualified support for the assertion is given in **D**, however, candidates should point out that most of this impression of 'unity' was superficial and a propaganda myth. Clearly, **C** states that in the essential area of indoctrination and preparation for war, Goebbels' methods have failed.

Candidates should test and evaluate these sources by applying relevant knowledge. Good answers might point out that a 'social' transformation was not achieved. Clearly the key to judgement on this is the extent to which the whole idea of a classless, unified 'volksgemeinschaft' was simply a propaganda device masking a dictatorship ruling essentially by fear and terror.

## 2583 English History 1042 – 1660

### England 1042-1100

#### 1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066

- (a) How effective was the government of England during the reign of Edward the Confessor?

Focus: Assessment of the condition of the Anglo-Saxon state

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. It is not expected that candidates will show knowledge or understanding of the period before 1042 or of developments after 1066. The effectiveness of government did depend very much on the personality of the king, but even the limitations of Edward the Confessor did little to undermine government. However, it might be argued that the monarchy had more potential power than Edward realised. Kings ruled the state with recognised powers by divine right and custom. The Witan was consulted but the king held the balance of power. Anglo Saxon England had a variety of institutions and a strength in the legal system that made it well organised and efficient. Edward's role in the succession issue could be used to show how effective the monarchy was. Some answers might also point to his ability to force the Godwins into temporary exile as evidence of effectiveness. The comparatively efficient working of administration and the fiscal system suggest an effective government. However, some answers may suggest that Edward was not effective over his marriage as he failed to provide a direct heir. Some answers may consider whether England was a feudal state and whether that made it more efficient.

- (b) How far did the Godwin family cause instability in the reign of Edward the Confessor?

Focus: Assessment of an important historical situation

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Godwin was already a powerful earl when Edward ascended the throne and might even have helped him in his accession. The Godwin family exercised considerable power and widespread influence, for example in Wessex, Northumbria, East Anglia and the London region. Candidates are not expected to have knowledge and understanding of a previous period but may point out that the family was well established by the time of Edward's accession, to which it probably contributed. Godwin's daughter, Edith, was the wife of Edward. Godwin resisted the Norman influences on Edward. Godwin was able briefly to exercise power over Edward, but died in 1053. Harold then continued the importance of the family and had a major claim to be Edward's heir, showing the status of the family.

**2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072**

- (a) 'William of Normandy's effective invasion preparations were the **most** important reason for his victory at the Battle of Hastings.' How far do you agree?

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for William I successful claim to the English throne

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. At the lower end answers are likely to focus on a narrative of the battle. Candidates may consider issues such as the basis of the claims of William and Harold, William's recognition by the Pope. The invasion was well organised, as was the military campaign and his army was well disciplined, although some may suggest that there was a danger of panic. There may be mention of William's leadership skills. Answers should also consider the failings of Harold. Harold was preoccupied with events in the north and this was followed by an over-hasty march to meet the Norman invasion. He failed to gain the full support of the Anglo Saxon earls and he probably mismanaged his resistance to William's invasion.

- (b) How important were castles in explaining why William I was able to secure his power during this period?

Focus: Assessment of a judgement

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Castles were useful as both a military and administrative centre and were a symbol of Norman rule. William began to build castles as soon as he had gained power. They were often built after a rebellion had been put down, but they also provided a local presence and may have stopped rebellion breaking out. The presence of soldiers meant that they could be moved to areas of unrest quickly and the large number of castles along the borders and south coast may also have been helpful. This factor should be weighed up against other reasons such as his military force, the division and weakness of his opponents. The rebels often lacked leadership and their causes were local, which limited their support and appeal. William's treatment of areas after a rebellion may also have been important in discouraging further unrest.

**3 Norman England 1066-1100**

- (a) To what extent had Anglo-Saxon methods of government been replaced by 1100?

Focus: Assessment of change in a period

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Historiography is not an AS level assessment criterion. Candidates will be given credit for accurate references to the views of particular historians but they are not required for any band. The topic begins in 1066 and candidates are expected to have only a general knowledge and understanding of Anglo Saxon government and administration. William I inherited a reasonably efficient system and was willing to accept much of it, adapted as required. The writ was useful and he continued its use, and more frequently, although in Latin rather than English. Sheriffs and shire courts continued. Counties and hundreds continued as administrative units. There was continuity in taxation. On the other hand, William quickly introduced Normans to govern and administer England and his personal methods were more determined or harsher, than Edward. The redistribution of land involved changes in government and administration. The question does not include religious or social change unless these are linked to government and administration.

- (b) Assess the issues that affected the relationship between the crown and church during the period from 1066 to 1100.**

Focus: Assessment of the factors affecting the relationship between key institutions

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. There are a variety of reasons that candidates might consider. They might point to the importance of the personality of the monarch, William I was not very religious, but retained papal support and they might point to his blessing of the invasion. This might be contrasted with William II, although they might point out that many of the chroniclers were churchmen. They might consider the use made by the Norman regime of the church to uphold their rule. Candidates might consider the relationships between the King and their archbishops, particularly William I and Lanfranc and William II and Anselm. Disputes over the recognition of the rightful pope might be mentioned. William's II use of the church to raise revenues through keeping lucrative church offices might be considered.

#### **4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042-1100**

- (a) To what extent did English trade and towns become more prosperous in the period from 1042 to 1100?**

Focus: Assessment of economic change

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The key issue involves comparison (more prosperous) but this question does not demand an even balance between Anglo Saxon and Norman England. Candidates are not expected to have specific knowledge of 1042 and 1100 in an economic history question; the dates represent the beginning and end of the general topic period. The element of change is the most important. Candidates may refer to the fact that the north was less prosperous after the destruction it suffered. Some answers may suggest that the condition of the peasantry suffered as they fell into the feudal system, but this does not necessarily mean that they became less prosperous. There might be reference to regional differences. Candidates might make reference to the growth of towns and markets, especially the growth of London, with Norwich and Winchester probably leading the second rank. Greater contact with the continent created more opportunities for trade.

- (b) How far did the social structure of England change in the period from 1066 to 1100?**

Focus: Assessment of social change

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Some candidates may argue that the Normans had completely destroyed the Anglo Saxon nobility by 1100, but there were some survivals. The case for the dominance is likely to be made in many answers. Most of the land that was not held directly by the King was controlled by the Normans. Many answers are likely to focus on the issue of feudalism. Whether or not it was a completely post-conquest phenomenon, confirmed Norman supremacy. However, some may refer to the fact a few individual Anglo Saxon lords survived and others who had not supported either Harold or later rebels against William I retained some influence, but not their former primacy. Some lesser thegns also survived such as Edward of Salisbury, but they were secondary to Norman lords. They lacked the personal relationship of the new nobility with the Norman Kings. The degree of change was considerable and much more than the element of continuity, although the change was not complete by 1100. Towns were little changed in their social structure although there was a divergence between some that prospered and others that declined in prosperity. The structure of the peasantry was largely unchanged in this period although there was

some simplification of the differences between peasant groups such as villani and cotarii, but this might well have begun before the conquest.

**England 1450-1509****5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450-1470**

- (a) How far do the events of the years from 1450 to 1461 suggest that the powers of the monarchy were still extensive?**

Focus: Examination of an important political institution in a specified period

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The most important discriminating factor will probably be candidates ability to examine the powers of the monarchy. The question refers to the period 1450 to 1461 and examples should be drawn from the relevant period. Monarchy was the highest institution and the office was surrounded by ceremony and formality. Offices such as Chancery and Exchequer could be used to enhance kingship. The king was the head of a more complex judicial system. However, the powers depended very much on the personality of the king. During this period there was discrepancy between 'the powers of the monarchy' and 'the practice of monarchy' by Henry VI. Theories of loyalty could take second place to the ambitions of nobles. Royal councils supposedly subordinate to the crown, could become centres of intrigue against the king. Candidates might examine the development of parliament and its relationship with the monarchy.

- (b) How successful was Edward IV in restoring royal authority in the period to 1470?**

Focus: Assessment of Edward IV success in a specified period

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The specified period is important and credit will be given only for discussions of the period to 1470. Despite his personal qualities Edward did face a struggle in this period. Edward IV was vigorous but faced considerable problems from important nobles, even in his own family, such as Clarence, Gloucester and Warwick. Disorder and private warfare continued and the Lancastrians were a threat, for example in the north. There were attempts by different groups to secure support abroad. The King's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville caused enmity with Warwick. The understanding between Warwick and Clarence further weakened Edward. Candidates can explain the lack of success by Edward in preventing the outbreak of civil war in 1470. However, he did provide a government that many thought fair and effective. Against this the defeat of Edward and the Readeption of Henry might be considered a direct result of Edward's lack of success in handling the nobility.

**6 The End of the Yorkists 1471-1485**

- (a) How far was Edward IV able to solve the problems he faced as king in the period from 1471 to 1483?**

Focus: Assessment of the success of Edward's effectiveness in a specified period

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates should identify the problems that Edward faced on his restoration and consider how successful he was at solving them. The succession is likely to play a large role in many answers and it can be argued that this was his greatest failure. The issue of the nobility may feature in many answers and Edward was generally able to keep control. The Lancastrian threat was effectively suppressed during this period. Edward was able to stabilise his position abroad through the friendship of Charles the Bold and then a treaty with Louis XI of France. He was able to build up the crown resources, which was important after the events of the 1460s, through gaining the Neville lands. Finances were important as a strong monarch needed to be wealthy and Edward died solvent.

- (b) Assess the main reasons why Richard III reign was so brief.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the failure of a monarch

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. It is likely that the issue of Richard's seizure of the throne will play a large part in many answers, but it must be remembered that it was the invasion of Henry Tudor that was the ultimate reason for the brevity of his reign. Some answers may develop this by showing that he was initially quite popular and had been successful under Edward. Answers will need to show how opposition created by earlier events in his reign led to his downfall of Bosworth, after all he was able to defeat the Buckingham rebellion. Answers may consider his lack of a wide power base and show that his support was largely limited to the northern nobility. His marriage plans following the death of his wife Anne Neville also lost him support. By 1485 he was imposing heavier taxes in the form of loans and benevolences and this may have lost him popular support. The Lancastrians always remained implacable and found a champion in Henry Tudor. The foreign support that Henry was given ensured that he stood a chance at Bosworth. Some answers might consider the role of the Stanley's at Bosworth.

**7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485-1509**

- (a) 'The restoration of royal finances was the most important achievement of Henry VII's domestic government'. How far do you agree?**

Focus: Assessment of the achievements of a monarch

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. This is a very wide ranging question and candidates are not expected to cover all issues, what is important is the quality of analysis. Candidates should be aware that strong finances were essential for a strong king. Henry VII certainly did much to improve royal finances, with the greater exploitation of crown lands and his use of other extra-parliamentary methods. He also increased customs revenue, gained a pension from France and by avoiding costly wars built up a strong financial base by the time of his death. However, candidates should weigh this achievement up against other factors such as controlling the nobility, securing the throne from Yorkist threats and restoring royal authority after the civil war. Local government was reasserted with the development of JPs. Although some candidates might compare Henry's situation with the period of the Wars of the Roses in order to assess his achievements this is not a requirement for any band.



**(b) How successful was Henry VII in achieving his aims in foreign policy?**

Focus: Assessment of the success of foreign policy in a specified period

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. In order to assess how successful Henry's foreign policy was better answers are likely to explain his aims and then judge his policy against those aims. One aim might be to ensure that foreign states did not undermine his kingship. Another was the development of this, to use foreign policy as a means of ensuring the future stability of the dynasty, for example through the marriage of Katherine of Aragon and Arthur. He tried to separate Yorkist claimants from potential assistance abroad. Henry's care to strengthen his finances meant that he used foreign policy to make trade agreements, for example the Treaty of Medina del campo (1489) and Magnus Intercursus (1496) which secured trade with the Netherlands and eased relations with Spain. Some candidates might make reference to other measures to strengthen and protect English trade. Relations with Scotland will certainly be relevant and Henry was able to improve the situation. Ireland was not strictly part of foreign policy.

**8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509**

**(a) How far did the social and economic position of the nobility change during the period from 1450 to 1509?**

Focus: Assessment of the extent of social change in an important class

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Some candidates might use the question to compare the nobility with other social groups, to assess whether the nobility were in decline. This is allowable as long as the emphasis remains on the nobility. Candidates might examine the 'decline' of the nobility but should be careful not to emphasise this too much as they still occupied a major place in social affairs. Candidates should not consider the political importance of the nobles, for example their responsibility for the Wars of the Roses and discussion of their administrative roles should be linked to their social importance. They were the largest landholders in a country that was substantially agricultural. Their social influence was obvious as they exercise much influence in the provinces as well as at court. Economic changes were important but more for their potential rather than their impact within the period. Land was still the centre of the economic system and therefore the nobility remained central. Changes to the peasantry and smaller landowners should be kept in proportion. There was pressure on the nobility because of agricultural depression but the impact was mostly after this period.

**(b) How important was the wool trade to the English economy in the period from 1450 to 1509? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of an important economic development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates might consider the importance of wool as an economic employer, with so many involved from shepherds to wool and cloth merchants. It was probably the most important source of employment directly and indirectly. Others were indirectly involved. Although there were regional variations, not all parts of England were involved with the wool trade, all of England had some connections. Some candidates might provide local examples such as East Anglia. Not only was wool important for the internal economy but also foreign trade was largely dominated by it. It was a major source of income for kings as well as merchants and for those who were closer to the production and processing of wool. However, there is some evidence that, during this period, it was becoming less important as other trades were growing and as export markets turned to other sources of wool and cloth.

**England 1509-1558****9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509-1529****(a) To what extent did Henry VIII achieve his aims in the period from 1509 to 1514?**

Focus: Assessment of the success of Henry in a specified period

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The selection of aims is open to candidates but there should be a reasonable range. Among aims that candidates might consider are: Henry VIII wished to impress his subjects as a vigorous king. However, he did not seek an immediate break with his father's methods of government because he retained some of Henry VII servants, but not Empson and Dudley (this might be linked to the desire to achieve popularity). He sought to build a reputation as a successful warrior abroad, which involved war. He aimed to make a worthwhile marriage and finalised the marriage with Katherine of Aragon. He soon imposed his will on England, winning some dubious popularity with the execution of Empson and Dudley. A successful parliament voted supplies. However, continental involvement brought mixed success. There was a victory in the Battle of the Spurs (1513) and some towns were captured, but victory was not complete. The King took credit for the defeat of the Scots at Flodden but the success was due to Surrey.

**(b) 'Henry VIII and Wolsey's foreign policy was successful only in the short-term'. How far do you agree?**

Focus: Assessment of the success of foreign policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. It is difficult to argue that they were never successful; however Wolsey's ultimate fall was linked to foreign policy failure. Candidates might consider the achievements of the foreign policy by comparing them with their aims. Wolsey sought to serve the interests of the king, enabling him to appear as a successful and expansionist monarch, especially against France. He tried to take advantage of the rivalry between Francis and the Habsburgs. He sought to preserve the balance of power in Europe. Some of the aims were contradictory and much depended on others, which may be used to explain why some of the achievements were short-lived. There were successes at the Treaty of London, an ambitious alliance between European powers against the Ottomans, but it soon collapsed. The Field of the Cloth of Gold provided Henry with splendid stage, but the effects were short-lived. Charles' victory at Pavia was a setback for Wolsey's role as leader of European diplomacy; Charles was now in the driving seat. Attempts to build a closer alliance with France through the Treaty of Cognac brought only limited success. The divorce worsened relations with Charles. It may therefore be argued that in some instance success was not achieved, even in the short-term.

**10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529-1558****(a) Assess the impact of war on domestic affairs during the period from 1542 to 1558.**

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for important developments in domestic affairs

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The specification mentions 'The main events of wars with Scotland 1542-6, 1547-50, and with France 1543-6, 1547-50 and 1557-8. This should give examiners an indication of the range that might be covered. It is likely that many answers will focus on the financial costs of the wars under Henry VIII and the impact that they had on domestic affairs, particularly

with regards to inflation and debasement. Some candidates might also point out that the lack of gains did much to discredit the latter years of Henry. The wars were also responsible for the rise of Somerset and Northumberland. During the rule of Edward war had an impact on Somerset's ability to deal with unrest as there was a shortage of troops and this may be a reason in his downfall. Somerset felt he needed military success in order to gain popularity, but again the cost may be linked to the social problems it created. Under Mary the unpopular war against France did much to discredit her regime, particularly the loss of Calais.

**(b) To what extent was Somerset a more effective ruler than Northumberland?**

Focus: Comparison of Somerset and Northumberland

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The range of issues that might be discussed is wide ranging and might include political government and administration, the significance of rebellion and how it was handled, government of religion, foreign policy and the handling of economic issues. Candidates might argue that Somerset was less effective because of the large number of rebellions he faced in 1549, compared with Northumberland, whose rule was largely peaceful. However, they might balance this against the fact that both rulers were unable to sustain their period in office. Somerset was unable to maintain the support of the ruling elite because of his social policies and the way he handled the rebellion and Northumberland's support was not deep rooted as once he left London following Edward's death support for him collapsed. In terms of economic policy Somerset continued the policy of debasement which added to the social problems, whereas Northumberland was more effective. Somerset raised hopes among the peasantry, with the Enclosure Commission, but was unable to satisfy them. Somerset faced opposition to his religious policies, but there was no unrest under Northumberland, despite the more radical moves. Somerset's use of proclamations might have been effective in dealing with immediate problems, but it did little to help his reputation.

**11 Church and State 1529-1558**

**(a) 'The Edwardian Reformation made little impact on the people of England'. How far do you agree?**

Focus: Assessment of an important religious development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Although there were many significant religious changes under Edward's rule their impact on the people is questionable. Candidates might consider the introduction of the Treason Law, the abolition of Chantries, the Prayer Books and the Acts of Uniformity. These measures were often supported by more radical bishops such as Hooper and Ridley, but there was a problem of enforcement at local level as can be seen by the repetition of some of the instructions. The First Prayer Book aroused resistance, particularly in a rising in Cornwall/Western rebellion. Candidates might refer to the lack of support for Lady Jane Grey when Northumberland tried to change the succession, although they may argue this was on grounds of legitimacy. The response to her coronation might be compared with the popularity that greeted Mary. Some candidates might make reference to some of the local studies and the evidence from wills. The study topic extends to 1558 and some answers might make reference to developments under Mary and argue that the ease with which she restored Catholicism illustrates how limited was the appeal of Protestantism. Candidates might suggest that most people did conform under Edward and therefore some inroads had been made.

**(b) How popular were the religious changes under Mary I? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Analysis of important religious developments

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The marriage of Mary to Philip of Spain was certainly unpopular and it is likely that this will feature in many answers, it resulted in Wyatt's rebellion. This was a marriage into one of the most Catholic countries in Europe and Spain was one of the most powerful and it also led England into an unpopular war. Until that point it may be argued that Mary's religious policies had provoked very little opposition. Much of England was still temperamentally Catholic in 1553 and the circumstances of her accession aroused much sympathy for her (her accession was greeted with more enthusiasm than Lady Jane Grey). Her first parliament agreed to repeal the legislation of Edward VI's reign, but it was clear that monasteries could not be restored because of the problem over land. The issue of papal power was more divisive. The ejection of clergy, usually because they were married was unpopular. A treason law was introduced and heresy laws revived. This resulted in extreme prosecutions and persecutions from 1555, causing more opposition to her religious policies; those who suffered were widely seen as martyrs. Some candidates might discuss the opposition to Mary's policies in parliament, they may conclude that this was due to religious reasons or because of other factors such as economic, factional or the sanctity of land. Studies of local areas may also provide material for some answers and these often suggest that the restoration was popular. Some candidates might point to the problems Elizabeth faced in establishing Protestantism as evidence that Mary's policies were popular, but this falls outside the dates in the key issue and should not be expected, but can be rewarded if used to support the argument.

**12 Social and Economic Issues 1509-1558**

**(a) How effectively did the government deal with the problems caused by enclosure?**

Focus: Assessment of the success of government economic policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The major problem in dealing with enclosure was that they benefitted some of the more influential groups within society, landlords on whom the governments relied for effective local government. Some were MPs and many were connected to important political figures. The profits from enclosure were one means of alleviating the effects of rising costs and prices. Legislation depended upon the often unwilling co-operation of these groups. Some good candidates might point out that the problem of enclosures was very regional; the total was small but the effects were severe in particular areas. Wolsey made efforts to limit enclosures (1517, 1518, 1526) but, in addition to the opposition referred to above, he was distracted by his many other responsibilities. Cromwell had similar problems when he tried to tackle enclosure in 1539. The inflation of the 1540s saw an increase in enclosures in spite of the criticism of the practice by the Commonwealth Men. Somerset took the problem seriously especially in the face of riots. He promoted the Hales Commission in 1548-9, but his position was weak and his fall ended real efforts by governments in this period to tackle the problem. Some candidates might point out that there were 'good' and 'bad' enclosures and it was only really the latter that created problems with rural depopulation and landless labourers or the loss of common land.

- (b) How far was there a crisis for towns in the period from 1509 to 1558? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Analysis of an economic problem

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Towns faced a number of problems during the period and candidates can decide whether these were sufficient to warrant the use of the term crisis. Poverty was certainly an issue for many towns, often areas within towns attracted the poor and there was the fear of disorder. Large towns, such as London, Norwich and Ipswich, were prone to the plague because of their relative population density. Smaller rural towns were probably more affected by famine because of the periodic failure of harvests. Inflation was a continuing problem, although it did not have the sudden and devastating impact of plague or famine. Changing trade patterns meant that larger towns in the south and east tended to benefit, and therefore perhaps avoided crises, at the expense of the towns in the north and west, with some exceptions such as Bristol, which gained from the greater volume of overseas trade. The growth of London may be used to show that not all towns suffered a crisis; it continued to be the most important centre of trade and thus attracted a growing population, however, the development of the London hospitals shows that there were problems associated with poverty as do measures taken by Wolsey. Some new trades also helped other towns develop, for example coal, helped some towns in the north east such as Newcastle, so there were exceptions to a regional pattern.

**England 1547-1603****13 Church and State 1547-1603**

- (a) Who was more successful in achieving their religious aims: Edward VI or Mary I? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of the success of religious policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Although it is not expected that candidates will follow a 50:50 split in their coverage there should be a reasonable balance. Some answers might argue that neither ruler was particularly successful as they ruled for only short periods and could not achieve their aims. Although Edward was only a boy he had strong religious beliefs and wanted to establish Protestantism. Some answers may argue that by the end of his reign the legal position was such that this had been achieved and use the Second Prayer Book as the example to support this claim. They may also consider some of the other religious changes such as the Chantries Act and the Act of Uniformity. This might be balanced by the unrest of 1549, although not all of that was religious and even the Prayer Book Rebellion had economic elements. Some answers may suggest that a local level Protestantism had made little progress and therefore Edward was not very successful in achieving his religious aims. In dealing with Mary some may suggest that she was more successful as the country was still basically catholic at heart and point to her accession. On the other hand the burnings and creation of martyrs might be used to counter this. The marriage of Mary to Philip of Spain was certainly unpopular and it is likely that this will feature in many answers, it resulted in Wyatt's rebellion. This was a marriage into one of the most Catholic countries in Europe and Spain was one of the most powerful and it also led England into an unpopular war. Until that point it may be argued that Mary's religious policies had provoked very little opposition. Her first parliament agreed to repeal the legislation of Edward VI's reign, but it was clear that monasteries could not be restored because of the problem over land and this was certainly a failure for Mary. The issue of papal power was more divisive. The ejection of clergy, usually because they were married was unpopular, but was still achieved. A treason law was introduced and heresy laws revived. This resulted in extreme prosecutions and persecutions from 1555, causing more opposition to her religious policies; those who suffered were widely seen as martyrs, but there was little unrest and some have argued that they had little impact. Some candidates might discuss the opposition to Mary's policies in parliament; they may conclude that this was due to religious reasons, suggesting difficulties in achieving her aims or because of other factors such as economic, factional or the sanctity of land. Studies of local areas may also provide material for some answers and these often suggest that the restoration was popular. Some candidates might point to the problems Elizabeth faced in establishing Protestantism as evidence that Mary's policies were successful and this is certainly a valid line to take.

- (b) How strong were Catholicism and Puritanism in England in 1603? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of the strengths of religious groups

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. In considering the Catholic threat answers might consider issues such as the loss of priests, which removed a central element required for practising catholics and that the missionary priests from the 1580s had little effect in spite of government alarm. Persecution did much to destroy the minority of catholic enthusiasts. The Church of England was increasingly seen as the national Church and as it could accommodate a wide spectrum it did much to destroy opposition. Specific developments such as the Papal Bull of 1570 and the Armadas might also have lessened the enthusiasm of many catholics who put nation

before religion. The destruction of much of the extreme puritan movement by Whitgift in the latter years of Elizabeth's reign, following the Marprelate Tracts, may also be mentioned. Some candidates might also argue that extreme Puritanism was never very strong and had been easily contained. However, some may look forward to the Civil war and argue that it maintained its strength despite persecution, however this is outside the Study topic and candidates should not be penalised for not considering this.

#### 14 Foreign Affairs 1547-1587

**(a) How far was the question of the succession the most important factor influencing English foreign policy in the period from 1547 to 1587?**

Focus: Assessment of factors influencing foreign policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. There are a variety of factors that candidates might consider and even at the top end it is not expected that all issues will be considered. Some may argue that dynastic factors were important under Edward with the rough wooing of Mary Queen of Scots, although this might be balanced against security or popularity. Dynastic factors were important to Mary, as shown by her marriage to Philip, but this might also be balanced by religion. Although Elizabeth used marriage negotiations she seemed less important in her reign, although this may be challenged with the importance of Mary Queen of Scots. Security may play a major role in many answers, particularly with reference to Elizabeth's reign and the Dutch revolt and the situation in Scotland. Religion may also be considered and linked to relations with Scotland and Spain. Trade was less important in this period, but some answers might mention it.

**(b) How successful was English policy towards Scotland in the period from 1559 to 1587?**

Focus: Assessment of the success of a particular aspect of foreign policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Most candidates may conclude that Elizabeth's policy was very successful, but at the higher levels alternative judgements should be considered, even if they are rejected. Elizabeth was faced with an immediate problem in Scotland because of the link between Mary and France, especially the very Catholic Guise group. England might also be dragged into the political and religious unrest in Scotland. Although the outcome was successful, it was uncertain for a long time and exposed the inexperience of the new English ruler. But Mary's claims to be her heir or even the rightful ruler of England continued to be a factor in Anglo-Scottish relations and the situation as complicated when Mary fled to England. In an option on English history, candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of affairs in Scotland but should be aware of the impact on England of the continuing uncertainty in that country. Stability had been achieved by 1587, but at a cost, including the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, that Elizabeth had so long tried to avoid.

**15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558-1603**

- (a) 'Elizabeth's relationship with her parliaments was one of co-operation rather than conflict'. How far do you agree?**

Focus: Assessment of a controversial historical interpretation

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Historiography is not an AS Level assessment criterion and candidates are not expected to show knowledge and understanding of this area of historical debate. The number of occasions when Elizabeth was forced to concede or agree to considerable compromise were comparatively few, most notably the religious settlement, pressure to execute Mary Queen of Scots and monopolies at the end of her reign. The examples of a minority such as Wentworth were outweighed by a general feeling of co-operation. Some may argue that Parliament did become more powerful and this led to conflict. This is likely to be based on the willingness of some to exert the rights of parliament, especially by members of the House of Commons. Parliamentary privilege may be an issue that is explored, this involved issues of free speech, freedom of elections and access to the Queen. Candidates may refer to the views of MPs who pushed vigorously the defence of these privileges, most noticeably Peter Wentworth, to argue that there was conflict. However, it should also not be forgotten that she was able to veto bills she disliked and members who went beyond the limits she would tolerate could be punished. Elizabeth did possess the ultimate weapon in that she could prorogue or dissolve parliament. Some answers might make reference to her relationship with the House of Lords.

- (b) How far do you agree with the view that the effectiveness of Elizabeth's government declined in the years after 1588?**

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. There are a number of issues that candidates might consider. The specification mentions the pressures of war against Spain, financial problems, the Irish Rebellion, Essex's rebellion, the parliament of 1601 and the Monopolies Debate. Some answers may also consider the fact that the Queen was becoming more isolated and the succession issue. Some may also consider the general social and economic problems. It is likely that many will agree with the proposition, but there are limitations. The government was effective in so far as the Irish Rebellion was defeated and the government was never seriously threatened, religious peace was also maintained and government under Robert Cecil was stable. The queen herself might have lost popularity, but the prestige of the monarchy was maintained. The last parliament showed the willingness of MPs to criticise her over the monopolies policy that pointed directly at the crown, but on the other hand her Golden Speech showed her continuing ability to diffuse opposition.

**16 Social and Economic Issues 1547-1603**

- (a) How successful was the Elizabethan government in tackling the problem of poverty? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of government attempts to deal with a major social problem

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. There is no need for candidates to assess the extent of poverty, this can be summarised quickly as a major problem throughout the country. Nor do candidates need to examine the causes of poverty at length. Poverty was a serious social problem and the government made a series of attempts to tackle it. Harsh measures such as whipping to deter vagrancy were



supplemented by measures that provided some relief. Elizabeth's government introduced a series of measures, for example the Statute of Apprentices or Artificers (which dealt with pay and conditions of service) and the late Acts of 1597 and 1601. Common features of these acts were that they tried to differentiate between the needy and the lazy and they devolved responsibility to parishes, especially through JPs. These acts combined both parts of official policy, punishment and relief. While the needy were to be provided with protection and the resources to maintain themselves, those who were able bodied were to be punished. Central government lacked the means to do much itself except to state policies. Government still relied on private charity for the problem of poverty. The need to repeat the measures is an indication that success was limited. A major problem facing the governments was that it lacked the machinery to enforce the measure, depending largely on local initiatives to implement policies. Local rates and initiatives depended upon the willingness and co-operation of those over whom the government had little control.

**(b) To what extent was the second half of the sixteenth century a period of expanding trade opportunities?**

Focus: Evaluation of an economic phenomenon

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The question arises from the third key issue and associated content, 'The collapse of the Antwerp cloth market, changing patterns of trade with northern Europe, the opening of new overseas markets'. Antwerp had been England's most important overseas market for the vital cloth trade, therefore the collapse of it as trading centre, gradual from the middle of the century, but increasingly obvious from the onset of the Dutch Revolt and especially after the 'Spanish Fury' was a major blow to the English economy generally; the effects were not limited to cloth. Attempts were made to develop other markets in Europe, but these were largely unsuccessful because of the worsening diplomatic situation with war between France and Spain and then civil war in France. Spain tightened up its monopoly within its Empire, restricting opportunities. New Companies were launched, for example the Muscovy Company and Levant, either to exploit new markets or to maximise trade with previously minor markets. There were attempts to find new routes to the Indies (the North West and North East Passages). Hawkins and others sought to exploit trade in the Caribbean but Spain's hold over the region was quite secure and limited opportunities. Reference might be made to develop settlements in North America. Although there were opportunities, success was limited.

**England 1603-1660****17 Politics and Religion 1603-1629**

- (a) 'Foreign policy caused more problems between Charles I and his parliaments in the period from 1625 to 1629 than it did between James I and his parliaments.' How far do you agree?**

Focus: Assessment of the impact of foreign policy

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Foreign policy certainly caused some conflicts with parliament and it might be argued that in this respect it was not successful, especially as parliament had to vote the funds needed. The practicalities of the policy were also unpopular. James' peace policy may be considered as realistic given the financial situation, but it was not what parliament wanted. Parliament wanted England to support fellow protestant nations in the Thirty Years War and therefore they were unhappy with James. Candidates may also point to the confused aims, the incompetence of Buckingham and the consequences of his failure. There was a setback when a poor army, led by Mansfeld, was defeated in a vain attempt to intervene in the Thirty Years War. Parliament's refusal to grant supplies suggests that they viewed the policy as a failure and action against the Huguenots at La Rochelle brought further criticism on the government. Charles' marriage to Henrietta Maria and a change to support the Huguenots was also a failure.

- (b) Assess the reasons why financial issues caused problems between the Stuart kings and parliament in the period from 1603 to 1629.**

Focus: Analysis of an important political development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. James spent more lavishly on his court than Elizabeth, including gifts to his favourites, which annoyed parliament who thought he was extravagant. However, he had inherited serious debts. Parliament was unwilling to grant more money. Attempts to increase the revenue of the crown, for example through a revision of the Book of Rates, were very controversial. The King's financial difficulties exacerbated a generally difficult relationship between James, who insisted on his right to rule by Divine Right which would inhibit the role of parliament, and members who were eager to defend what they saw as just privileges to influence royal policy. Negotiations over the Great Contract also failed. Control over the purse strings was the way parliament was able to exert some influence over the monarch and this became more important as distrust developed. James' later parliaments were affected by controversies over monopolies. Charles' financial problems became apparent immediately with the refusal to grant enough supplies. War added to the expense so that 'arbitrary taxation' was a major parliamentary grievance by 1628.

**18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629-1649**

- (a) The most important reason for the outbreak of Civil War in 1642 was religious divisions'. How far do you agree?**

Focus: Assessment of an important historical event

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates can consider a variety of issues at stake between Charles and his opponents. They can argue that factors other than religion were more important and this flexibility can be reflected in the amount of time they give to religion. Suspicions of Charles' Catholicism and the unpopularity of Laud's Arminianism and the associated prosecution of Puritans caused opposition in Parliament. The Root and Branch Petition may be examined as can the significance of the arrest of Laud. The Irish Rebellion had a major impact. Candidates can set these issues against the unpopularity of the King's absolutist tendencies, leading to demands for more frequent parliaments and the abolition of prerogative courts. The issue of Strafford may also be considered.

- (b) How far was the influence of the army responsible for the execution of Charles I? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about the reasons for a very controversial development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Some will argue that other reasons were more important, but answers should still consider the role of the army. They might consider the role of army officers and grandees, this might be balanced by a consideration of the Levellers, although their importance in bringing about the execution of Charles is arguable. Candidates might also consider the role of Charles. He played out negotiations in the hope that he could finally win the day or at least in the conviction that he would not surrender his powers. Finally, he embarked on another Civil War with an alliance of convenience with the Scots.

**19 The Interregnum 1649-1660**

- (a) How successful was the Rump in solving the problems it faced in the period from 1649 to 1653?**

Focus: Assessment of the problems of a particular government

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The Rump faced many problems and candidates may consider how well these were handled. There was support for the monarchy, particularly after the execution of Charles. This was followed by a political vacuum or at least uncertainty, because the Rump was unable to achieve a political settlement. The political aspirations of the groups were very different. They found it difficult to deal with the financial problems. The royalist threat in Scotland and Ireland remained but in England it was not active. Increasingly the disillusionment of Cromwell, who held real power, posed a major problem especially over the issue of elections. This resulted in the dissolution of the Rump, suggesting failure.

- (b) Assess the reasons why support for the Protectorate was limited in the period from 1653 to 1659.**

Focus: Explanation of the failings of a system of government

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The answer can discuss a variety of reasons. Candidates may consider the continuing intransigence of royalists and the misgivings of moderates who were still royalist by sympathy. The policies of Cromwell's regime appeared inconsistent. For example attempts to win popular support

were contradicted by forceful measures such as the Major Generals and a high rate of taxation. Credit should be given when candidates examine the opposition to the Protectorate from republicans, who claimed that the 'Good Old Cause' had been betrayed. The constitution was never firmly established; stability depended heavily on Oliver Cromwell and therefore his death weakened support further. There were also financial weaknesses in the regime and this may have limited support.

**20 Society and the Economy 1603-1660**

- (a) Assess the reasons why London played an increasingly important part in national affairs.**

Focus: Assessment of an important socio-economic development

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The relevant content in the Specification mentions 'Growth in the population and the spread of London: building, the Court, fashion, the seat of parliament and law, commercial and financial activity, a centre of conspicuous consumption'. London was the largest centre of population and far outstripped other centres such as Norwich and Bristol. It attracted groups from all social classes. It was the cultural centre. It was the largest market in England with a proliferation of tradesmen and craftsmen. The court played an important role as it could provide offices and direct or indirect employment. It provided patronage that could benefit well-to-do provincials and Londoners. It was the centre of both secular and religious government and administration. It handled a very considerable proportion of England's trade, both internally and externally. It was the centre for many trading companies. Many rich men lived in London. London was the centre for officials and lawyers. It was at the heart of government finance and there were many moneymen there.

- (b) To what extent was the Civil War the main reason for the growth of radical religious and political groups in the period between 1640 and 1660?**

Focus: Analysis of reasons for the growth of radicalism in the period

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The number and variety of religious groups were many and confusing. Political instability and the role of the army rank and file may well be used to explain the role of the Civil War in causing the proliferation. Millenarianism is a confusing term, but should be understood by AS candidates. Some answers might refer to Quakers. Candidates are likely to consider issues such as the breakdown of censorship and the authority of the Anglican Church during this period. Answers might consider the ease of printing, making it difficult for the authorities to control the dissemination of radical views. The prevailing atmosphere in an age where there was a universal belief in God, salvation and damnation led to the proliferation of radical sects. There was an emphasis in radical circles on individualism.

## 2584 English History 1780 – 1964

- 1 (a) 'His ability to reform explains Pitt's domination of politics in the period from 1783 to 1793.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might get credit for attempts to place the relative importance of his reforming policies into the context of other factors assisting his domination – royal support (especially in the 1784 election and during the danger of the 1788 Regency Crisis), his exploitation of the patronage system, the weakness of the Whig opposition, made worse by splits over the French Revolution in 1790, the dislike of Fox and Lord North, economic and financial recovery in the 1780s (which is, in part, linked to his reforming policies) and the political benefits of Pitt's handling of the French Revolution to 1793. More successful candidates in **Bands I and II** may be aware of the fluctuating balance of factors during the period. Many candidates may agree with the question's assertion, stressing the importance of his financial, commercial and taxation reform combined with practicality and vision but the links to his political domination need to be made. These can be matters like the handling of the sinking fund, his bowing to vested interests on political matters and his handling of customs and taxation. However it is possible to point to Pitt's indebtedness to others, to the strength of the economy in the 1780s and to some failures (Parliamentary Reform, mutually reduced tariffs between Britain and Ireland in 1785 and some of his new taxes). Pitt was careful not to offend key interests. Such points could lead candidates to stress the importance of the other factors mentioned, especially royal support and the initial impact of the French Revolution or perhaps Pitt's control of the political system.

- (b) How serious was the radical challenge facing Lord Liverpool's government in the period from 1812 to 1822? Explain your answer.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might establish the nature of the challenge and the extent to which it posed a threat to Liverpool's government. Although they failed in hindsight, the 1810s were very disturbed years which the radicals were able to build upon. 1812 saw bread prices reach their highest in the 19th century and the 1815 Corn Law was seen as a hated Bread Tax, there to keep peacetime prices artificially high. The Continental System was followed by depression in 1815 with Poor Relief reaching its peak in 1818. Luddism in 1812-13 and rick burning in 1816 threatened town and country. Such economic distress stimulated the revival of radical politics and the spread of revolutionary ideas continued via frequent protest meetings spreading democratic and republican ideas under the banner of Parliamentary reform and 'Old Corruption' (March of the Blanketeers 1817; Peterloo 1819). Radicals were experienced in extra-parliamentary methods: meetings, petitions, clubs, press and even a coup d'état (Cato Street). Yet candidates could challenge the relative seriousness of the threat pointing out that they were undermined by an experienced government. There was a lack of cohesive radical leadership which was often impractical and divided over aims and tactics (argument and numbers v force). A very regionalised response fragmented the radicals and they were undermined by moments of economic recovery (1818 & 1821 onwards). A useful route through this question might be to examine the effectiveness of government responses and the activities of a national leader like John Cartwright and his Hampden Clubs and Political Union Societies, Orator Hunt (Spa Fields and Peterloo) or revolutionaries like Thistlewood (attacks on the Tower and Cato Street). Government certainly took the Radicals very seriously.

- 2 (a) Assess the main reasons why it took Britain so long to defeat France in the wars from 1793 to 1815.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to assess a range of reasons before reaching a judgement on the most important explanation. Candidates are likely to stress that Britain's focus for most of the war was on a naval strategy that secured her from attack and protected her trade and overseas colonies. Pitt's interventions to aid counter revolution in the 1790s served only to rally the French to more revolutionary efforts. Not until 1807 did Britain blockade French ports and attack Napoleon's Continental System, and economic blockades took a long time to work. Secondly, Britain was reluctant to intervene directly in mainland Europe, preferring unreliable allies to tie French armies down. The British army was small, poorly led and under-funded in the 1790s. Reforms in 1802-3 brought some improvements but the army was always much smaller than Napoleon's. Even in the Peninsular War, Wellesley only had 60,000 troops and it took him five years of skirmishes, sieges and small battles to wear down the French in what was for the French a secondary theatre. Not until 1812 did Wellesley adopt a more offensive strategy and invade France. Thirdly, Britain's allies were unreliable and selfish, intent on securing their own objectives and reluctant to fight for each other. The first three coalitions collapsed and it needed Castlereagh's diplomacy to bring about a Fourth Coalition in 1813-14 that would achieve victory at Leipzig. Fourthly, Napoleon was unwilling to make peace until he was convinced he could not win the war. Attempts at peace in 1796-97 failed, Amiens in 1802-03 was widely seen as a truce, and not until his navy (at Trafalgar) and army (at Borodino, Leipzig and Waterloo) were defeated would he surrender. Finally, only after 1803 did the British government accept that more money had to be spent on the army, navy and foreign subsidies and that a major military intervention alone would enable her to speak with force on the diplomatic front. Candidates will need to cross reference these factors, perhaps stressing the reluctance to commit militarily as the key factor.

- (b) Which British foreign secretary most successfully upheld the balance of power in the period from 1814 to 1841?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to understand why a Balance of Power was seen as a key British interest – that it was seen as stabilising Europe, thus encouraging trade, preventing the domination of any one power and the need for an expensive and difficult British intervention, as recently seen in the Napoleonic Wars. Castlereagh and Palmerston certainly accepted the need for it, although better candidates might argue that Canning was less certain, stressing his belief in enlightened self interest and the importance of pursuing these. The question refers to who had the most 'success' and candidates will need to make a judgement on this. A possible pattern would be to stress the success of Castlereagh in the period 1814-1817, when Britain was able to play a major role in the Vienna settlement, gaining both what she wanted (extra European supremacy) whilst appearing as a disinterested arbiter in Europe via the Congress System. This very much suited Britain's interests. However by 1818 success seemed less assured as the Holy Alliance (based around an Austro-Russian rapprochement) threatened conservative ideological intervention in Italy and Central Europe. Castlereagh was forced to withdraw from the Congress system. Some might question Castlereagh's success generally given that Britain was reluctant to intervene after 1815, that Austria had been overburdened and Russia had become too powerful. The Canning period could be a crucial test for relative success. It could be argued he backed a wider view of the balance of power, claiming to have brought in to play the New World (South America) to redress the balance of the Old. Was this rhetoric or did his policies of unilateral agreements with France and Russia over Greece and the Eastern Question successfully preserve the balance of power threatened by a resurgent Russia and a recovering France? However the period 1827-1841 is more open to question re success. Britain lost the initiative after Navarino and Russia was able to produce a balance

favourable to herself by 1833 (The Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi). France too sought advantage in the Belgian Question and in Spain, Portugal and the Near East (Mehmet Ali). Palmerston took until 1841 to reverse Russia's advantage at the Straits Convention, but was able to have an earlier success with the more compliant government of Louis Philippe in France. The Quadruple Alliance of Britain, France, Spain and Portugal in 1834 acted as a useful deterrent to the Holy Alliance, restoring a more favourable balance of power. The best answers will adopt a comparative approach between Castlereagh, Canning and Palmerston.

**3 (a) What was the most serious problem that Peel faced in Ireland in the period from 1829 to 1846? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should consider the relative seriousness of the problems before reaching a judgement. A potential route through the question is to examine the political, religious and economic problems. In 1829 the most serious problem was constitutional and religious in the form of O'Connell's Catholic Association which threatened to make Ireland ungovernable. One argument is that by appeasing the Catholic lobby for Emancipation in 1829, Peel solved the religious problem and achieved what Pitt had failed to in 1800, although at a great price to his own reputation. However, he also drew a lot of criticism from Protestants and Emancipation encouraged the Catholic Association to call for repeal of the Union which became a serious issue once he returned to office in the 1840s. Peel regarded the Repeal Association and its Monster Meetings as a serious threat and he was determined to outface O'Connell, arresting him and putting him on trial. The problem of sectarianism still remained, and his attempt to placate the Catholics with the Maynooth Grant was very controversial. Here one could argue he failed but it is questionable whether the conservative Catholic Church was a serious threat after 1829. The question of land reform, perhaps the most serious problem within Ireland, although not necessarily the most serious from an English perspective, was tackled by Peel in an attempt to resolve landlord-tenant issues with little success, but agrarian problems worsened with the Famine of 1845-46, which many candidates may see as Peel's most serious problem, and certainly one which he chose to act upon. It indirectly brought down his government. Better candidates may argue that religious, political and economic problems were interrelated and were most serious when combined as in 1829 or in the early 1840s, and indeed changed with the passage of time. An alternative view would be to stress as serious any Irish issue that affected politics at Westminster, such as Emancipation or Land reform.

**(b) How successful was Peel as prime minister (1841-46)? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to assess Peel's success as PM. A useful division might be made between Peel's political success and that of the reforms associated with him. As a politician candidates could question his success – he controlled policy and confided only to a chosen few like Graham, neglecting to win the support of back bench Tory MPs. From the point of view of social reformers like Ashley or health reformers like Chadwick he was stern and unforgiving. Increasingly he alienated key interests and relied for support on cross voting. Yet on commercial, financial and law and order issues he commanded success if not always agreement. The Budget and reintroduction of income tax 1842, the success of Tariff reform, the Bank Charter Act 1844, the Companies Act 1844, the lessening of industrial unrest and a hard line approach to Chartism and the beginning of mid-Victorian prosperity could all be seen as successes, although better candidates may point to some of their limitations. His social policies (amendments in 1842 to the 1834 Poor Law; the Mines Act 1842, the Factory Act 1844 but without educational reforms) were considered successful by the wealthy and their theorists. Politically Peel always tried to prevent disorder, and was largely successful. In Ireland, he defeated the Repeal Association after Clontarf, set up the Devon Commission 1843-45, the Charitable Bequests Act 1844 and



the Maynooth Grant 1845 but this also lost him a lot of popularity among Protestants. He introduced public works schemes and relief for victims of the Famine 1845-46. Critics of Peel may argue that he always put his perceived interests of the nation ahead of his party, and some of his policies caused disquiet among the Tories (eg. opposition to the Factory Bill, the Sugar Duties and most infamously Corn Law repeal). Corn Law repeal would provide a useful issue to discuss the pros and cons of Peel's relative success as PM. Candidates do not have to be comprehensive in their approach to this question as there is much that can be used to answer the question.

**4 (a) How far was Urbanisation seen as a serious problem in the period from 1780 to 1846?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Lower level responses are likely to identify and describe some of the main problems associated with urbanisation. These include social issues such as the spread of diseases, (typhoid, cholera, tuberculosis); poor housing, diet and sanitation; poverty linked to low wages and the uncontrolled expansion of towns. Better essays should assess who viewed urbanisation as an increasingly serious problem and how widespread they were. Groups such as Radicals, Chartists, trades unions, friendly societies, savings banks and cooperatives all tried to mitigate the impact of urbanisation on workers. This could be by turning their back on towns (the Chartist Land Plan) or by campaigning to improve conditions. However it tended to be Individuals such as Kay (who surveyed the living conditions in Manchester in 1832) who were concerned. Owen campaigned to improve factories, and the attempts by Ashley, Fielden, Oastler and particularly Chadwick (his Sanitary Report) to reform living and working conditions, may be considered as evidence that Urbanisation was taken seriously by some. The Improvement Commissioners did much locally, albeit in the central and richer urban areas. Politicians saw in urbanisation mainly a law and order problem but even here it was not until the 1830s that police forces began to develop. However it could equally be argued that few, throughout the period, took urbanisation seriously. Social and urban legislation focused more on the rural areas (the new Poor Law) than the Urban ones, whilst Municipal Reform (in 1835) was more concerned with distributing power from Tory to Whig than with street lighting, sanitation and clean water supplies. Romantics in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century turned their back on the towns, as did the Novelists, at least until the 1830s. Vested interests and local oligarchs fought to prevent any change under the banner of opposition to despotic and an un-English centralisation and interference (as represented by the Benthamites and personified by Chadwick). A public health act was successfully prevented throughout the period. London particularly resisted improvement. Better candidates might point to the final decade, the late 1830s and early 1840s, as the turning point when urbanisation could no longer be ignored.

**(b) 'Popular opposition to industrialisation always failed in the period from 1780 to 1846.' How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. How candidates assess 'always failed' will be the key to this question. Among the types of popular opposition to industrialisation are: Luddism and Croppers, Chartism, the Co-operative movement, Short-Time committees, the Anti-Poor Law League, factory reformers, and Trade Unions or Combinations. Candidates could also consider methods like riots, strikes, petitions and meetings. As regards Unions candidates may point to their illegality between 1799 and 1824, to the failure of Owen's Grand National Consolidated Union, to the legal problems after 1825 and to Trades Unions relatively low profile in Chartism. Other groups could be seen as more effective, especially over time. Factory Reformers (with both a Parliamentary and extra-parliamentary leadership) and the Anti-Poor Law League, who impacted on the imposition of workhouses in the North, achieved some of their objectives. The Cooperative Society had some success in undermining the

Truck System whilst the Chartists could frequently mobilise very large numbers indeed in their attempts to control industrialisation and ensure its even handedness. Better candidates should be aware that although most movements 'failed', there were some successes as individuals such as Cobbett, Owen, Chadwick, Fielden, Oastler and Ashley campaigned against the moral and physical abuses of industrialisation, publicising them, rallying support and, after 1830, having some effect on legislation.

**5 (a) How far was the weakness of Palmerston's political opponents the main reason for his political dominance from 1855 to 1865?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will be expected to establish the relative importance of the various factors for his dominance. A good case could be established for the prime importance of his **foreign policy** stances. He came to power in 1855 on the issue of an effective prosecution of the Crimean War and appeared to have won it by the Treaty of Paris. In the 1857 election his victory was largely due to the pursuit of an aggressive policy in China. He carefully maintained his reputation for defending British interests, championing popular issues like Italian Unification, carefully handling the American Civil War and even avoiding damage over the Danish Duchies. These contributed to his final electoral victory in 1865. However foreign policy wasn't always a vote winner. The Orsini affair led to defeat and resignation in 1858. Candidates could also point to many domestic factors in his favour, not least the **weakness of his opponents**, particularly a divided Conservative Party, still unable to woo effectively urban Britain. Derby tended to acquiesce, curbing Disraeli and often preferring accommodation with Palmerston, especially over parliamentary reform. Economic stability helped as did his political astuteness in finally binding the non-Tory elements together in Parliament to forge a new alliance / party (the Liberals) in 1859. Once the Whigs, Peelites and Radicals came together under his leadership there was little but his death that could shift him. He also cultivated the press, (much helped by the Abolition of the Paper Duties), played down earlier disputes with Russell and above all established a working relationship with the rising financial star of Gladstone, his Chancellor from 1859. This ensured a dose of extensive Peelite free trade, low taxation and administrative reform that gave added lustre to the mid- Victorian love affair with a stable and maturing industrial economy. His opponents were unable to exploit this, although Disraeli tried in 1858/9. It brought in the upper working class and the urban middle class, especially its activist non-conformist element. Palmerston was the perfect balance between Gladstone, Cobden and Bright on the one hand and Russell and the aristocratic Whigs on the other. He also avoided the possible pitfalls of Ireland and Parliamentary Reform. All of this was immensely popular to a stable, propertied and limited electorate for whom Palmerston had come to personify Britain at its complacent zenith. Thus it is quite possible to argue that Palmerston dominated through his own efforts rather than relying on the weakness of his opponents.

**(b) How far was Gladstone responsible for Liberal defeat in the general election of 1874?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will be expected to explain how, despite a generally good press for Gladstone's legislative achievements, he lost the 1874 election. They need to assess the fall-out from many of his reforms - the Whig upper classes unhappy over Irish Reform that, in the case of land, was ill thought through and, in educational terms, inept, combined with dislike of the Abolition of the Purchase of Commissions in the army and exams in the Civil Service; the crucial Nonconformists, unhappy with Forster's Education Act's implicit siding with an over-advantaged Church of England; artisan and working class disapproval of Trade Union legislation that was repressive on peaceful picketing and acts in restraint of trade as well as class resentment over the Licensing Act. There were few votes in administrative reform and high level efficiency. General issues such as an apparently 'weak' foreign policy also contributed to electoral loss, as did Gladstone 'losing steam' and a faltering of leadership in

1873/74 as he tried unsuccessfully to 'go early' but failed to find an effective rallying cry in 1874 beyond the promise of income tax abolition. Candidates in **Band I to II** will assess the relative importance of such factors (Gladstone blamed Bruce's 'drink' legislation; others stressed Nonconformist anger and inaction in 1874). Candidates will need to assess whether it was Gladstone's fault and need to balance this by examining how effective Disraeli and Gorst's strategy was in 1873/4. Was it Gorst's strategy that won? There was certainly a better contested Conservative opposition in the election and some evidence in the Home Counties of the rise of Mr Pooter's suburbia (here the conservative's benefited from the rise of the lower middle class). The Secret Ballot in Ireland also helped to smash Irish liberalism and make possible a Home Rule Party. Was Gladstone responsible for failing to see this effect?

**6 (a) To what extent did the Conservative party benefit from the Second Reform Act in the period from 1867 to 1880?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to assess the effects of the Second Reform Act on the Conservative party. Disraeli had achieved a parliamentary victory at Westminster over Gladstone and the Liberals and secured some advantages for the Conservatives in the small print of the Act – securing the Tory counties, limiting redistribution etc. However, as the 1868 election demonstrated, the Conservatives failed in the short term to make any headway in the larger urban constituencies and were outmanoeuvred on the issue of Irish Disestablishment by Gladstone and the Liberals. Politically, the Conservatives saw the need to organise their party nationally and so, under Gorst's direction, set up a Central Office in 1870, and a National Union of Conservative Associations in 1867 in each parliamentary seat. Candidates could argue that the benefit of work on these aspects was seen in the electoral victory in 1874, although it could equally be argued that it was the Liberals who lost that election rather than the Conservatives who won it. Nationally the size of the electorate nearly doubled and included skilled workers and artisans from cities such as Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and Sheffield. Such men tended to be natural liberals and needed to be actively wooed on issues like trade union rights (which Disraeli did in 1875). The Act also disenfranchised smaller boroughs and gave more seats to the counties. Moreover, some Liberals criticised the Act's failure to address constitutional issues such as plural voting, the lack of a secret ballot, electoral bribery and the disproportionate size of some constituencies, but Disraeli had intended a conservative act in this respect. However, the Act was not widely welcomed by the Conservatives in practice. The social profile of voters was changing and the Conservatives would have to adapt their policies if they were to stay in office. The social legislation passed between 1874 and 1880 on issues such as education, factories, trade unions, licensing and religious reforms, may show how the party attempted to benefit from the effects of the Act, although they lost the 1880 election, partly because of their failure to combat the agricultural and industrial depression. Gorst had resigned and the machinery created post 1867 had been run down. The issue of 'benefit' is a mixed one for the Conservatives.

**(b) How far did Conservatism change during the period from 1846 to 1880?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question of change and its extent. It would be possible to argue that Conservatism had reverted to Toryism at the beginning of the period in 1846 (a resolute defence of agricultural protectionism) and found it difficult to broaden its appeal in the subsequent period, hence the predominance of Liberalism. Alternatively it could be argued that it did change, accepting Free trade, wooing the middle classes, becoming the party of property and even seeking working class support via a policy of Tory democracy. From a party of Land, based in the English counties, it became a party of the growing urban middle classes, especially in London. A useful route through this question would be to examine key characteristics across the period. In terms of **Protection** the party certainly did change. Disraeli's two budgets in the

1850s saw free trade embraced, although that of 1852 also saw an attempt to compensate traditional Tory interests, Sugar and Agriculture. There was certainly no attempt to assist agriculture when in power in the late 1870s. The **Anti- Reform stance** was also ditched in the 1850s, especially on Parliamentary Reform where it can be argued the Conservatives became more progressive than the Liberals. 1867 was a considerable achievement. A belief in a **landed and aristocratic territorial constitution** underwent less change as much that they espoused sought to strengthen this – the leadership remained aristocratic (Derby and Salisbury) with Disraeli always deferring to this. The party avoided an Irish policy in part to preserve Irish Landed interests. Middle class elements like Cross and Gorst, felt isolated and unappreciated. **Defence of the Anglican Church** also remained solid throughout the period. The party opposed Irish Disestablishment, supported the Disraeli's Ritual Act to cleanse the Church of Romish practices and sought to prevent The Board Schools penetrating the Counties in Sandon's Education Act of 1876. The party strengthened its claim to be the party that **defended the Monarchy**. In the first half of the period the Monarchy tended, courtesy of Prince Albert, to be Peelite, but Disraeli's cultivation of Queen Victoria in the 1860s and 1870s saw a partisan relationship develop that culminated in Victoria being made Empress of India. Candidates may also argue that an attempt was made to woo the working class, **Tory Democracy**, via parliamentary reform and a programme of social reform in Disraeli's 2<sup>nd</sup> Ministry (Housing, Health and Trade Union legislation) but equally this could be challenged given Disraeli's disinterest, its confinement to 1875/6 and to its liberal and permissive nature. More might be made of the Conservatives becoming the **party of Empire and Patriotism** on the death of Palmerston. Disraeli's Crystal Palace Speech of 1872 made much of Liberal intent to dismantle the Empire and after 1874 he sought actively to defend British interests in the Eastern Question, South Africa and in India and Afghanistan. Alternatively candidates might stress that other Conservatives were less concerned (Derby and Salisbury). Another area for consideration may be **party organisation**. Did the Conservatives change from a party of patronage to a more modern political party in this period (the work of Gorst)?

**7 (a) How successful was Britain in achieving its aims in the Eastern Question during the period from 1854 to 1880? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to understand what British aims were in the Eastern Question. In **Egypt** this involved checking French influence in an area crucial for communication with the East. It could be argued that here Disraeli was very successful in obtaining British control of the French built Suez Canal and of Cyprus to protect her naval power in the Eastern and South Eastern Mediterranean in 1878. The Khedive did not become a French puppet. Of greater importance were the **Balkans and the Straits**, both threatened by the growth of Russian power and ambition, a threat to the balance of power and British trade. Here it can be argued that success was less assured. The Crimean war saw military defeats and military scandals. The Treaty of Paris 1854 did secure British aims in that both rival powers guaranteed Ottoman independence (the preservation of this was a key British aim), the Balance of Power was upheld and neither Russia or Turkey were allowed a fleet in the Black Sea, removing any danger of a threat to Britain's Mediterranean supremacy. The independence of the Balkans was preserved (Rumania). However candidates could point out that such achievements were not always very long lasting (the Sultan's treatment of Christian people worsened, the Black Sea Clauses were abrogated in 1870 and the War had unforeseen consequences (Austrian isolation, abandoned by Russia to its fate at the hands of Prussia and France, dangerous for the Balance of power in Europe and for the preservation of the 1856 settlement of the Eastern Question). Britain failed to prevent the Ottoman and Russian navies entering the Mediterranean in 1870-71. From 1875 to 1877 Britain lost the initiative (in restraining the Ottoman reaction to Christian rebellion) to the Dreikaiserbund. There were Cabinet disagreements (Disraeli v. Derby) and Gladstone exploited this in his Bulgarian pamphlet of 1876. Disraeli's attempts to disrupt the Dreikaiserbund prevented a settlement and he was lucky in 1877-78 that Britain's policy

was rescued by Russia's invasion of the Ottoman Empire in 1877 and by Salisbury's negotiations with Ignatiev and Shuvalov culminating in the Berlin Conference. Britain was also lucky that other powers were horrified by San Stefano and Russia was prepared to negotiate without recourse to war. Nonetheless Derby and Carnarvon resigned. The settlement however secured Britain's interests- a large Bulgaria with a Mediterranean coastline was broken up and Turkey survived, although the insistence on the Straits being closed to Russian warships had to be abandoned in favour of an open waterway and Britain acquired a commitment to protect Turkey's Asian frontier which she could not effectively maintain. Better candidates will be aware of Britain's fluctuating fortunes in the Eastern Question and of differences over aims within governments (Aberdeen v. Palmerston and Disraeli v. Derby and Salisbury) and between them (Gladstone v both Palmerston and Disraeli).

**(b) 'Britain's motives in Africa were mainly strategic during the period from 1868 to 1902.' How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The importance of **strategic** factors could be stressed in a period when Britain was no longer the sole imperial power and faced a growing interest in imperialism from both old (France) and new (Germany) imperial rivals. Strategic issues were central to the need to protect Indian trade routes and to limit German involvement in East Africa and French involvement in North and West Africa. Indian trade routes would explain the involvement in South Africa, the East African coast and in protecting the new Suez Canal route post 1875 (controlling the shares, the acquisition of Egypt from 1882, involvement in the Sudan in 1885 and 1898, Zanzibar 1899 and the Fashoda incident with France in 1898 over the White Nile). Some might argue that it is difficult to distinguish between strategic and economic motives where North East, East and Southern Africa were concerned. One could point to **economic** factors as prevailing in these areas, especially in Eastern and Southern Africa. Pre-1886, the strategic interests of Lord Carnarvon in Disraeli's Second Government and Sir Bartle Frere were paramount but the discovery of gold and diamonds, clear economic interests, in the Transvaal transformed the Southern African situation (Cecil Rhodes and the Second Boer War). Coffee and tea plantations in East Africa also became economically important in the later period, whilst Cecil Rhodes' Cape to Cairo railway was clearly for profit. Candidates could also consider **political interests** in the period. Disraeli and perhaps more reluctantly Salisbury used Africa as a stick to beat Gladstone and the Liberals, seeing in it the possibility of electoral advantage (although here Gladstone used Africa and other imperial issues to win the 1880 election, whilst Lord Salisbury won the Khaki election in 1902 over the Boer war). They also had to react to the **involvement of other countries** in the 'Scramble for Africa' (the Berlin Conference in 1884), especially the French in Northern Africa and the Germans in South and East Africa. The activity of **missionaries and more active men on the spot** could also act on public opinion to persuade governments to involve themselves in areas that otherwise may have been left alone (Gordon in the Sudan, Rhodes and Jameson over the Transvaal). Whether strategic, economic or political and cultural interests prevailed is largely a matter of area, region, or time (as in Southern Africa). Some candidates may argue that such interests overlapped at times but better responses will be aware of the exceptions and will be able to prioritise their points.

- 8 (a) 'The impact of the Taff Vale Case was the main influence on the emergence of the Labour party during the period from 1886 to 1906.' How far do you agree?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should be aware that the Labour party emerged as a result of several factors, **Taff Vale** being one of the later influences. The Taff Vale judgement of 1901, which found in favour of the railway company and against the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, led to 127 unions joining the LRC, more than doubling its membership (to 850,000), and providing funding for Labour candidates in the 1906 general election. It cemented the bond between the Unions and the socialist bodies. When the TUC met in 1899 to consider labour representation in Parliament the Railway Servants were already embroiled in recognition arguments so that Taff Vale became the crucial midwife to the Labour party. There were other legal rulings that brought home to the Unions the precariousness of their situation – Lyons v Wilkins in 1899 (which threatened even the older craft unions) and, later, the Blackburn Weaver's case of 1903. Alternatively it could be argued that the **increasing politicisation of the Trade Unions over a longer period** was the key influence. Without the 'depression' and the ensuing employer backlash of the 1880s and 1890s (the Engineering lockout of 1897) the TUC would have stayed within an evolving Liberal Party, despite the New Unionism. A maturing industrial economy created a more sophisticated Trade Union movement, involved in 'wider' labour questions. Candidates could also argue that the main influence was the **Socialist Societies** of the 1880s, the SDF, the ILP and the Fabians, whose middle class leadership thought in terms of a separate labour party. Their stress was on policy and this could be seen as the main influence on the emergence of Labour, especially as debates on poverty and efficiency came to the fore in the 1890s and the early 1900s. Here however the appeal of their socialism was not universal. The other parties had different solutions but before 1900 the **decline of Liberalism and the longevity of Conservative rule** did assist the emergence of a Labour Party. Candidates who wish to stress the **influence of leadership** could contrast the traditional Lib-Lab MPs with the drive and determination of Hardie, MacDonald, Henderson and the Webbs. Hardie especially pushed for a separate and independent Labour Party, forming firstly a Scottish one in 1888 and inspiring the ILP in 1893. He became the first independent Labour MP in 1892 and later pushed for the TUC to become involved, without which numbers, finances and institutional structure would forever be lacking. His role was pivotal in forming the LRC and in downplaying policy as a potentially too divisive. MacDonald, as its secretary, then gave it coherence, negotiating a pact with Liberalism in 1903. Candidates however could downplay leadership and the Societies, stressing the divisions (SDF and the Fabians) and the Labour reluctance to accept strong leadership. **The Electoral Pact of 1903** could also be considered as crucial to the growth of the party as it guaranteed them seats in 1906, but it could also be seen as something that enmeshed them too much in a reviving and dynamic New Liberalism. Better candidates will balance the relative importance of the longer term factors with the more immediate ones of 1899 -1906, and the Socialist Societies with the Trade Union factors.

- (b) **Assess the impact of the rise of the 'New Unions' on the labour movement from 1888.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is possible to argue that their impact on the labour movement was considerable. Prior to 1888 the New Model Unions were cautious, moderate and confined to the skilled upper working class that sought acceptance within Victorian society, finding in Gladstonian Liberalism an all but perfect home. The New Unions had different aims, leadership and organisation. The key impact on the labour movement was their socialism and their activism, combined with what appeared to be much greater numbers which, via strikes, could progress through intimidation. Between 1888 and 1891 they mobilised huge numbers, recruiting the unskilled and the casual (the Dock Strike 1889) in the large scale but low paid industries of

Gas, Dockers, Seamen and Firemen, Match Girls and Railways. They were 'general unions' rather than specific to a skilled trade as before and could, significantly, involve women as well as men (Annie Besant and the Match Girls' Strike 1888, although she irritated the TUC with her well founded accusations that they neglected women workers). As a result they could not afford self help benefits but instead offered a redistribution of wealth and improved wages via strike action, what funds they had being used as strike funds. 1889 saw success for the Match Girls and the Dockers. Many of their leaders were socialist – Annie Besant (SDF and Fabian Society) and Will Thorne of the gas workers (SDF). This provided links to the Socialist Societies of the 1880s and helped to provide a view that was not integrative and liberal, as before, but class based, Marxist and Socialist. Engels thought the masses were stirring at last as part of a rising socialist movement. It presaged the formation and merger of larger and thus potentially more powerful unions. **However** it could be argued that the New Unions had only a temporary effect. The socialism of their leaders was not always shared by the mass membership which fluctuated wildly in the years that followed. The most prominent of the leaders did not have a great impact on the movement after 1891. The 'victories of 1888/9' were short lived and prompted a fierce backlash from employers and the older craft unions, although this clearly focused minds at the end of the 1890s into the question of a political party to represent labour interests in parliament. The rise in membership and the upheavals of 1888/9 had more to do with temporary high employment and the brief period of bargaining power this provided than with a sudden commitment to socialism and the labour movement. Trade Union membership dropped again in the 1890s, with the new Unions still only having 200,000 members in 1892. The Unions were much preoccupied with selfish sectional disputes rather than the labour movement as a whole, whilst overall the trade unions remained a modest influence in politics.

9 (a) **How important was the Asquith – Lloyd George split of 1916 in explaining the decline of the Liberal party by the end of the First World War?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to assess the **relative importance of the 1916 split** in the decline of the party to 1918. They could set this against their electoral performance in 1906, 1910 and 1918 (ie evidence of progressive decline over time), their local profile (how well they were doing locally), membership, finances, policy (a possible area of strength), the impact of other parties (neither Conservatives or Labour were doing well before 1914) and the effect of the wider context (eg the role of class which may have impacted negatively on the Liberals). Candidates could point to **the war** as the 'rampant omnibus' that knocked liberalism down and use the potentially catastrophic Asquith-Lloyd George split in 1916 as a part of this given that it was occasioned by a disagreement over war conduct, although it could be argued that it was simply Lloyd George's ambition that drove it. Those prioritising this as the most important factor will need to develop the **consequences of the split**, deepened by Lloyd George's conduct in office and his use of the 'coupon' in the 1918 election to sideline both official Liberals and Labour (in 1910 the Liberals had 272 MPs; in the 1918 election they were split into 29 official Asquithian Liberals and 133 Lloyd George Liberals). By moving into Coalition LG had divorced both himself and much of the talent from the main Liberal party. This remained under the control of Asquith, although it might be remarked that Asquith had already moved towards Coalition in 1915 and that this may be seen as the decisive occasion that sidelined Liberalism and rescued both Conservatives and Labour. Candidates may however examine **longer term weaknesses before 1914**, especially the impact of pre-war crises and the disappointing results of 1910 (with an irritating return to the party's dependence on the Irish). Alternatively they may focus on their hold over workers where much could be made of the New Liberalism. Locally, Labour was better organised, but still found it difficult to challenge the Liberals in bye-elections. Dependence on the traditional liberalism of middle class Nonconformists was still strong, but by 1918 this too was being eroded by the compromises occasioned by war. Some candidates may stress the **impact of the 1918 reform Act** which conceded male universal

suffrage, giving a large tranche of votes to a group that had never had any affiliations to Liberalism and possibly moved straight to a labour allegiance. Similarly middle class women may well have gone directly to the Conservatives. The Lib-Lab Pact had been abandoned, advantaging the Conservative. The **trade unions** looked lost to liberalism whilst **Ireland** was lost to Sinn Fein (73 MPs).

**(b) Which was the more serious Irish threat for British governments in the period from 1909 to 1916: Ulster Unionism or Irish nationalism? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to assess each of the two threats as the basis for reaching a judgement. A focus on just one of the problems cannot go beyond **Band III**. In the period 1909-16 it is likely that candidates will argue that Unionism was the more serious threat. Asquith's Liberal Government had been able to marginalise Redmond's Irish nationalists and Sinn Fein before 1910, given their substantial majority, but both Unionism and nationalism became more serious after their loss of an overall majority in the 1910 elections and the end of the House of Lords veto in 1911. Dependence on Redmond's Nationalists made a Home Rule Bill inevitable and this precipitated a clash with Unionism. Its leader, the very effective Carson, resisted the Home Rule Bill and radicalised Ulster by the Solemn League and Covenant establishing the Ulster Volunteer Force which increased the likelihood of civil war. Pressure to compromise was put on Asquith after the Curragh Mutiny from both Unionists in England and Ireland. In comparison Irish Nationalism could also present a serious challenge to the British government and it mimicked the Ulster Volunteers (the National Volunteers). However it lacked the arms (Roger Casement and German gun running were notable failures) and the experienced military training of its northern counterpart. The IRA and IRB were extra-parliamentary groups and had little popular sympathy even during the 1916 Easter Rising. This was a brief affair, largely confined to Dublin and with little support even there. The Irish nationalist party, on the other hand, held the balance of power in Westminster after 1910 and pressed for Home Rule 1912-14. Redmond was reluctant to accept a compromise bill that excluded Ulster. Home Rule polarised the British political parties and enabled both Ulster Unionists and, to a lesser extent, Irish nationalists to become a serious threat before 1914. The government's handling of the Rising also made nationalists more of a threat. Yet Nationalism remained divided between Redmond's moderate and traditional Nationalists, effectively bound to the Liberal government, and the revolutionary nationalists who took advantage of the war to take a lone stand in 1916. However this was not a serious threat to the government, unlike the Unionist stand between 1912-14, which threatened civil war and loyalist rebellion and even managed to secure the backing of Bonar Law's Conservatives (his ill advised Blenheim Palace speech). The Government had to balance the Unionist crisis at the same time as the international one and it could be argued Asquith made matters worse. The officer class were divorced from the government in the Curragh Mutiny, thanks to political mistakes by Seely at the War Office. The revolutionary nationalists only assumed more importance in 1916 given the over reaction to the Rising by the Coalition Government. More than the Rising it was this that slowly began to create support for independence, although candidates cannot be expected to know of developments beyond 1916.

**10 (a) 'The issues at stake in the General Strike of 1926 were more economic than political.' How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The **economic issues** were the ones that the Trade Unions and the miners stressed – the need to modernise the coal industry with new machinery; to amalgamate into larger concerns (the many smaller pits were very uneconomic and the geological conditions were deteriorating), preferably via the semi nationalisation of the wartime period (a useful issue that points both to economic and political issues); to respond to foreign competition and new fuels not by reducing wages and extending hours but by staying off the gold standard



(which was done until 1925) and facilitating modernisation; at a time of slump it was argued that wage reductions would further cut consumption and demand. If the miners and the unions could convince the public that these were the issues they stood more of a chance of attaining their aims. The coal owners felt that much of this (adverse world and geological conditions) were outside their control and their only economic option was to cut production costs by reducing wages and lengthening hours. Candidates could use the evidence of the Sankey and Samuel Reports to support this as their findings on the problems of the coal industry were couched in economic terms. It could also be argued that the government's opposition to the strike was because of the potential damage to the economy. **Political issues** were stressed by the government and the press. They saw the strike as part of a Syndicalist approach to social and political change. From 1917 if not before Conservatives feared revolutionary action and saw the rise of Labour and the amalgamation of Trade Union power not in terms of economic change but as a political threat to the status quo. They had used their influence in Lloyd George's government to restrict wartime industrial control and were concerned at the apparent capitulation to the miners on Red Friday, viewing the Samuel report purely as a means of buying time to prepare to defeat the possibility of a general strike which was seen in political and syndicalist terms. Candidates might refer to conservative attempts to destabilise the 1924 Labour government using revolutionary smears and to the Miner's Secretary, Arthur Cook's Marxism (who did see the issue in the political terms of class war). The trigger for the ending of negotiations by the government was the Daily Mail Incident in 1926 (the Printing Unions refusal to print an article attacking the idea of a general strike), allowing them to conduct the strike on political terms – that it was a threat to constitutional government by a minority force (the Unions) that had attempted to limit a free press rather than as sympathetic action in an industrial and economic dispute over wages. The government certainly portrayed the 9 day strike in political terms (the British Gazette), and arguably were successful in so doing. From the trade Union point of view they were aware that wage cuts in the mines would lead to a hard line elsewhere and the reduction in Union power. Better candidates could argue that political and economic issues were inextricably linked, citing the subsidy as a case in point – clearly a political issue (public ownership) but also an economic one (State encouraged consumption).

**(b) To what extent were the National governments forced to change their economic and employment policies during the period from 1931 to 1939?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The argument that they were **not forced to change** lies in the continued establishment view of maintaining low taxation and free trade, a gold standard, a balanced budget and a light government touch when it came to economic interference (little beyond charring negotiations over reorganisation and the odd occasional subsidy – certainly not deficit finance). The National governments were dominated by Conservatives and traditional Liberals who were identified with such views and whose attitude to the economy and employment remained unchanged. These were the policies that they sought to uphold, with the ever present exception of agriculture which was provided with subsidies – indeed the National Government was formed to do precisely this and in particular to push through cuts to balance the budget and reassure the City and the Banks that the pound would be maintained. Income tax was increased and cuts were made. Snowden and Chamberlain were both traditional Chancellors and it has been argued that given the small nature of the British budget there was little else they could do. The traditional caution can be seen in regional policy. The Special Areas Acts were underfunded and apart from designating depressed areas little was done in practice to encourage investment. However it could be argued that **circumstances forced the hand of governments** to change in practice and a more pragmatic policy was pursued. In 1931 the **Sterling crisis and the Invergordan naval mutiny** forced the government to abandon the Gold standard and pursue a more flexible policy of cheap money which was responsible for the private house building boom in the '30s. International trading conditions enabled the conservative dominated

government to introduce a general 10% protective tariff (although it could be pointed out that since the First World War there had been a tariff on foreign cars and dyes). It is debatable whether this reflected forced need or merely a longer held conservative belief in tariffs that could now be applied given the excuse of the depression. Certainly the imperial protection aspects of this policy were unobtainable given colonial circumstance, as the Ottawa Agreements demonstrated. The other example of forced change is the **international threat posed by Japan and particularly Germany** from 1937. Increased spending on rearmament forced a move away from balanced budgets. National governments were reluctant to finance this by borrowing but were forced to do so by the threat posed in 1938/9.

**11 (a) How far did the Second World War change British foreign policy during the period from 1939 to 1945?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It could be argued that **much remained the same** – the desire to preserve the Empire intact, to maintain good relations with the self governing dominions and limit the nationalist ambitions of the colonial empire; suspicion of the ambitions of Communist Russia, which were reinforced by the Nazi Soviet Pact in 1939 and their attack on both Poland and Finland and were to resurface in 1944/5 over the future for both Poland and Germany; apprehension at the anti colonialism of Roosevelt's US and her reluctance to abandon isolationism; a commitment that remained Global; concerns over the ambitions of Mussolini in the Mediterranean and North Africa; fears of Japanese ambitions in China and South east Asia. However the **advent of War** was to transform much of this, increasing its urgency and subjecting everything to the need to win the war, especially against Germany in Europe. A no holds barred policy had, by force of circumstance, to be adopted. This was represented by the urgent **need for Allies** from 1939 to 1941. The League of Nations had collapsed along with Collective Security, France fell and the USSR had joined Nazi Germany. Churchill especially worked on wartime Conferences, aided by the Nazi declarations of war on both the USSR and the US. He secured agreements with the Soviets, a major change in policy, and at Newfoundland with the US, in effect a **Grand Alliance** and then worked on the US to prioritise the war in Europe. Earlier Lend lease had been secured from the US and now Britain's aim was to support the USSR as the main military force against Nazi Germany via the Arctic Convoys rather than establish a second front in France as the USSR and to some extent the US wanted. Britain continued her fight against Mussolini in North Africa, protecting her oil and Middle Eastern Empire and Churchill persuaded the US to focus here, opening a second front in Italy rather than France. In the **Far East** Britain was forced to allow the US to dictate and although reluctant to aid Chiang Kai -Shek on grounds of potential losses Britain bowed to US pressure in 1943. Much had to be sacrificed to the **US alliance** (scientific know how, Eisenhower's preponderance in military councils) and it was clear that foreign policy was now dependent on continued alliance with the US, especially as old tensions with the USSR resurfaced after Tehran, although it did not prevent Churchill trying to go it alone in the Percentages deal with the USSR over the Balkans in Moscow in 1944. The key change was accommodation to a situation of being the leading global power in 1939 to a supporting role to the US in a bi- polar world in 1945, but it can be argued that much remained the same, particularly as regards the Empire and the USSR.

**(b) How successful was Britain in achieving its aims in foreign policy during the period from 1945 to 1953? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to assess foreign policy aims in respect of successes and failures. Areas of **potential success** could be the following, although better candidates will be aware of some of the limitations. At Yalta and Potsdam it could be argued that Britain was able to maintain its status as a World Power. In the Middle East, Turkey and Greece, Communism was

successfully halted. Support for the Truman Doctrine after 1947 enabled Britain to cement her special relationship with the US and receive the lion share of Marshall Aid, using much of this to finance her own nuclear capacity. In alliance with the US, Britain was able to reorganise the German western zones and defeat the Berlin Blockade thus preserving the status quo in Germany. Bevin's role in the establishment of NATO, tying in the US to a European defence commitment, enabled Britain to contain the USSR's ambitions. Britain clearly remained the major power in Western Europe and after exclusion by the US from nuclear weapons successfully pursued her own bomb from 1947. Palestinian and Indian issues were resolved with the rest of the Empire still intact and with no intention of further retreat. Military support was given to the UN in South Korea. **Problem areas** can be seen in the failure to save Eastern Europe from falling under the control of the USSR. Poland in particular was particularly galling given Britain's commitment to save her in 1939. In the Greek Civil War Britain was forced by economic and financial problems to hand over responsibility to the US in March 1947 who, in the Truman Doctrine, formally replaced Britain as the major power both globally and, in this specific incident, in the Balkans. Concern was levelled at Britain's over-commitment to US policies at the expense of better USSR and Western European relations. In Western Europe it could be argued that, as a result, there were missed opportunities to be involved in greater defence and economic integration, allowing France the initiative. There were allegations that the British government was pro-Arabic in its handling of Palestine and that its precipitate departure left major problems in the area. The withdrawal from India left issues unsettled, led to terrible sectarian massacres, a Partition that few regarded as desirable and led to war in Kashmir. Candidates may conclude that, in the circumstances, Britain enjoyed considerable success in a bi-polar world. Alternatively they can point to the missed opportunities and the limitations on British policy.

**12 (a) How successfully did the Labour governments of 1945-51 overcome the problems facing them? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. **The problems** of health and housing were huge, although arguably diet had improved during the war, rationing had created more equality and health care was available for the majority involved directly in the war effort. Housing was particularly acute given bomb damage and neglect, particularly in the larger cities. Education had suffered during the War and secondary provision was only for the able. Candidates can argue for **the success** of Bevan's and Griffith's social reforms, especially the NHS and housing and the overhaul of national insurance which dispensed with means testing. Universality was a key success and at a time of economic hardship large sums were spent. Future governments didn't repeal any of it. In education, the leaving age was raised to 15 and rebuilding was encouraged. Nonetheless some candidates may **point to shortcomings** – 'free at the point of delivery' in the NHS was breached by prescription charges, compromises had to be made on the housing programme given the wildly ambitious targets and the administrative chaos (prefabs were introduced, squatting was tolerated and there was a squeeze on private building). On education there were few new initiatives and a comprehensive policy was abandoned by Ellen Wilkinson in favour of a socially divisive tripartite approach to secondary education. As to **economic policies** better candidates may be able to make the link between successful economic policies and social ones, stressing that a commitment to Keynesian economic policies of high public spending to control unemployment was the most important as it was the key to prosperity and paying for social reform. However contemporaries would have pointed out that the economic policies were draconian and some would regard welfare resources as better spent on industrial recovery. To defend Labour's economic policies candidates could point to the dire economic problems facing the government – war bankruptcy, the need for US loans, a balance of payments crisis in 1947 and devaluation in 1949. This required rationing, import controls and the introduction of nationalisation to save teetering industrial giants like Coal, Railways and Iron and Steel. Candidates could discuss whether these were successfully

overcome or not. Many would argue that they were more successful in overcoming problems than the Welfare reforms. Marshall Aid was secured. Only the nationalisation of Iron and Steel generated any opposition. A mixed economy became the accepted norm. Others would stress the lack of purpose and economic drive to make a competitive success of them. Their record was a patchy one, existing managers were left in charge and workforce appointments to management were restricted. Planning was often absent. Overall it is likely that candidates will argue that, given the magnitude of the problems faced, the Labour governments enjoyed considerable success, despite their loss of the 1951 election.

**(b) 'Conservative economic policy was responsible for the party's long period in office from 1951 to 1964.' How far do you agree?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It could be argued that the long period of Conservative office was made possible by economic prosperity and relative affluence, especially after 1952 when international recovery formed the background. Their **economic policy** enabled them to dismantle the bureaucracy of 'austerity' and gain the credit. Butler's role as Chancellor to 1955 could be usefully examined. Taxes were reduced but social expenditure could continue to expand, allowing NHS spending to grow and the early completion of the promised 300,000 homes (Housing policy proved a big plus for the Conservatives). A policy of full employment spread the gains more widely. Although there were blips in late 1955 and 1958 the boom had resumed by the time of the 1959 election, another Conservative victory. Candidates could usefully examine how Macmillan weathered the economy's downturn in 1957-58 and the resignation of Thorneycroft and the entire Treasury team in protest at Macmillan's refusal to make the necessary budgetary deflationary cuts. It illustrates both the importance of economic factors and effective leadership. Candidates wishing to stress the importance of economic policy could point to the role of the economy in the elections of the period (1951, 1955 and 1959). However the early 1960s did see economic policy falter under Selwyn Lloyd and unpopular deflationary policies were pursued until Macmillan and Maudling countered with an interventionist economic strategy (the 'dash for growth'). **Labour divisions** and weakness were evident, especially in the 1955 election (Bevanites v Gaitskellites) but is unlikely to be the main reason for Conservative electoral dominance. **The Cold War** also played into the hands of the Conservatives – Churchill and Macmillan were able to exploit their relationship with Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy to good effect and weather imperial challenges like Suez or Africa. **Social change** also aided the Conservatives – the move towards a service economy and the consolidation of a middle and lower middle class electorate who looked to moderate conservative leaders with a working class that could also be attracted to Conservatism. Some candidates may see the **Conservative leadership** as a key reason. Churchill, Eden and MacMillan could all be effective. In the Cold War Churchill and Eden were vote winners, whilst the former's illness was kept carefully hidden. Eden's blunder and his failure to command the trust of his colleagues over Suez were not exposed to the verdict of a general election, just as his successor Macmillan's mistakes over Profumo similarly avoided the electorate's judgement. Macmillan was able to combine aristocratic pedigree with a sure economic touch and a 'modern' feel bolstered by an effective use of TV. He could also be ruthless as the Night of the Long Knives demonstrated. Only Alec Douglas Hume proved a mistake, at the end of the period. The policy of a property owning democracy within a mixed economy proved especially popular. Hailsham and Macmillan also paid attention to new election methods – opinion polls and modern public relations. Overall much will depend on whether candidates credit Conservative economic policy or general world recovery for their success and how they balance these economic factors against others.

## 2585 European History 1046 – 1718

### Europe 1046-1250

#### 1 The Reform of the Church 1046-1122

##### (a) How far did Urban II and Paschal II strengthen the power of the Papacy from 1088 to 1118?

Focus: Assessment of role of an individual in wider historical context

Answers need to assess both contributions within the context of the period mentioned and not just focus upon the role and place of one Pope. Answers which do the latter, no matter their quality, will have a **ceiling of Band III** since other contributions need to be assessed against his (the 'How far ...' of the question). The 'power of the Papacy' needs to be considered and the aftermath of the Investiture Crisis will feature here. Many answers may see Urban II (Pope 1088-99) as important or very important: his identification with the First Crusade, his vigorous preaching, his use of the Crusade to strengthen the Papal position. Beyond there are other issues relevant to the question theme: Urban was a reformer; he was a skilled administrator; there was a strong Cluniac dimension to his reforms; he continued the Gregorian reforms, sought a working relationship with the Byzantine Church, further reorganised Church administration, made improvements in Rome, centralised power, developed the idea of the Curia and created a basis for the eventual College of Cardinals. He held two important Synods in 1095 and 1098. He had uneven relations with secular rulers and faced a sturdy challenge in the anti-Pope Clement III. His successor Paschal II (pope 1099-1118) furthered aspects of papal control, power and pretensions and entered into disputes with the Emperors Henry IV and V as well as with the French and English kings. He continued reforms and resolved the investiture issues with the French and English kings.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range. Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

##### (b) Assess the reasons why the Cluniacs lost their appeal from 1046 to 1122.

Focus: Assessment of causation of religious change

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Here candidates need to focus on the Cluniacs and any references to other Orders need to be used only as contextual evidence. The religious-spiritual context was important in respect of (eg) the Benedictine Rule, prayers, good works, ways to salvation, traditions of patronage, family connections, benefactions, the appeal of monastic life to the younger members of families. Increasingly, the Cluniacs were criticised for pursuing a 'contaminated' form of Benedictinism; for they had, it was said, lost the true and pure nature of the Rule. Their leadership, it was alleged, had

become lacklustre and too closely identified with lay society and its leaders, accepting too readily extensive endowments. They were over-centralised and too formalized, even formulaic. They were no longer committed to key aspects of the *Opus Dei* and it was felt, not least by their Cistercian critics, they had lost their sense of brotherhood and become over-institutionalised. Other Orders offered (or appeared to offer) alternatives, not least a pure, strong commitment to the Benedictine ideal. Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question and will have a strong focus on 'Assess ...' and offer a sense of prioritisation.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands II and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and will be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**2 France and the Empire 1152-1250****(a) Assess the reasons why Frederick Barbarossa intervened in Italy.**

Focus: Evaluation of causal factors explaining conflict

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need a good focus upon 'Assess ...' and will have a range of factors, prioritising wherever possible. They will see links between the positions of the Papacy and the Lombard Communes and reasons for intervention and within the context of Barbarossa's ambitions and needs within Italy. Reasons will include practical politics, revenues and wealth, ideological-religious issues. Tensions grew between Frederick and a Papacy keen to assert its authority and power and between Frederick and North Italian (Lombard) Communes in turn growing in wealth, power and independence. Political and ideological issues were important as well as more material and practical factors. Imperial visions and goals, a desire for control, expectations in Italy should be assessed, in the context of determined Papal and Communal resistance. The origins and nature of such resistance, expressions, links, specific examples, references to phases and events will help. Answers in the higher Bands will convey a good sense of prioritisation in their focus upon 'Assess ...'.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised. **Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very restrictive and may well have a restricted range. Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**(b) To what extent were the mistakes of the Angevins the main reason for the growth of the power of French monarchy under Philip Augustus?**

Focus: Assessment of causation of change in French power

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to focus upon and assess Angevin mistakes but also adopt a wider evaluative framework. The Angevins, above all John, did make mistakes, military, diplomatic, political and feudal; they had wide commitments and needed strong, vigorous personal leadership. While Richard I sustained defence against Philip Augustus, John made serious miscalculations (1202-04, but also later in 1214). Other likely factors include: Philip's leadership and skills; his reshaping of royal administration and finances; his diplomatic skills and skilful use of his feudal suzerainty; his capacity for duplicity and calculation allied to patience and determination; military successes at critical junctures. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good, persistent focus upon 'To what extent ...' and the needs of the question. Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.



**3 Crusading and the Crusader States 1095-1192**

- (a) How far was leadership the main reason for the success of the First Crusade? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of causation of major historical event

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. ‘Strong leadership’ might embrace elements such as: the personal role of Pope Urban II and other Church leaders, the place of the Papal Legate Adhemar, the presence of (often powerful) personalities such as Bohemond, Tancred of Taranto, Godfrey of Bouillon, Raymond of Toulouse, Robert Curthose, Hugh of Vermandois, Stephen of Blois and Robert of Flanders. Candidates might point out that often there were internal divisions and squabbles, and that knights and others often provided an element of leadership or direction (notably after the siege of Antioch and in galvanising the drive for Jerusalem). Other factors might include: religious fervour and zeal (the impetus provided by Pope Urban, various religious men on the ground, events such as the Holy Lance at Antioch, the procession outside Jerusalem), military strategy and tactics, the significance of key military successes (eg at Doryleum, at Antioch), tensions and disunity among opponents (eg Sunni and Shi’ite, divided leadership, Turks and Egyptians, Aleppo and Damascus). Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. There will be good and strong focus on ‘How far ...’ and a clear sense of argument. Focus only on ‘strong leadership’ or only on other factors will merit no more than **Band III**.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question.

Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Band IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

- (b) How successful was the Third Crusade (1189-92)?**

Focus: Evaluation of outcomes of major historical event

No set answer is required but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers in the top Bands will have a strong focus upon ‘How successful ...’ as well as upon the sense of argument here, namely whether the Third Crusade was a success or not. Candidates may well argue that it was a failure and well-presented points will reach the top Band. A balanced answer, assessing possible successes as against failures, will be worthy of reward in the top two Bands. There was failure in terms of the ultimate goals, the outright defeat of Saladin’s forces and the recovery of Jerusalem and the Holy Places (etc.). The tensions between Richard I and Philip Augustus as well as the consequences of the untimely death of Frederick Barbarossa could well be assessed; Christian disunity and suspicions were features. Then again, Richard I in particular fought Saladin to something of a standstill and there was a truce, with a promise (nothing more) of a return to crusading action later. Cyprus was acquired; there was success at Acre; the peace settlement confirmed Jaffa (itself a useful port) as Christian and allowed Christians access to Jerusalem; some blows to Muslim morale were delivered; the existing Crusade States

were preserved for a while longer. However, territorial gains were not great; survival alone was the future for the States; the strengths of Muslim power and the importation of further rivalries were evidenced. Answers in Bands I and II will have a good, persistent focus upon 'How successful ...' and the needs of the question.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**4 Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century****(a) Assess the importance of the developments in architecture in the twelfth century.**

Focus: Assessment of importance in architectural developments

No set answer is required but candidates will need to address the question. While some description will be necessary here there must be evaluation and an answer that lacks the latter will **not go beyond Band IV** unless it begins to make some analysis; more focused, sustained analysis **will merit Band III and above**, according to quality. Candidates need to consider change, impression and impact; illustrative detail will be important. Although reference to church buildings is likeliest, reference to urban and especially castle developments would be welcome. In respect of church structures, the painted arch, ribbed cross-vaulting, the flying buttress (pre-Gothic) are all possible example areas, with perhaps some linkage to the emphasis on visual beauty, strength, power yet delicacy and ideas of a changing relationship of God and man (figures, ornamentation, naturalism). In respect of urban and castle structures, again size and scale are likely themes; greater strength of walls and public buildings; developing domestic as well as stronger defensive features of castles. Answers in **Bands I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question and will have a good focus on 'Assess the importance ...'.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**(b) Assess the reasons for the growth of heresy during the twelfth century.**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need a good sense of 'Assess ...' and need a range of reasons, prioritising wherever possible. This will be a feature of the top Bands. No set conclusion is expected here. Heresy needs to be defined and contextualised. There may be much concentration upon the Cathars/Albigensian dimension and this is acceptable, though a broader perspective would be welcome. A sense of contemporary society as of religion will be helpful in establishing why heresy did grow, more so later in the century. Areas of discontent with the Church and its teachings that might be embraced are: theologians wanting to break away from mainstream teaching and questioning established beliefs and practices; an expanding, urbanised, more educated 'middle class' in search of more personalised spirituality; rural and urban, personal and communal expectations and needs, not met within the established Church; theological disputes not contained by the Church; forms of class conflict; heresy as a means to attack the established order; the growth of universities; possible Balkan connections; the spread of ideas amongst ordinary people and the interpretation (or misinterpretation) of those ideas; misplaced enthusiasms for religion; economic and social brotherhoods; the effects of economic and social changes; reactions to ecclesiastical corruption and perceived worldliness; the defence of traditional practices and customs seen to be under attack from the Church.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

**Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

**Band II** answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

**Band III** answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Europe 1450-1530****5 The Italian Renaissance 1450-1530**

- (a) How important was the role of Venice in the development of the Renaissance? Explain your answer.**

Candidates are likely to focus on the late flowering of the Renaissance with developments in art such as those of Titian and Tintoretto, and the high point of printing with the Aldine press. These developments are likely to be set in their economic, political and cultural context, Venice being aided by its trading empire and links, cosmopolitanism and expanding lands with the development of 'villas' encouraging experiments in architecture such as those of Palladio. References might be made to other areas of importance such as Florence as a means of assessing Venice's relative importance. Whatever conclusion is reached, there should be a good focus on Venice.

- (b) How far did the works of Renaissance writers reflect ideas about government and society in Italy?**

Focus:

Candidates may argue that Renaissance writers were generally humanist and as such formed the whole basis of Renaissance thought with its revival of classical values such as the greater importance of the secular, civic participation, the importance of education, the dignity of man etc. Candidates should be given credit for this though it should be noted that only Castiglione and Machiavelli are specifically mentioned in the syllabus. Candidates may mention the ideas of Castiglione as expressed in 'The Courtier' eg l'uomo universale and the importance of the classical world, whilst Machiavelli's work 'The Prince', can be seen to illustrate new Renaissance statecraft based as it was on the rule of the Medici in Florence.

**6 Spain 1469-1520**

- (a) 'Lack of law and order was the main problem facing Ferdinand and Isabella in the early years of their reign.' How far do you agree with this view?**

The issue of Civil War is likely to form a strong focus with emphasis placed on powerful nobles such as the Marquis of Villena, and their ability to cause problems by supporting contenders to the throne such as Joanna (la Beltraneja) and the interest of foreign monarchs such as Alfonso of Portugal and Louis XI of France. This may be set against other problems such as that of ruling jointly such a disparate set of states, finance, the economy and religion. Emphasis should be firmly on the problems rather than the solutions, though better candidates could indicate the nature and scale of problems through the measures taken to deal with them.

- (b) To what extent were the problems faced by Charles I from 1516 to 1520 of his own making?**

Candidates should refer to the problems faced by Charles I on his accession to the throne and may point out that although there were some problems he could do little about such as his country of birth, native language and unprepossessing appearance, he did little to improve the situation and much to exacerbate it. He arrived late, used foreigners in important positions, such as Adrian of Utrecht as regent and a seventeen year old Burgundian as Archbishop of Toledo. He demanded money to finance his imperial ambitions thus confirming Spain's worst fears that their interest were to be subjugated to those of the Empire. Other issues might focus on the legacy of Ferdinand and Isabella with dis-satisfaction of nobles and dislike of corregidores culminating in the revolt of the

Comuneros. Some attempt should be made to show the relative importance of the different factors.

## **7 The Ottoman Empire 1451-1529**

### **(a) Assess the reasons why the Ottoman army and navy were so successful in the period from 1451 to 1529.**

Answers are likely to focus on the devshirme and timar systems to explain the strength of the army and the administrative and economic systems which supported and made it effective. An assessment of the Devshirme system is likely to focus on the effects of the janissaries – a highly trained and disciplined fighting force, considered by some to be the best in Europe, as well as its provision of a highly educated professional civil service.

Candidates should also examine the provision of sipahi cavalymen through a system designed to meet the military needs of the state. Rise of the navy is likely to be related to the fall of Constantinople and the acquisition of shipyards and naval expertise. Military weaknesses and disunity of opposition is also likely to feature. Some hierarchy of reasons should be established for top bands.

### **(b) How far did Mohammed II and Selim I fulfil their aims?**

Mohammed II was concerned with establishing himself as heir to the Byzantine Empire and as such was relatively successful with the fall of Constantinople – now made the centre of his Empire – and successful conquests in the Balkans and Greece – Serbia was over-run in 1459, Athens in 1458 and the Morea in 1460. He also began to establish dominance over Venice with the capture of the trading base at Negroponte in 1490. There were however some setbacks eg an unsuccessful attack on Belgrade. Selim changed the focus expanding eastward developing the Caliphate and Jihad and successfully arranging truces with the West and expanding the navy. On the other hand he did expose the Empire to powerful enemies in the East such as the Portuguese – intent on expanding their empire, as well as the Shi'ite Safavid Empire. Requires some balance and conclusion on the extent of success in achieving their aims.

## **8 Exploration and Discovery 1450-1530**

### **(a) To what extent was patronage by royal families the main reason for Spain and Portugal's leading role in exploration and discovery?**

Substantial consideration should be given to the issue of royal patronage even if it is eventually rejected as the main factor. For Portugal relevant comment could be made on Henry the Navigator, (though some of his work, such as the organisation of the capture of Ceuta in North Africa, lies outside the period) but more centrally on John II and his financial support for such ventures as those of Pedro de Covilha in India and Bartholomew Diaz in Africa. Similarly for Spain with Ferdinand and Isabella's support for explorers such as Columbus. However, other issues might be considered such as navigational and technical expertise with the development of caravels and carracks and geographical factors of winds and position on the 'street corner of Europe', but focus must be firmly on reasons for leading role ie factors which distinguish Spain and Portugal from other countries. The question is not about motivation.

**(b) Assess the importance of Columbus and Cortes in the success of Spanish exploration and empire building.**

Candidates are likely to focus on the importance of Columbus as a pioneer of exploration with his journey to the West Indies in 1492 and later journeys to the South American coast. Candidates however, may see his importance as limited, with a failure to find a passage to the east and little success in establishing and maintaining settlements, although the town of San Domingo Hispaniola did become the capital of the Spanish Indies for 50 years.

Discussion of Cortes is more likely to focus on empire building, candidates seeing considerable success in his victories against the Aztec Empire and more permanent settlements in Mexico. They might point out that initial journeys would have used the knowledge acquired by Columbus and that Cortes was therefore less important as an explorer.

Answers should be more than just an account of the activities of Columbus and Cortes to reach the higher bands.

**Europe 1498-1559****9 The Holy Roman Empire 1517-1559**

- (a) How far was Charles V to blame for the failure to restore religious unity in the Holy Roman Empire in the period to 1559?**

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the failure of a key policy aim

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

Candidates may set his failure in the context of his own desire and commitment to achieve religious unity and therefore argue that for Charles this would have been a major concern. There are a wide range of factors for candidates to discuss and examiners should not expect answers to consider all possible causes, but what matters is the quality of analysis. Some answers may consider his frequent absences at crucial periods was vital in his failure, but there could be a balanced discussion of whether this was his fault. Other reasons could include the link between the prince's desire to increase their political power and the religious developments. This may be balance against the fear that many princes had about Charles increasing his power and how religion was used to prevent this. This may be linked to Charles' failure to capitalise on his victory at Muhlberg or to the fact that even catholic princes were willing to oppose him as they feared a growth in Imperial power. Answers may also focus on the appeal of Luther's message to a wide range of groups within society and how they could manipulate his message; relating it to the social, political and economic situation within the Empire. Answers may argue that that the role of cities was vital in spreading Protestantism and that there was little Charles could do to prevent this. This issue may also be linked to the importance of the printing press. Candidates may also place the religious problem in the context of other problems he faced, such as foreign threats from France and the Ottomans and his rule elsewhere, to argue that these issues had to take priority and were out of his control, but were seen as his duty. Some may also suggest that the Papacy failed to support Charles and that they were to blame.

- (b) 'Charles V's foreign policy as Holy Roman Emperor was a complete failure.' How far do you agree with this view?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

In order to evaluate how far his foreign policy was a failure, candidates may evaluate his policy against his aims to see how far he failed to achieve his aims. They may consider issues such as preventing French encirclement, the Burgundian issue, his desire to dominate Italy and particularly the issue of Milan. Some answers may also look at the failed attempts to achieve peace and the financial problems that the policy created. Candidates may also consider his policy towards the Turks in Eastern Europe and whether that can be considered successful.

**10 Spain 1504-1556**

- (a) To what extent did Charles I fail to achieve his aims in foreign policy in the period from 1516 to 1556?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

Better answers may establish Charles's aims and then judge his policy against those aims. Candidates may consider his aims in a broad manner focusing on issues such as the



integrity of Spanish borders or the desire to increase Spanish territory, other answers may differentiate between his aims against France and the Ottomans, however this is not essential as the issues influenced each other. Some candidates may even argue that Spain was too weak in this period to have a foreign policy and therefore any wars fought were imperial in nature; credit should be given for this argument. It is likely that many will argue that he was more successful against France and will support this with reference to the issue of Milan, Pavia and diplomatic triumphs. In terms of dealing with the Turks some answers might refer to the split nature of the attack, with Charles dealing with the Mediterranean, whilst his brother dealt with Austria and Hungary (no detail of this is required) and will support their argument with reference to Tunis, Tripoli and links between the Ottomans and the French.

**(b) Assess the success of the domestic policies of Charles I.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

Candidates may argue that the period was a relatively quiet time for Spain, although the financial demands of the Crown were damaging. It might be argued that Charles was successful in dealing with the unrest at the start of his reign and that this set the tone for the rest of the period. Answers may consider areas such as his policies towards the towns and corregidores, reform of the court, the work of los Cobos, the use of conciliar government, the Cortes, religious policy and an assessment of financial and religious policy. It is likely that issue of financial strength will play a large role in many answers and there may be discussion of apparent wealth and impending bankruptcy. Candidates may discuss how well Spain was governed and whether administrative changes had strengthened the monarchy.

**11 France 1498-1559**

**(a) How serious were the challenges of Humanism and Protestantism to the French Church in the period from 1498 to 1547? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

Better answers will deal with humanism and Protestantism as separate movements, whereas it is likely that weaker answers will merge the two movements together and write in a more general manner. Answers may suggest that neither were serious threats as the French church had wide appeal and parts were already being reformed (Bishop Briconnet). However, this may be balanced against Francis I ambivalent role towards humanism, which allowed reform movements to gain a foothold. Many are likely to consider the importance of the Sorbonne and parlements in the crushing of heresy. Some answers will also suggest that the threat of Protestantism was never serious as France had weak trade links with Germany which limited the influx of protestant ideas and the small scale of the French printing industry which also prevented the spreading of these ideas.

**(b) How successful was French foreign policy in the period from 1498 to 1559? Explain your answer.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

It is likely that better answers will identify the aims of French foreign policy in the period and then assess how far these aims were achieved. Candidates may consider that it was an all-dominating policy based on dynastic territorial disputes over Naples and Milan and

areas to the east of France, as well as being dynastic and personal. Candidates may point to the gain of Milan in 1499, 1515 and regaining it in 1524, victory at Marignano in 1515, the establishment of the League of Cognac, the occupation of Savoy and Piedmont 1536-7, the Truce of Crepy 1544, the occupation of Corsica 1553, the recovery of Calais 1558 and the success in frustrating Charles' attempts to solve his internal problems in Germany. However, this should be balanced against expulsion from Naples 1503-4, expulsion from Milan 1512, 1521 and the unsuccessful attempts to regain it and defeat at Pavia, the subsequent Treaty of Madrid, defeats at St Quentin 1557 and Gravelines 1558 and Cateau Cambresis. Candidates may also consider the financial impact of foreign policy for the crown. Better answers may distinguish between Francis I and Henry II.

## 12 Warfare 1499-1560

### (a) Assess the reasons why warfare became more defensive in the period from 1499 to 1560.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

There were significant developments in defensive fortifications during this period. Candidates may focus heavily on the development of *trace italienne* fortifications and the reasons for their development and the ballistic shaping to build lower and thicker walls and, increasingly, earth ramparts. *Trace italienne* encouraged more defensive warfare and helps explain why set piece battles, like Pavia, became increasingly rare in the period. The growing power of artillery encouraged more defensive warfare with enfilading fire in angled bastions with orellions, free standing ravelins in ditches and double Pisan ramparts. The successful defence of Milan in 1521 also encouraged more defensive warfare. However, some may argue that not every state could afford the new defensive fortifications and in those parts of Europe offensive warfare continued to dominate unchecked and they may point to the example of invasion of Hungary by the Ottoman Turks in 1526.

### (b) To what extent were the role of the nobility and the cult of chivalry affected by the changes in warfare in the period from 1499 to 1560?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion.

The strongest answers will weigh up various effects of military changes on the nobility and the cult of chivalry to reach a balanced conclusion. Answers might consider issues such as how financial costs, caused by the growth in the size of the armies affected the nobility to wage war, the changes in tactics and their impact on the cult of chivalry; the use of mercenaries and the changing nature of armies. Some may argue that on the surface nothing appeared to change in the way that the nobility behaved, whilst others may argue that the concept of the cult of chivalry was itself an illusion.

**Europe 1545-1610****13 The Counter Reformation 1545-c.1600**

- (a) Assess the importance of the Jesuits in the Counter Reformation from 1545 to c.1600.**

A consideration of the role of the Jesuits must be central to the answer even if ultimately they are considered to have a lesser role than other factors. This should be more than just a mere description of their activities, and should be set firmly within the context of the Counter Reformation. Thus a consideration of such issues as their greater spirituality, discipline and emphasis on education at a time of moral laxity and abuses within the church would be particularly relevant as would their missionary work such as that of Peter Canisius in Germany, and their position as spiritual advisers to ruling monarchs.

Other issues such as the Council of Trent, impact of reforming Popes, the Inquisition and Index might also be set against the Jesuits in assessing their contribution, but can be assessed within its own terms.

- (b) 'Catholic Reformation rather than Counter Reformation.' How far do you agree with this view of Church reform from 1545 to 1600?**

Candidates should give a more or less balanced discussion, though they may well point out that events post 1545 are largely a response to Lutheranism, particularly the council of Trent and the doctrinal issues with which it dealt such as papal authority and the re-assertion of the seven sacraments. Matters of discipline, such as residency and the education of clergy might be interpreted either way. Organisations such as the Jesuits and earlier reforming orders such as the Oratory of Divine Love might be considered to have their origins in an earlier period and be seen to be part of the wider movement of Christian Humanism and as such an argument for Catholic Reformation. Candidates should reach some conclusion within the demands of the question.

**14 The Reign of Henry IV 1589-1610**

- (a) How successful were Sully's policies in dealing with royal finances and the economy? Explain your answer.**

Candidates are likely to argue that both underwent a considerable improvement under Sully. For finance, fiscal reforms concerning the taille, gabelle, the don gratuit and introduction of the Paulette might be considered as well as the attempts to improve tax collection, but there should be a balanced discussion of their limitations and drawbacks eg for the Paulette the loss of long-term administrative control. For the economy, a similarly balanced discussion should take place with references to agricultural and industrial developments and communications being likely. Candidates are likely to suggest some success in agriculture, with an eventual surplus for export, but may also point out the lack of noble interest necessary for more long-term success.

In industry, the work of Laffemas is likely to be mentioned and the rather limited achievements in the production of luxury goods such as silk.

- (b) How effective was Henry IV as King of France from 1598 to 1610? Explain your answer.**

Candidates are likely to focus on the relative stability of France during this period with the settlement of religious issues in the Edict of Nantes, his embracement of Catholicism, the ending of the war with Spain and the improvement of finances and the economy under

Sully. On the other hand they might point out the limitations of Henry's effectiveness with the nobles, parlements and peasant risings. Short and long-term effects might be considered. Some conclusion is required in line with the question with some ranking and linkage of issues. The scope is wide and candidates would not be expected to cover all issues. Some balance is required.

## **15 The Dutch Revolt 1563-1609**

### **(a) How important was Calvinism in the outbreak and development of the Dutch Revolt? Explain your answer.**

Candidates may well point out that Calvinism as such did not become a major issue until later and that the revolt initially was more about opposition to Spanish policies of imposing laws against the traditions and regional policies of the Netherlands ie toleration as an issue in itself and as a means of embracing trade. Later developments concerning Calvinism are likely to include the conversion of William of Orange and the activities of the Sea Beggars as both a uniting and dividing force. Calvinism may be set against other issues in order to assess its relative importance eg Philip and Alva's policies, economic and political issues etc. but there must be a substantial discussion of Calvinism as a factor.

### **(b) Assess the importance of William of Orange to the success of the Dutch Revolt.**

There should be some balanced discussion of the achievements of William of Orange eg his early failures of 1572 contrasting with the height of his success at the Pacification of Ghent in 1576. There is also likely to be a consideration of his abilities both as a military and political leader and his determined efforts to keep the issues on the international stage. Candidates might also assess his relative importance by setting against other factors such as failure of Spanish troops and Spanish policy, economic issues, activities of Maurice of Nassau etc. Whatever conclusion is reached, it should include a substantial discussion of the part played by William of Orange.

## **16 Spain as a Great Power 1556-1598**

### **(a) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the legacy of Charles I to his son Philip II of Spain.**

Possible issues include the continuing problem of regionalism, particularly that of Aragon in relation to Castille, the limitations/successes of conciliar government, the weaknesses of crown finances and the related issue of wars, economic underdevelopment and unsolved religious problems such as the Moriscos and problems with the Turks. On the plus side, candidates might point out that Spain itself had been relatively peaceful for much of Charles' reign and considering the religious turmoil in central Europe, remarkably free of religious problems. Candidates should not stray too far into Philip's reign. Some balance is required but candidates need not cover all issues.

### **(b) To what extent were financial and economic issues the main problems facing Philip II from 1556 to 1598?**

Candidates are likely to argue that the problems related to these issues were considerable. In terms of finance, Philip inherited a massive debt of c. 50 million ducats and was forced to repudiate his debts 3 times during his reign, which made it difficult to borrow money thereafter. Such problems might be linked to ongoing warfare against the Dutch, English and French. Attempts to resolve eg by raising cash from juros simply made problems long-term. Similarly increased taxation contributed to the stagnation and underdevelopment of the economy, though candidates may point out that there were pockets of success such as

Seville. Reference is also likely to be made to the effects of incoming bullion from the New World. There is likely to be substantial focus on the financial and economic problems, although candidates may also set them against other factors such as factionalism, regionalism, personality issues and religious problems to reach a conclusion in line with the question.

**Europe 1598-1661****17 Richelieu and Mazarin 1622-1641**

Answer **either**

**(a) To what extent was Richelieu's success in domestic policy limited by noble opposition?**

Issue of noble opposition must be addressed to reach Bands I and II. Consideration of domestic policies may include strengthening of royal authority, a major aim; bolstering his own position relative to the king; financial affairs; the economy; religion; and underpinning them all, the reduction of noble power and influence. Policies aimed at reducing the power of nobility included; reduction of Parliament of Paris to role of only registering decrees; by-passed Parliaments in general by setting up new bodies under his direct control eg Court of Chambre d' Arsenal; targeted provincial governors control – three quarters had “disappeared “by 1642; he dealt ruthlessly with popular revolts eg the Nu-pieds in Normandy. He had great success in dealing with the Huguenots who became loyal supporters of the state eg supported Richelieu in The Thirty Years' War. In spite of considerable noble plotting eg Marie de Medici he ensured the survival of the king. The greatest failure in domestic policy was the rejection of centralised universal taxation. This had less to do with noble opposition, Marillac excepted, than with general dissatisfaction with wars and tax burdens. Richelieu often forced to give ground in order to succeed – eg local parliaments/estates continued to exist.

**or**

**(b) To what extent did Mazarin continue Richelieu's foreign policy?**

The general line is likely to be in favour of continuity. A sound approach would examine aims and features of Richelieu's foreign policy to start with. Richelieu aimed to strengthen France's borders which were threatened almost everywhere by the Habsburg power – Spain in the north and south and Austria to the east – Spanish invasion in the wars of religion in the late sixteenth century emphasized France's vulnerability. It can also be argued that Richelieu was addicted to war and his policy reflected that – France was almost continually at war during his rule. Religious loyalty to Catholicism played no part in his policy as indicated by his financial backing of Sweden versus the Habsburgs, then followed by direct intervention in The Thirty Years' War. A brief examination of French gains at Westphalia and the Pyrenees will demonstrate how closely Mazarin followed Richelieu's foreign policy – the strengthening of France's borders via territorial acquisition was achieved eg Alsace, Lorraine. France not Spain was the dominant power in western Europe. On the other hand France's ambitions in Italy exemplified by invasion in 1620's were eventually downgraded by Mazarin to retain only the fortress of Pinerolo. He also broke with Richelieu's antipathy to England via an alliance versus Spain which led to the Peace of the Pyrenees.

**18 The Problems of Spain 1598-1659**

Answer **either**

**(a) How serious were Spain's domestic problems from 1598 to 1659? Explain your answer.**

A response which argues that war increased the seriousness of Spain's domestic problems particularly economy and finance would be a sound start. Bearing in mind that foreign policy per-se does not figure in the question set. There is no doubt that Spain's

economic condition was parlous through this period. Spain's government were too often blinded by bullion imports which were "wasted" to support and pay – off loans for maintaining war efforts across the whole period. Nothing is more indicative of the waste by the failure of Lerma during the long truce with Holland to even begin to address economy and finance. The generally intractable nature of Spain's domestic problems is further illustrated by both the aggressive nature of Olivares' reforms and the hostile responses which caused their failure. This could lead directly to a wider discussion of the severity of Spain's domestic problems – social inertia; regionalism; lack of consistent focus on internal affairs because of distractions of war. How severe then? – very – being widespread and pernicious in their effects.

or

**(b) To what extent had Spain succeeded in maintaining its international position to 1659?**

Long narratives are not required here. It will be perfectly acceptable to compare 1598 with 1659. Some may argue that reports of Spain's demise have been greatly exaggerated. Band I and II responses may well argue for weaknesses in apparent strengths in 1598 and strengths in apparent weaknesses in 1659. With the death of Philip II it might be argued that the gold turned to dross, but it is also evident that it took much longer than 1659 to effect this reverse alchemy.

Evidence of situation in 1598 which may be offered includes the weakening effects of Spain's involvement on widespread wars none of which were "won" by 1598 – eg England, Holland, France. On the other hand no power or alliance was able to defeat Spain outright at that time. This is perhaps an argument to support long decline punctuated by occasional success. Spain was never supremely powerful at its peak but neither was it amongst the weakest of powers in 1659. Although its military decline was apparent eg difficulty of financing large armies. The army in Milan was reduced from 40,000 to 10,000 by the 1660's but Spain's European and overseas empires' were still very extensive. By 1659 though it was apparent that the revival of its opponents – England, Holland and especially France would continue the decline of Spain's international position.

**19 The Thirty Years' War 1618-1648**

Answer either

**(a) Assess the importance of Wallenstein to Habsburg success in the Thirty Years' War to 1629.**

Clear focus on Wallenstein is essential for Bands I and II. General explanation of Habsburg success will not move beyond Band III, but in order to meet the command – "assess the importance" other factors contributing to Habsburg success have to be judged. Wallenstein was the greatest mercenary general of his age. From the start Wallenstein was employed by Maximilian of Bavaria and the German Catholic princes. This army was essential to the Habsburg cause at several points in the war. In particular in the defeat of the Calvinist rebels and their allies in the early stages. Unlike Tilly however Wallenstein's loyalty was questionable. He had ambitions to be a ruler in his own right. Success in battles in northern Germany in the late 1620's saw off Danish intervention on the Protestant side. Wallenstein was given the title "General of the Oceanic and Baltic Seas" by a grateful Ferdinand. Success bred greater ambition in Wallenstein and Emperor Ferdinand sacked him in 1631 then had him assassinated, ironically by a group of mercenaries in 1634. Other factors of importance to Habsburg's success to 1629 include; Spain's support in 1619; John George of Saxony helped Ferdinand crush the Bohemian revolt and then fought successfully

against Frederick V of the Palatinate. Finally it may be argued that the divisions and weaknesses of its opponents before 1629 greatly contributed to Habsburgs success.

or

**(b) Assess the reasons why the Habsburgs did not maintain their success in The Thirty Years' War after 1629.**

Most responses will focus on Swedish and French intervention, but Band1 responses will recognise that Hapsburg failure was not a smooth downward curve. Both sides were exhausted as early as 1640, but none could find the military wherewithal to achieve decisive victory, nor the political will to end the war around the peace table.

Many will argue that the tipping point from early success to later problems for the Habsburgs was the Edict of Restitution in 1629 which, in its triumphalism, antagonised Habsburg friend and foe alike. The Edict led directly to Sweden's intervention on behalf of Protestantism in Germany and northern Europe. Swedish victories at Breitenfeld and Lutzen turned the tide at a crucial point in the war. Though Sweden was defeated at Nördlingen in 1634, this led France to step up its involvement after 1635 and again after 1639 ensuring a stalemate between the main protagonists.

Perhaps the most important reason for the lack of success after 1629, compared with 1619 – 29 was the leveling up of anti – Habsburg forces and a dilution of the obviously religious causes of the war because of the diverse ambitions of a variety of states and rulers.

**20 Social Issues in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century**

Answer either

**(a) To what extent did fear provide the main reason for witch-hunts in the first half of the seventeenth century?**

Whatever line of argument is produced the issue of “fear” must be addressed. Fear of what? – the unknown, the inexplicable combined with fear-fuelled superstition. Fear of whom? – different races and religions, eccentric behaviour, newcomers. These fears were often stoked up by religious bodies, Catholic and Protestant alike. They often encouraged jealousy of one group for another, eg anti – Semitism. Financial reward for persecutors was not unusual eg half a million florins were confiscated by the witch – finder of Bamberg in the 1630's. In an age of great social, political and economic uncertainty many people sought solace in scapegoats to excuse their own failings or unfortunate circumstances. A strong misogyny was prevalent in the witch – hunts, rarely were men accused by all – male witch – hunting bodies. Fear was important as an explanation but the wider context and evidence require analysis.

or

**(b) To what extent did the social structure in France limit economic development in the first half of the seventeenth century?**

Responses might consider the latent economic strength of France. Its resources were many and its population was large. Yet its economy did not reflect these advantages. Commerce and overseas trade were not attractive outlets for the wealthy and were not seen as paths to social and political improvement. Land and office were more promising. An aspiring middle – class was too small to make an impact. The lower orders were usually tied to subsistence farming and were exploited ruthlessly by taxation. Answers might refer to attempts for example by Sully and Richelieu to make economic changes. Sully's work has been praised but had little long – term effect because of the lack of



political support after the death of Henry 1V. Richelieu's efforts although well meant, were hindered by his preoccupation with other problems, especially war, and the deadening effect of hidebound customs and attitudes.

**Europe 1660****21 Sweden and the Baltic 1660-1718**

Answer **either**

**(a) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Sweden in 1660.**

The steer should ensure that both highlighted issues are treated in a balanced fashion. The start date is also the end date – there is no imperative to move beyond to the policies of Charles XI. Both foreign and domestic scenes are relevant and lack of either will limit such responses to Band III. Top Band responses may recognise that whilst some of Sweden's strengths were more apparent than real, some weaknesses were capable of solution if a strong monarchy developed. The caveat over focus on post 1660 still applies though. Evidence of strengths may include: Sweden's pre – eminent position in the Baltic based on gains through Sweden's military might; the development of a national army as opposed to a mercenary one. Evidence of weaknesses may include: the actions of the Regency during Charles XI's minority; the loss of crown lands and revenue; decline in copper supplies; a sparse scattered population. Linking both is of course the issue of Sweden's enemies – Denmark, Poland, the Habsburgs, and Russia under Peter the Great. In 1660 none of these were in a position to mount a serious challenge to Sweden's empire – but that was to change. It may be concluded that Sweden's international position was a false one depending as it did on the weakness of Sweden's enemies in 1660. At the same time the domestic weaknesses were more capable of resolution.

**or**

**(b) To what extent was Charles XII's recklessness to blame for the defeat of Sweden by Russia?**

There must be strong focus on Charles XII's recklessness, with special consideration given to the pejorative nature of the term. The case for recklessness is based directly on his rush to war in 1700; his failure to bring Russia to heel after crushing Peter at Narva. Instead he turned to Poland for the next few years allowing Peter the respite to rebuild his forces; in 1707 his disastrous invasion of Russia ended in rout at Poltava. The case against recklessness is based on wider perspectives. Sweden's weaknesses were eventually "found out" by coalitions of jealous neighbours eg the invasion of the empire in 1700; linked to this is the ability of Sweden to maintain its empire only in a power vacuum; Sweden lacked both natural resources and demography after the 1660's. Overwhelmingly though it is the growth of Petrine Russia which made Sweden's loss of empire well – nigh inevitable. Some may argue that instead of being castigated for recklessness, Charles XII deserves credit for staving off the inevitable for so long. Others may argue that when he was killed in action in 1718 he was as worn out by war as was his land which had lost a generation of its male youth and had consumed its prosperity in war. The peace treaties at Nystadt in 1720 -1721 marked the end of Sweden's hegemony which was taken by Russia. It might be remembered though that Charles XII's sobriquet "The Lion of the North" was neither given nor earned lightly.

**22 France and Europe 1661 – 1715**

Answer **either**

**(a) How far did Louis XIV's France influence European culture?**

The key issue is the wider influence of France not simply of Versailles court culture though this is an important part of the response. Versailles architecture and culture appealed to many rulers and if imitation is the sincerest form of flattery eg Peterhof and Schönbrunn then certainly Versailles was influential architecturally. Of wider importance and influence however is the "political" culture of Versailles and particularly of Louis XIV's view of kingship. Louis XIV saw culture as an instrument of policy for the glorification of king and country. This influence was widely imitated largely because it was a cheaper and safer way of glorifying one's rule for petty princes rather than by the more traditional route of war eg the Prince – Bishops of Wurzburg. Even Frederick I of Prussia was dazzled by the aura of the "Sun – King". The concept of kingship developed by Louis XIV placed the ruler as the sun at the centre of revolving noble satellites who were forced to live at Versailles where they would be less troublesome. The Versailles court explicitly modelled this and was much imitated. This in turn influenced other areas of monarchical activity eg the establishment of standing armies and of bureaucracies both loyal to the ruler via service to the state.

In addition this was a golden age of French culture with leading figures in Art, Music and Drama. French was the language of diplomacy and the coffee-house hosted the language of intellect across Europe. It is however true to say that these influences were limited to upper and bourgeois classes in Europe. Their direct impact /relevance to the masses was minimal even in France itself.

**or**

**(b) "The main aim of Louis XIV's foreign policy was the achievement of personal glory". How far do you agree with this view?**

Louis XIV aim to achieve personal glory was undeniable. He had an overwhelming desire to bring about French military and cultural ascendancy over Europe. It might be argued that Louis wanted the same for France also, though he probably did not distinguish between the two, "L'état c'est moi". Some may argue that whilst he had other aims his foreign policy was consistently in pursuit of "La Gloire". Amongst his aims were his wish to break Habsburg threats, whether real or imagined; the wish to secure France's "natural boundaries" a weasel phrase if there ever was one, eg the Reunions, war against the Dutch, designs on the Spanish throne. It is likely that most responses will agree with the view expressed in the question. Band I and II responses will be distinguished by the quality of evidence, argument and evaluation.

**23 The Development of Brandenburg – Prussia 1660 – 1713**

Answer **either**

**(a) To what extent was the army the main factor in the success of Frederick – William the "Great Elector" in ruling Brandenburg – Prussia?**

An adequate focus on the rôle of the army is expected; its rôle was very varied including police and civil matters eg tax – gathering as well as more narrowly military functions. The amount of time devoted to the army will depend on the weight of the arguments. Other factors may include the Great Elector's personality because much of the efficiency of government reflected his forceful personality. He was greatly concerned with government and administration creating a loyal bureaucracy. Originally his accommodation with the

Junkers gave them senior administrative posts, though later the bureaucracy became more representative of the bourgeoisie. It might be argued that his policy with the Junkers was the main reason for his success in ruling Brandenburg – Prussia. He gave them formal recognition of their land rights and control over the peasants in return for giving up their political influence in the government of their regions. This was highly important because it allowed Frederick – William greater power in ruling his scattered territories.

or

**(b) To what extent was Brandenburg – Prussia a major international power by 1713.**

Responses may include the following: in 1713 Brandenburg – Prussia stood at a cross – roads with regard to its international position, since the 1640's it had developed a growing and competent army battle – hardened by wars with and against France. Brandenburg – Prussia was regarded as an ally, but only on the basis of supplying troops in return for subsidies. The unique fusion of army and state which set Prussia apart from its neighbours had begun by 1713. The state might well have continued in this vein for a long time. Brandenburg – Prussia was never regarded as an equal ally in this period but there was a chance that it could take a different path. This was because in return for military support against France, Emperor Leopold granted enhanced status albeit grudgingly, to Frederick I. He recognised him as king **in** Prussia, but not **of** Prussia. This served both as a reminder of Brandenburg's still minor status, but also as an incentive to future rulers to drive towards full international parity.

**24 Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century.**

Answer **either**

**(a) Assess the reasons why Holland and Brandenburg – Prussia adopted policies of religious toleration in the second half of the seventeenth century.**

Responses need to demonstrate a clear understanding of the extent of religious toleration in both countries. In Holland and Brandenburg-Prussia there were some similarities: eg tolerance was a part of economic policy and the benefits were considerable. Toleration of Jews and Huguenots was linked to governments and societies being pro- active in economic matters. There were also differences in the approach to religious toleration of Holland and Brandenburg- Prussia. By mid seventeenth century the formal separation of Calvinist north from Catholic south was well established. Religious toleration in the north was less explicit when compared with that allowed in Brandenburg – Prussia. Here the Great Elector positively promoted toleration of all faiths which exemplified Hohenzollern belief in personal discipline in the interests of the state. Toleration was therefore a pragmatic solution to economic and demographic problems rather than an ideal for its own sake. Judgment of the relative importance of reasons for toleration may be made separately for each state.

or

**(b) Assess the reasons why the economic development of France was limited in the second half of the seventeenth century.**

The forces impeding the economic development of France are varied and include the work of Colbert a major influence on French economic affairs. It is likely that much will be about Colbert but the question commands consideration of other influences. There is no doubt that France possessed a number of advantages on which economic development could have flourished eg large land mass – much of it

fertile; the largest population in western Europe. In spite of this the French economy underwent only limited development in this period. Colbert firmly believed that government should closely regulate all aspects of economic activity. This “Mercantilism” was a major factor in the relative failure of the French economy to achieve its potential. He believed that production and trade were finite and that trade supremacy could only be achieved by war eg with Holland. This belief placed the French economy in a strait – jacket. His insistence on developing the urban economy at the direct expense of the rural community was another factor. The maintenance of a rigid social hierarchy in which peasants were exploited eg via excessive tax burdens whilst the upper classes saw economic activity as an inferior occupation was therefore another major limiting factor. Added to this was that the almost continuous warfare of Louis XIV’s reign placed enormous strain on the economy in any case. Band I and II responses will demonstrate clearly the ratchet effect of Colbert’s beliefs allied to wars and a rigid social hierarchy in limiting France’s economic development in this period.

## 2586 European and World History 1789 – 1989

### Europe 1789-1849

#### 1 The French Revolution 1789-1795

Answer **either**

##### (a) Assess the reasons for the revolution in 1789.

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates may discuss some of the following reasons: the actions and character of the monarchy (candidates may discuss Louis XVI's personal qualities as a monarch, the reputation of the monarchy in the 1780s, enlightened ideas about monarchy, the impact of key decisions, changes of mind and hesitancy by Louis XVI in the build up to and during 1789); the failure to deal effectively with financial problems; the reputation of Marie Antoinette and the significance of the Austrian connection; economic factors, including the immediate economic circumstances of the Revolution; the influence of the Enlightenment; the reluctance of the nobility to change; the impact of the calling of the Estates-General; the grievances of the people expressed in cahiers; the unrest of the summer of 1789 and so on. What matters is the candidate's ability to assess the reasons discussed by analyzing their relative significance and linkages.

or

##### (a) How far were people of Paris the main factor in shaping the course of the Revolution between 1789 and 1795?

Focus: Assessment of factors

Candidates may focus on key events such as the revolutionary events of 1789, the Champ de Mars Massacre (1791), the overthrow of the monarchy (1792), and the Reign of Terror (1793-4) and assess the role of the people of Paris in these. Candidates may argue that the Revolution of 1789 was made in Paris and that from the time the monarch was brought from Versailles to Paris in October 1789, the people of Paris (and increasingly the sans-culottes and the Parisian Jacobins) were to exert a crucial influence on the course of the Revolution, at least until the autumn of 1793. The role of the people of Paris, however, needs to be set against some other shaping factors such as the role of the monarchy, factions, counter-revolution, federal revolt, war and foreign intervention, religion and economic problems.

#### 2 Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815

Answer **either**

##### (a) To what extent did Napoleon's government of France during the Consulate bring benefits to the French people?

Focus: Assessment of impact of policies

Benefits to the French people can be interpreted broadly. Some will discuss the people generally, whilst others may examine the impact of reforms on different groups within society. Among the 'benefits' candidates may point to internal peace and stability, order and efficient government, economic stability, religious toleration, educational opportunity and meritocracy, equality before the law and so forth. Candidates may suggest that the real beneficiaries were the notables, the men of property and aspiring middle classes who

benefited most from the political, social and economic changes introduced, whilst peasant and worker were subject to conscription, taxation, restrictions on movement and little access to the benefits of state education or opportunities in the administration. Some may point to the failure to recognize female equality in the Civil Code. Candidates could also set 'benefits' against disadvantages such as censorship and police and other limitations associated with the Napoleonic state.

or

- (b) 'The weaknesses of his enemies were the main reason for Napoleon's military success in Europe to 1807.' How far do you agree with this view?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

In relation to the weaknesses of his enemies, candidates may point to their relative disunity (states pursued their own interests, were rarely united and even coalitions were loose associations rather than binding alliances), the weaknesses of their generals (inferior to Napoleon and many of his Marshals), the size and organization of their armies, their outdated concepts of strategy and tactics, and so on. Candidates may contrast such weaknesses with the qualities of the French army (mass conscript, motivated, mobile, organization in corps and divisions, flexible mixed order tactics, offensive strategy, relatively meritocratic officer corps, superior artillery etc.), and Napoleon's qualities as a commander-in-chief and campaign and battlefield general. Candidates should support their arguments with evidence drawn from the military campaigns fought between 1799 and 1807.

### **3 France 1814-1848**

Answer **either**

- (a) To what extent was the reign of Louis XVIII a failure?**

Focus: Assessment of success

Failure can be interpreted by a variety of criteria, for example, in relation to aims, results of policies, the historical context of the reign. Candidates may argue, for example, that Louis XVIII was not a failure in that, despite the Hundred Days, he survived and passed his throne peacefully to his successor in 1824. They may also point to the Charter, the dealing with early problems, the success in paying the indemnity, intervention in Spain and the containment of the Ultras in the early part of the reign. On the other hand, candidates may argue for failure in that, despite the concessions made in the Charter, he failed to appease the liberals and the left (the Charter effectively only allowed property owners into the political process), became more reactionary after the murder of Berry (itself an indication that opposition existed) and failed to restrain the ultra sympathies of his heir. A harsh judgement might be that Louis XVIII failed to win the loyal support of the French people despite their war-weariness and readiness for stability.

or

- (b) To what extent was economic crisis the main reason for the overthrow of Louis Philippe in 1848?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates must deal with the role of the economic crisis of 1846-48 even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. Candidates may argue that the economic crisis (hitting both the middle classes because of the over investment in railways and the peasantry, and workers, because of the impact of bad harvests and inflation) provided the circumstances for revolution, but did not in itself cause it. They may argue that other

factors were as or more important: the failures of Louis Philippe's domestic and foreign policies, the failure to grant reform under Guizot, the lack of positive support for the monarchy, the groundswell of opposition because of the harsh repression of urban unrest in the 1830s, the evidence of opposition in the various assassination attempts, unrest and Bonapartist efforts, Louis Philippe's own lack of resolution in February 1848, the revolutionary heritage of France and its impact, and so on.

#### 4 Revolution and Repression in Europe 1815-1849

Answer **either**

- (a) To what extent was the development of Liberalism the main cause of revolution in the German Confederation in 1848-49?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates must deal with the issue of liberalism even if they wish to argue that other causes are more important. In relation to liberalism candidates may or may not distinguish clearly between liberalism and nationalism. They may refer to the growing pressure for change in Germany both within states and across the Confederation, especially in the 1840s, pointing to evidence such as the *Zollverein* (a vehicle for economic liberalism), student protests, the growth of liberal nationalism, the importance of the Rhine Crisis (1840) and the Schleswig-Holstein issue (1846) and various national societies. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors: for those who distinguish nationalism they may argue this was more important; the role of economic crisis in the mid-1840s; growth of economic unity through railways and the *Zollverein*; the influence of the French Revolution; the fall of Metternich and the revolution in Vienna and so on.

or

- (b) 'The loyalty of the armed forces to the Emperor was the main reason for the failure of the revolutions in the Austrian Empire in 1848-49.' How far do you agree with this view?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates must deal with the issue of the armed forces even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. In relation to the armed forces, candidates may point to the actions of Radetsky, Windischgratz and Jellacic and argue it was the armed forces that crushed the revolts in Vienna, Prague, Hungary (albeit with Russian help) and Italy. Such arguments need to be balanced against other reasons: the generally narrow base of support for revolution (middle classes and students); the divisions with revolutions and between revolutions in the different states; the lack of mass support, especially as economic crisis died down; the recovery of nerve by the Austrian Emperor and his ministers and so on.



**Europe 1825-1890****5 Italy 1830-1870**

Answer **either**

- (a) To what extent was lack of unity amongst the revolutionaries the main reason for the failure of the revolutions in Italy in 1848-49?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates must deal with the issue of lack of unity even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. In relation to lack of unity, candidates may refer to: the different ideas about aims and methods such as those of Balbo, Gioberti, Mazzini and others; the differences between revolutionaries in Sicily, Venice, Rome, Piedmont and elsewhere; and the lack of cohesion in and between the revolutions in various Italian states. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as: the role of Pius IX; the loyalty and actions of the Austrian army; the aims and actions of Charles Albert of Piedmont; the lack of mass support; the lack of foreign support (including the French role in defeating the Roman Republic) and so on.

**or**

- (b) To what extent were Cavour's leadership and diplomacy the main reason for the creation of a Kingdom of Italy in the period to 1861?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

In relation to Cavour, candidates may refer to his actions to modernise Piedmont in the 1850s, his handling of the Plombières meeting with Napoleon III, his engineering of a war with Austria in 1859, the impact of his resignation over Villafranca, his negotiation of a settlement regarding the central duchies with Napoleon III and his actions to forestall Garibaldi in 1860. Candidates may argue that, more than anyone Cavour was the architect of the Kingdom of Italy. However, discussion of Cavour's role needs to be balanced against other factors: the roles of Napoleon III and Garibaldi; the actions of the National Society (in the central duchies especially); and relative Austrian weakness and the international situation.

**6 Germany c.1862-1890**

Answer **either**

- (a) To what extent were economic factors the main reason for the unification of Germany?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates need to deal with economic factors even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. In relation to economic factors candidates may argue that it was Prussia's economic dominance of Germany (and Austria's relative weakness and exclusion) and her economic development ('coal and iron') that provided her with the resources and opportunity to unify Germany. They may be discussion of the *Zollverein* and the economic advances under Manteuffel in the 1850s. Candidates need to balance such discussion against other factors such as: the development of the Prussian military machine and its effectiveness in war; the diplomacy of Bismarck; the international situation; the role of nationalism and so on.

or

- (b) How successful was Bismarck's foreign policy from 1871 to 1890? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of success

Success may be judged by reference to criteria such as aims, results and context. If discussing success in relation to aims, then candidates may discuss the overall aim of security for the new German Empire and the avoidance of war. They may also refer to the desire to isolate France, to be '*à trois*' in a Europe of five great powers, and the use of foreign policy as a means of uniting Germany at home. Judgements about particular developments and events may be assessed in the light of these aims and the results of actual policies pursued. Candidates may discuss the French war scare of 1875, the alliances with Austria and Russia (and Italy), the attempts to woo Britain, Bismarck's handling of the Eastern Question and colonial issues and so on. Candidates are likely to argue that on the whole Bismarck was successful.

## **7 France 1848-1875**

Answer **either**

- (a) Assess the reasons why the Second Republic (1848-1852) was short-lived.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates need to assess several reasons and examine their linkages and/or relative importance. Candidates may well examine the circumstances in which the Second Republic came about and may point to the expectations of different groups and the divisions which quickly emerged (between the party of 'Order' and that of 'Progress', the June Days and the election of Louis Napoleon, the nature of the Constitution (particularly the arrangements concerning the relationship between President and Assembly), the coup of December 1851 and the plebiscite of December 1852.

or

- (b) How successful were Napoleon III's domestic policies? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of success

Success may be judged against criteria such as aims, outcomes and context. In relation to success, there may be discussion of social policy and economic policy – railways, free trade, banking etc where arguably there was a good deal of success. There may be discussion of the development of Paris (slum clearance), the nature of government and the move to a more liberal constitution. Candidates may argue that policies in these areas enjoyed some success. Such discussion may be balanced against criticisms of Napoleon III's style of government, the growth of criticism and opposition and the limitations to domestic success (e.g. criticisms of free trade). Overall, candidates may judge that in economic and social policy he was more successful than in his handling of political and constitutional issues.

**8 Russia 1825-1881**

Answer **either**

**(a) How successful was Nicholas I in his rule of Russia? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of success

There should be reasoned judgement on the question of success which might be assessed in relation to aims, effects and the difficulty of the problem/issue faced. Candidates may examine his rule in relation to the Decembrist Revolt, nationalism (especially Poland), how to maintain autocracy, political opposition, Russian 'backwardness', serfdom, foreign policy and the Crimean War. Candidates may refer to Nicholas' policies in the framework of orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality, his limited reforms, his various 'Sections' to deal with different areas – especially the Third Section. They may discuss the view that his reign represented 'thirty wasted years' and suggest that whilst he had success he failed to deal with the real problems facing Russia.

**or**

**(b) 'Alexander II's reforms were too limited to have much impact on the problems facing Russia during his reign.' How far do you agree with this view?**

Focus: Assessment of impact of policies

Candidates may seek to identify problems such as serfdom, maintenance of autocracy, nationality, the growth of opposition, the pressure to modernise, local government, pressure for change in the army, law, education, the economy etc. There may well be full consideration of a limited range of key reforms such as emancipation of the serfs and local government or a more wide-ranging treatment. The key to a good answer will be how far the candidate assesses the impact of reform on the problem with which it was designed to deal. They may argue, for example, that emancipation reforms failed to go far enough because of Alexander's concern to prevent social change, and that a similar concern shaped his reform of local government. Economic reforms were too little to do much in the short term to industrialise Russia rapidly, and reforms in the army were similarly too cautious.

**America 1846-1919****9 The American Civil War 1861-1865**

Answer **either**

- (a) Assess the reasons why it took the North so long to defeat the South in the American Civil War.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates will need to identify and explain the relative significance and linkages between a number of reasons. Candidates may refer to: initial expectations of a short war, the effectiveness of Southern resistance, especially that marshalled by General Lee, Confederate morale, the overall strategic position (the North would have to defeat the South in the South), the time it took to harness the North's superior resources effectively, the ineffectiveness of many Union generals (expect criticism of McClellan), the eventual finding of a strategy, the resources and a general (Grant) to persevere to victory whatever the cost.

**or**

- (b) How effective was Davis as the leader of the Confederacy? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of effectiveness

Candidates coverage of leadership may involve discussion of appointment of generals and involvement in the conduct of the war, relations with ministers and quality of appointments, handling of public opinion and criticisms, handling of issues related to war effort such as recruitment, taxation, civil liberties, states' rights etc., and, of course, degree of responsibility for defeat in the war. Effectiveness may be judged against aims, outcomes and/or context.

**10 Politics and Reform 1877-1919**

Answer **either**

- (a) To what extent were economic motives the main reason why America pursued an imperialist foreign policy in the 1890s and the early twentieth century?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates may argue for economic motives as markets became saturated and cheap raw materials were sought and as a diversion from domestic depression. However, they should also examine some of the following: the extension of the notion of 'Manifest Destiny' to foreign affairs; the expansion of 'superior' US 'civilisation'; a christianising mission; imperial rivalry with Europe; the significance of Mahan's 'The influence of Sea Power on History'. In assessing the relative merits and linkages between these reasons candidates may refer to McKinley's presidency, Samoa and Hawaii, the Philippines and China, Cuba and war with Spain, Panama, the Roosevelt Corollary and interventions in Dominica, Nicaragua and Haiti.

or

- (b) How successful was Woodrow Wilson's domestic policy? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of success

Wilson's presidential campaign spoke of New Freedom – and had a broadly progressive tone – anti-trust, lower tariffs, breaking up the financial power of Wall Street, social reform. We can expect candidates to evaluate some of the following: there were lower tariffs (1913), there was banking reform (1913), there was anti-trust legislation (1914), but there was little social reform partly because Wilson was not fully committed to it, but he did return to this issue in his 1916 campaign and one result was child labour legislation (1916). After 1916 issues relating to the First World War dominated.

## **11 Western Expansion 1846-1900**

Answer **either**

- (a) How important were developments in transport in opening up the West? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of importance of a factor

The main issue is the impact of transport– candidates may evaluate what developments did and did not do, and should seek to balance the impact of transport against other factors to address how important?. The role of developments in opening up the west should be addressed – Cumberland road (completed 1852), the various trails, stage coach routes, steamboats, and of course the railroads. Candidates may stress links to communication (mail and Pony Express, the telegraph (1861 onwards), the development of towns, land sales associated with railroad development etc. and may suggest the symbiotic relationship between transport developments and other factors (e.g. mineral discoveries, cattle trails, farming etc.).

or

- (b) Assess the impact of the policies of Federal governments on Native Americans in the period from 1846 to 1887.**

Focus: Assessment of impact of policies

Candidates may place their assessment of the impact of Federal policies in the context of the tensions and conflicts arising from continuous westward expansion. There may be assessment of the attempts at peaceful coexistence as evidenced by such agreements as that made at Fort Laramie in 1851. There should also be discussion of the onset of violence and Federal involvement in the Indian Wars, the 1867 Peace Commission, the impact of the policy on reservations, Americanisation and the Dawes Act (1887).

## **12 Race Relations in the South 1863-1912**

Answer **either**

- (a) How successful was Reconstruction in improving the position of Black Americans to 1877?**

Focus: Assessment of success

The key to a good answer may lie in an analysis of the legal and formal changes and the reality for Blacks in the Reconstruction period – many may argue that despite legislation in reality Reconstruction represented a false dawn. We can expect references to:

emancipation, the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments and the Civil Rights Acts of 1866 and 1875; the Freedmen's Bureau, developments in education, political representation; Black Codes, the Ku Klux Klan, other legislation such as the Enforcement Acts; poverty and migration, etc.

or

**(b) How important were decisions of the Supreme Court in undermining the position of Black Americans in the period from 1877 to 1912?**

Focus: Assessment of importance

We can expect discussion of the impact of such Supreme Court Decisions as the 1883 decision to throw out the 1875 Civil Rights Act and the *Plessey v. Ferguson* (1896) decision which established the principle of 'separate but equal'. In 1898 the decision in the *Mississippi v. Williams* case undermined Black voting rights. Candidates may argue that the actions of the Supreme Court tended to confirm the undermining of Black rights that was already taking place in the South, although, in the last case, for example, the case encouraged further discrimination and the introduction of 'grandfather clauses'. In assessing 'How important?' candidates may set these decisions in the context of other factors such as the ingrained social prejudice, the role of lynchings and white supremacist organisations, the poor economic position of Blacks and so on.

**Europe 1890-1945****13 Russia 1894-1917**

Answer **either**

**(a) How far had the Russian monarchy recovered from the 1905 Revolution by 1914?**

Focus: Assessment of change over time

Candidates may discuss the impact of the 1905 Revolution in terms of undermining the Tsar's image as the benevolent 'father' of the Russian people and of forcing concessions from the government in the October Manifesto. Candidates may argue that in large measure the Tsar's position had recovered by 1914 and that the prospect of further mass unrest and revolution looked remote. Candidates may point to the Tsar's undermining of the apparent concessions in the October Manifesto that began with the Fundamental Laws and continued through the dissolution of the first two Dumas. They may also point to the rapid decline in strikes and protests after 1906 and the successful suppression of the strike on the Lena goldfields in 1912. In addition they may point to the successful combination of repression, arrest of revolutionaries and reform pursued by Stolypin in the years after 1905. On the other hand, candidates may argue that after his assassination in 1911 the Tsarist government lost its way, coming into conflict with the Duma and experiencing a rise in 'political' strikes.

**Or**

**(b) To what extent was the Tsar responsible for the February Revolution (1917)?**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates must deal with issue raised in question and balance this against other factors. There may be discussion of the Tsar's character, his weak will, indecision, his poor choice of, or ditching of able, ministers and advisers, poor decision-making at crucial times, his role in the First World War, his entrustment of the government to his wife (and Rasputin) when he took command of the army and so on. This may be balanced against the growth of opposition, the long history of social and economic problems, the problems associated with industrialisation, the pressure for constitutional government or revolution, and, crucially, the impact of the First World War.

**14 The Causes and Impact of the First World War c. 1890-1920**

Answer **either**

**(a) To what extent were the arms races the main reason for the outbreak of the First World War in 1914?**

Focus: assessment of reasons

Candidates must deal with the issue of arms races even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may discuss two types of arms race: the German naval race with Britain that assumed significance particularly after 1906; and the military arms race that saw all continental powers seeking to increase and modernise their armies. Candidates may argue that the naval race helped shaped the friction between Britain and Germany and particularly encouraged Britain to take a strong line in support of France in the Moroccan Crises. Whilst the military arms races also served to heighten tension and the prospect of war. For example, German military thinking centring on the Schlieffen Plan was jeopardised by Russian rearmament after the Bosnian Crisis and particularly with its escalation on military spending from January 1914. However, candidates may well argue

other factors were more important, such as the role of alliances, the Balkan rivalries of Austria and Russia, German pursuit of 'weltpolitik' and influence in Europe.

or

**(b) To what extent do military technological developments explain the stalemate on the Western Front during the First World War?**

Focus: Assessment of factors

Candidates are likely to discuss some of the following elements of military technology and their impact on the nature of warfare: breech-loading rifles, machine guns, artillery, barbed wire, gas, aircraft. They may argue that the nature of the weaponry and their mass use tended to favour the defence over the attack and forced armies to adopt entrenched position which were difficult to assault without massive casualties. They may well also argue that whilst technology (railways) enabled armies to assemble on mass and be supplied from the railheads, thereafter movement was impeded by reliance on speed of march. Candidates may balance their arguments by considering the role of mass armies, lack of effective strategies and battlefield tactics until such time as technological advances such as the tank, calibrated artillery and aircraft, and more advanced tactics allowed for more fluid warfare,

**15 Italy 1919-1945**

Answer **either**

**(a) To what extent was Mussolini able to establish a full dictatorship in Italy in the 1920s?**

Focus: Assessment of nature of government

Candidates' answers may depend on their definition of the term 'full dictatorship'. Candidates may discuss the dismantling of parliamentary government, the establishment of 'Il Duce', the elements of police state, censorship, proscription and propaganda, control of education, the Rocco Law, Corporative state, Fascist Grand Council, and the personality cult. On the other hand, whilst Mussolini appeared as a dictator, candidates may balance their discussion by referring to the limitations of Mussolini's power by reference to his agreement with the Church, the continued existence of the Monarchy, and the limits of Mussolini's power in country and over his party.

or

**(b) Assess the consequences to 1945 for Italy of its involvement in the Second World War.**

Focus: Assessment of consequences

The initial consequences of Italy's entry into the war seemed promising, despite lacklustre performance Italy share in the victory over France and had high hopes of pursuing her ambitions in the Balkans and North Africa. However, defeats of her army and of her navy (destroyed at Taranto) left Italy exposed and increasingly dependent on Germany, not only for military muscle but for raw materials. Allied victory over Rommel left Italy exposed to Allied invasion in 1943. Within Italy the strains and defeats of war led to disillusion with Mussolini, along with food shortages, inflation and rationing. One consequence was the growth of internal opposition with even some Fascists advocating peace and Mussolini's removal. Mussolini's removal from power was the consequence of the invasion of Sicily, but hopes for peace were dashed when the Germans took over northern and central Italy (Republic of Salò). As Allied armies pushed slowly north, German occupied northern Italy



descended into virtual civil war and Mussolini was finally captured and murdered as the Germans retreated.

**16 Germany 1919-1945**

Answer **either**

**(a) Assess the reasons why the Weimar Republic was able to survive during the 1920s.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates need to identify and explain the relative significance and linkages between a number of reasons. They may examine the 1920s chronologically, dealing with the survival in the early years of crisis and then reasons for continued survival during the later 1920s. Among the reasons discussed, candidates may refer to the mutually exclusive threats posed by the extreme left and right (pointing to the army's and freikorps' willingness to put down threats from the left (as in the Spartacist revolt and the Red Rising in the Ruhr), and the left's willingness to combat the right (as in the general strike which ended the Kapp Putsch). They may point to the willingness of moderate parties to work together increasingly through the 1920s, despite shifting coalitions. Candidates may also refer to the unity brought by the French invasion of the Ruhr and the subsequent road to recovery secured by Stresemann's leadership and foreign policy (including the Dawes Plan).

**or**

**(b) How successful were Nazi economic policies from 1933 to 1939? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of success

Candidates may assess New Plan and Four Year Plan or deal generally with different areas. Aims, economic context and results can be used as test of success. Candidates may discuss Nazi success or failure in dealing with unemployment and public works, industrial and agricultural policy, heavy industry and autarky. There may be discussion of the impact of foreign trade agreements, and the debate over consumer goods v. war materials (guns v. butter). The New Plan and Four Year Plan may be discussed in relation to how far they achieved their aims.

**Europe and the World 1919-1941****17 International Relations 1919-1941**

Answer **either**

**(a) How far do you agree that the Treaty of Versailles was harsh on Germany?**

Candidates can use the Terms of the Treaty to provide the framework of an answer to examine how fair it was. The emphasis needs to be on analysis rather than description for the higher levels. The focus certainly needs to be on the Treaty's impact on Germany. The traditional view that it was unfair might be challenged by candidates using some of the specific evidence available of territory lost and damage done to Germany's economy. Answers could use the territorial settlement, examining specific area of land lost to weigh up this proposition, as whilst the stripping away of the Polish Corridor, leaving East Prussia on a limb and the Sudetenland issue could be seen as unfair, comparison with the return of Alsace Lorraine could prove a useful comparison. Union with Austria? Other areas to discuss include the demilitarised Rhineland and the suspension of the Saar area to France for 15 years. Reparation and the final figure of 1921, compared to actual amount paid up to their suspension in 1932. Military restrictions on army, forbidden an airforce and no big battleships or submarines could all be discussed. Overall, perception and the impact of this on Germany's future might provide suitable conclusions/perspectives

**or**

**(b) Assess the reasons why the League of Nations was unable to stop aggression in the 1930s.**

This answer will require analysis of the motives and actions of Japan and Italy in particular. The limited reaction of Britain and France should also be evaluated. An overview bringing in each could be expected for a strong answer, though such a perspective might prove a challenge for some. Focus is to be anticipated on the Manchurian crisis with evaluation of the causes and consequences of Japan's aggression. The Lytton inquiry, signalling Britain and France's response will provide a good basis for considering development of policy and links to the later events in Abyssinia are to be expected. Abyssinia can be evaluated in the context of the Hoare Laval proposals and the serious damage to the credibility of the Anglo-French response subsequently. The question of aggressive or swift action outside of Europe should be examined, as too the perspective of future consequences for the League: that Abyssinia was the effective death knell.

**18 The USSR 1924-1953**

Answer **either**

**(a) To what extent were the purges the main reason why Stalin was able to consolidate his power in the 1930s?**

This answer will require candidates to evaluate the effectiveness of Stalin's purges in the 1930s. Whilst the purges should provide the focus, answers could also include discussion of the other ways in which Stalin consolidated his power by controlling the bureaucracy, dominating the Party, introducing Collectivisation and the Five Year Plans. Such evaluation will enable candidates to arrive at a considered judgement after considering all the evidence.

or

**(b) Assess the impact on the USSR of the Great Patriotic War.**

Answers will need to consider the impact of Stalin's leadership, the importance of his earlier purges and the development of agriculture and industry. Stalin's leadership and the opportunities the War provided for further control can provide important perspectives to answer this question. During the war, generalship, emergency planning and mobilisation of the whole population to meet the German invasion could be weighed to reach final conclusions.

**19 The Cold War in Europe 1945-1989**

Answer **either**

**(a) Assess the reasons why mutual distrust rapidly developed between the USSR and the Western Allies from 1945 to 1949.**

Answers should concentrate on Soviet attempts to control Eastern Europe from the perspective of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. They could include evaluation of the effectiveness of economic, political and social constraints; Stalin's divide and rule tactics on recently liberated states and the imposition of Moscow's own brand of communism. All this should enable strong evaluation of Stalin's success in exploiting his opportunities and thwarting the challenge from the West. The example of the Berlin Blockade could be used to consider how effectively Stalin played his hand and the subsequent consequences (eg NATO and Warsaw Pact).

or

**(b) To what extent was Gorbachev the main reason for the end of the Cold War?**

Particular focus will need to be on Gorbachev's role in the USSR, though the USA's policies should also be considered. Internal pressures for the USSR, particularly Gorbachev's modernisation (policies of perestroika and glasnost) and the difficulty of maintaining satellites were compounded by the continuation of continued military spending by the USA. USA's determination to confront and develop its military capacity throughout the 1980s should also be evaluated. Both internal and external factors could be considered, with the best answers emphasising how Gorbachev tried to manage these for the USSR.

**20 The Cold War in Asia and the Americas 1949-1975**

Answer **either**

**(a) How successful was the UN's intervention in Korea from 1950 to 1953? Explain your answer.**

Answers will need to consider the importance of the USA's strategy of containing communism in the West, with the challenges posed by the success of the Mao's communists in China. Domino theory, clash of ideology and the strategic importance of Korea after WWII could be considered. The immediate opportunity of exploiting divisions within the Security Council can also be evaluated. The course of the war, military setbacks and success can provide good material to evaluate the issue of success.

or

**(b) Assess the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis on the Cold War.**

Answers will need to consider the causes and course of the Crisis in order to fully evaluate issues. USA and USSR's involvement in Cuba, military, economic and political considerations should be evaluated, along with the importance of the immediate circumstances of military escalation, ultimatums and communication between the two super powers. Kennedy and Khrushchev's political and policy outlooks will underpin sound answers. The perspective after the Crisis will need to include the way that the Cold War developed with, for example, the Limited Test Ban treaty 1963 and Nuclear Non Proliferation treaty, 1968

## 2587 Historical Investigations 768 – 1216

### King John

#### 4 Study all the Passages.

Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that King John's quarrel with Innocent III over the Canterbury election lasted so long because the Interdict had a limited impact upon England. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Several lines of debate are raised in the Passages. Passages **B** and **D**, more indirectly **C**, see support and a range of factors, while **A**, highly critical of the King, suggests strongly that John was bound to fail in any contest between a good Pope and a bad King. **B** and **D** highlight continuities and continuations of some practices; the Church carried on; there were adjustments; **B** and more so **D** point to the royal controls exerted and the benefits that accrued to John; the two Passages are close in what they say about the normal functioning of a good part of the machinery of the Church. **C** points out that Innocent III did not expect the quarrel to last so long and points to the skills and luck that allowed John to maintain the quarrel to his advantage. Own knowledge can add to these Passages; reflecting changes of historical opinion on this theme: the dispute of 1205; main events thereafter: the place of Langton; key ideas held by Innocent III, John's assertions of traditional regalian rights; the number of vacancies among bishoprics and some religious houses; the wealth accumulated by John; the desultory negotiations; the interdict, the excommunication; the key moments of 1212-13.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

#### 5 Assess the view that King John's poor leadership was the main reason why he failed to regain his French lands after 1204. [45]

Focus: Assessment of John's capacity as a leader in context

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

One view would be that John was always a poor leader, poor politically and militarily; hence key reasons why he failed in his attempts. Another would be that he was competent at least, had diplomatic successes (assembling a potentially powerful coalition against Philip Augustus) and was undone by a series of unlucky circumstances and events. This latter view sees John as a competent (or better) administrator, able to drive hard the Angevin system of government, to raise the necessary money for his grand design – but alienating sections of the political community in the process. Financial exactions, from a variety of sources, and demands for military service may have weakened his domestic position. The unwillingness of many English barons to support his ventures in 1205-6 – even resistance from some by 1213-14 – should be examined. Some historians have argued that, in any event, John faced a skilful, successful powerful opponent in Philip Augustus, arguably getting wealthier all the time. In addition, John had to deal with other problem areas – the Church after 1205, Wales and Ireland – though some would argue he had successes in those areas. Even when he could focus on the plans to regain the

Angevin lands in France, he had to deal with difficult and demanding Continental allies, and their defeat at Bouvines ruined his plans. He was however, relatively successful in Poitou. Answers will consider several factors, cross-evaluating such against 'poor leadership' and will embrace political, military, diplomatic and economic-financial areas. Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**6 'The breakdown of King John's relations with his barons after the acceptance of Magna Carta was solely the fault of the King.' How far do you agree? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of a major feature of the reign

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the historical debate.

Candidates will need a good focus on 'solely the fault' and set up argument to that effect as well as counter-argument set around the actions of sections of the baronage. There has been much debate here, linked to the issues surrounding John's relations with his barons, the nature of *Magna Carta* and his personality. Whereas it was believed that John was all at fault – shifty, untrustworthy, bad – now there are those who see baronial divisions and indeed self-interest as important. There was a view of the barons as defenders of the 'community of the realm', pitted against an evil king, almost fighting for national rights and liberties. Views now are different. Focus has been placed on those barons never reconciled to John and increasingly embittered and disenchanted ('outs'), a group – the 'Northerners' – never likely to trust John, either side of the signing. Also attention has been given to the support John had – there were loyalist barons – as well as to the advantages gained from Papal overlordship (as is to be expected, there has been debate over his motives in making an agreement with the Pope). And there has been some return to a view of some of the rebel barons as narrow, partisan, sectional, self-interested. Events did escalate after Runnymede, with John emboldened by Papal approval to break the Charter and condemnation of his rebellious vassals. John's lack of commitment, his character, the support from Innocent III, self-interested barons and the impractical nature of parts of *Magna Carta* can be set against signs of John's willingness to support the agreement, the role of the negotiators, especially Stephen Langton and the 'middle ground' held by many barons. There has been debate over a 'middle party' of barons who created the conditions of negotiation leading to the settlement and their role in the aftermath. It has been observed that John was conscious of the possibility of winning over more support. There are debates over John's sincerity and commitment in 1215: he may have simply bought himself time; he was never fully committed (he could be sure of Innocent III's absolution); or else he might have accepted it and held to it if he could be sure it would bring peace and obedience. The retention of London under Robert Fitz Walter, the ambition of Philip Augustus and Louis and the intervention of Alexander of Scotland all contributed to the breakdown. Long term causes of the breakdown should be treated with discretion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

## 2588 Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725

### Philip II

Markers need to bear in mind the relatively limited weighting of AO1a and AO1b in this unit: the emphasis is upon AO2: in relation to historical context: interpret, evaluate and use the range of source material; explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.’  
(*Specification*, pp.6-7)

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Philip II’s failures as King of Spain were mainly the result of factors beyond his control. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

A supported and evaluative judgement should be reached. There is debate on the reasons for Philip’s failures as King of Spain during what has traditionally been seen as its ‘Golden Age’. The three themes here are: firstly, inherited political, religious and economic problems within the Spanish empire; secondly, Philip’s personal ineptitude and thirdly the quality of his opponents, though in **C** it is accepted that they had their own weaknesses. Passages **B** and **D** give a more positive view than **A** or **C**, which are generally negative concerning Philip’s role. All four Passages refer to the problems of his inheritance – a far-flung empire which came under attack, a diverse structure of government, financial weakness and defence costs. **A** also refers to Philip’s religious inheritance and the need to defend the Roman Catholic Church. Passage **A** represents a Black Legend view and condemns Philip for ‘ruining his country’ by his personal ineptitude and costly foreign policy, though it does accept that he did acquire Portugal. Passage **D** observes Philip’s vast overseas empire in a more positive way. **B** agrees that he was weak, by his own admission, and suggests that Philip’s foreign policy was thrust upon him by his inheritance, leading to a spiral of ‘war, debt and decay’ producing financial and economic collapse. Knowledge of the system and his vast inheritance might be used to evaluate how far these failures were beyond Philip’s control, as suggested in Passage **B**, caused by his own personal weaknesses as in **A** and **C** or by the strengths of his enemies, as in **D**. **C** sees him as weak in exploiting his opportunities, whereas **D** explains his failure by asserting the quality of Philip’s opponents. Own knowledge should be used to evaluate these claims, and might include factual examples of debts, revolts, religious clashes with the Papacy, religious oppression or cultural decline caused by use of the inherited Inquisition and policy of ‘purity of the blood’. Philip’s personal bureaucratic obsessions, attempts at absolutism, weakness and indecisiveness might be set against a flawed system of government, finance and economy. There might be mention of military and naval problems in defending a vast empire under continuous attack from enemies, and a discussion of how far Philip provoked attack. Overall, there should be a range of evidence used, but there is a wide range of material here for consideration, and it is not necessary to include all these factors for Band I.

- 2 Assess the view that Philip II’s main motive in his religious policies was to serve Spanish national interests. [45]**

**Debate:** The debate on the sincerity of Philip II’s religious motivation.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

Philip's religious policies involved his use of the Spanish Inquisition, his relations with the Papacy and Jesuits, and his duties as Catholic King in acting as the political arm of the Papacy in Europe during a time of Catholic Counter Reformation. In all these cases there is debate on whether Philip acted for religious reasons, or for defence of Spanish national interests. Had he wished to serve the international Roman Catholic Church and Papacy, he might not have discouraged the excommunication of Elizabeth; he might not have scrutinised the Tridentine decrees before implementing them, and allowed Rome to try Carranza for heresy. Had he been a crusader for the Church he might not have made a truce with the Ottoman Turks or clashed with the Papacy over the Jesuits. He might not have found himself on the opposite side to the Papacy over the annexation of Portugal and might have made peace with Henri IV on his conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1593 instead of continuing to fight him until 1598. The link to national interests should be defined for each of the examples used. The arguments that his aim was to strengthen the Spanish national church, government, society and economy by Philip's religious policies and church taxes, might be balanced by the counter-argument that he genuinely believed he was increasing orthodoxy and suppressing heresy in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church. The best answers might mention that some Popes also pursued their own interests. Relevant evidence may be drawn from a wide range of material to illustrate points made, but not all these points are needed. A supported judgement should be reached.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**3 How effectively did Philip II's strategies deal with changing problems in foreign relations? [45]**

**Debate:** an assessment of the impact of Philip II's foreign strategies

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The debate centres on Philip's changing religious and defensive strategies in the theatres of the Mediterranean, the Atlantic and Northern Europe. There should be clear evaluation of 'how effectively'. Some historians suggest that Philip's main foreign problem was to defend the international Catholic Church from heresy and the infidel, while others consider defence of his territories the major problem. At the beginning of his reign he prioritised the Mediterranean, and debate centres on whether it was his strategies or the Persian threat to the Ottomans which effectively increased the security of Spain. In religious terms the effects of his strategies were more mixed, containing but not eradicating the threat of the Ottoman Turks in the eastern Mediterranean by joining the Holy League in the Battle of Lepanto but alienating the Papacy and Venice by his Treaty with the Porte in 1580, provoking Papal support for Dom Antonio's claim to Portugal. His strategy of peace with the Protestant Elizabeth I proved defensively ineffective due to provocations by Elizabeth and her privateers. They undermined Spain's position in the Channel and Atlantic, stretched Spain's finances and necessitated an Atlantic convoy system to protect Spanish bullion. Concentration on the Turks until 1578 meant only half-hearted support for plots to free Mary Queen of Scots even after papal excommunication of Elizabeth, and the prolongation of the Dutch Revolt with English and French interference there. England also supported Dom Antonio for the crown of Portugal, and Philip's later war strategy against England was ineffective. Peace with France, while it was at war internally, changed for religious reasons in the Treaty of Joinville 1584, but this strategy was ineffective in preventing Henry IV becoming king, though it might be argued that Catholicism was retained in France by Spanish intervention. So overall his Mediterranean and Portuguese strategies were effective defensively, but his strategies in Northern Europe failed to defend his lands and religion or defeat his enemies. A supported judgement should be reached.



**4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Puritans posed a serious threat to stability in Elizabethan England. [45]**

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The nature of Puritanism is a key issue raised in the Passages in determining the extent of the threat Puritans posed. Puritan clergy and laity; form of worship or doctrine; church structure – all are raised in the Passages. Candidates will also need to show what might threaten stability at the time in order to engage fully with the question. There is a strong measure of agreement in the first three Passages, while **D** takes a different line. Passages **A**, **B** and **C** all identify a potential threat. **A** stresses that there *could have* been threat, with conformity enforced by the Church authorities, yet a desire for changes in the Prayer Book remaining. Equally, **B** argues that there was little to distinguish Puritans from the rest of the population in terms of church attendance or theology, yet also implies that they were different. Candidates will need to recognise the implication of this point in the context of the conformity required in the Church of England and the threat posed by those who deviated from this. **C** adds to the argument by explaining the context in which the laity came to be more critical of the clergy. **D** raises a further issue, that of church reform, as well as discussing the extent to which the Puritan challenge had changed by the end of the reign. **D** indicates a more serious problem with Puritanism than do the other Passages. Candidates may use their knowledge to expand on the examples alluded to in the Passages, such as the ‘Puritan Choir’ in **B**, the vestment controversy, demands for changes in the Prayer Book and Presbyterian moves, in order to assess the extent and nature of the Puritan challenge. To engage with the debate they will need to discuss how the various aspects of Puritanism threatened the establishment (an issue raised, for example, in **D**) as well as the success of the authorities in imposing conformity or at least containing Puritanism, referred to in **A** and **D**.

**5 Assess how far Elizabeth and her government were able to control Parliament. [45]**

**Debate:** the effectiveness of government management of parliament.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate centres round the methods used by the government (Queen and Privy Council) to control parliamentary elections and debate and their success. Candidates may also distinguish between queen and government, discussing attempted manipulation of the queen through parliamentary pressure. Candidates may explain why the Lords were generally under greater government control, with Archbishops and bishops owing their position to the crown (with the exception of the 1559 parliament) and lay lords being royal, and mainly Tudor, creations. The ‘Puritan Choir’ thesis and its correctives may be evaluated. Methods used in an attempt to control Parliament include the election of Privy Councillors to the Commons and their promotion to the Lords, royal nomination of the Speaker, instructions to the Speaker, planning of legislation and requests/justification of subsidy bills before the session began, use of the royal veto, re-drafting of legislation and royal speeches in parliament. Besides this examples of more unusual methods may be cited: the arrest of bishops in 1559, and the attempt to silence individual MPs (e.g. Wentworth, Strickland). The monopolies issue may be used to indicate lack of control. The use of ‘men-of-business’ by Privy Councillors may also be cited. The focus should be on the relative success of the methods used, weighing the evidence for example by assessing the seriousness of lapses, or typicality of incidents cited. Control of a range of issues might

be discussed, for example, religion, marriage and succession, Mary Queen of Scots, subsidies, parliamentary privileges such as freedom of speech, discipline of members.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**6 Assess the view that Catholics posed a serious problem to the government in Elizabethan England. [45]**

**Debate:** the extent to which Catholics posed a threat in Elizabethan England.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate centres round the nature of the Catholic threat, that is, the extent of support for Catholicism and how far this threatened the integrity and authority of the Church of England and hence the government, along with the probability or possibility of Catholic uprisings or plots with or without foreign support. Candidates may discuss the extent of Catholic survivalism and the impact of the missionary priests, but should focus their comments on these aspects of the debate on the question of threat, for example the difference in aims between the missions of the seminary priests and the Jesuits and the extent to which church papism could present a threat to the Church of England and hence the government. The changing nature of the threat during the reign forms an integral part of the debate. Is there a division between the first decade of the reign with Catholic Lords making difficulties with the Church Settlement, but no rebellion, and the late 1560s onwards with the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots, Regnans in excelsis, and the missionary priests, set in the context of rebellion in 1569, plots involving Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Spanish Armada? The threat perceived by contemporaries as evidenced, for example, in MPs urging for stricter anti-Catholic laws may be set against the threat as perceived with hindsight. Candidates may focus on one aspect of the debate more than another, but should engage with the different interpretations of the issue.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

## Oliver Cromwell

- 7 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Cromwell was driven by religious conviction during the search for a settlement with the king from 1646 to 1648. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passages **B** and **D** cite religious conviction as the primary reason for Cromwell being persuaded of the need to execute Charles. Passage **A** argues that Cromwell was driven by circumstances, with no clear programme behind his actions, and was reluctant to act against the king. Passage **C** argues that Cromwell bent with the opinion of the Army in order to retain control but was able to couch his arguments in religious terms, suggesting a degree of cynicism about how genuine Cromwell's religious convictions were. The circumstances certainly changed during the period between the First Civil War and the execution of Charles I, and, as **A** and **B** indicate, the events of the period influenced Cromwell's decisions. However, the question remains whether it was the events themselves, the Army's opinion, or Cromwell's conviction that removing Charles would be what God wanted, that held most sway in persuading Cromwell what to do. All these issues are touched on in the Passages and candidates could expand on these points, referring perhaps to the Putney Debates when Cromwell responded to the Leveller ideas about the form of government and the Windsor Prayer Meeting when the Army seemed to have resolved to remove the king. There is also evidence in Cromwell's letters and speeches to indicate his thinking during the period. Candidates may also refer to Cromwell's part in negotiations with the king on behalf of the Army, offering the Heads of Proposals. Candidates may suggest that Cromwell was driven by personal ambition.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

**8 To what extent was Cromwell influenced by the Army during the period from 1649 to 1653? [45]**

**Debate:** The balance between Army and other interests from 1649 to 1653.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates may cover events including Cromwell's role in the king's trial and the signing of the death warrant, the suppression of the regime's enemies – Levellers, Ireland and Scotland, the events leading to the dissolution of the Rump, the Nominated Assembly and the Instrument of Government. Influences in the Army were more radical in political and religious terms than Cromwell's preferences, creating a tension in which he was delicately balanced between Army and parliament. Cromwell was aware of the need for healing and settling, particularly securing the support of the traditional ruling elite for the regime. This, or the need for Army discipline, may have caused the suppression of the Leveller mutinies of 1649. Cromwell may have agreed to lead the Army in Ireland because of the soldiers' previous reluctance to serve there. He may also have been engaged in protecting the Commonwealth or have been motivated by personal ambition. In Scotland, Cromwell was asked to make war on his erstwhile allies, and may have done so to protect the regime. Cromwell's position in the Army was strengthened by Fairfax's resignation and Ireton's death. This may have influenced him to expel the Rump which had failed to introduce radical religious policies, or he may have been trying to prevent elections on a wide franchise which may have brought the Commonwealth to an end. In the remainder of 1653 Cromwell may have used his position as commander of the Army to his own advantage or have been guided by others in the Army.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**9 How far did Cromwell consistently follow a policy of 'healing and settling' during his Protectorate? [45]**

**Debate:** Cromwell's consistency as Lord Protector.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Cromwell is generally thought to have had two main aims as Lord Protector – to create a godly nation and to ensure 'healing and settling' of a country divided by Civil Wars and the regicide. Unfortunately it was difficult if not impossible to reconcile these two aims as they were essentially mutually exclusive, and this question asks about the extent to which Cromwell seems to have been influenced by one (perhaps rather than the other) of his aims as Lord Protector. The aim of healing and settling can best be exemplified by dealings with the ruling elite in parliament when Cromwell appears to give in to their demands, for example in the case of the Major Generals when the decimation tax was not renewed, when he accepted the Humble Petition and Advice, albeit without the title of king, and when he accepted reduced levels of the assessment which meant cuts in the standing army. However, candidates may conclude that the creation of a godly nation was a greater priority. The Rule of the Major Generals can provide evidence that Cromwell initially prioritised godliness over healing and settling even though he abandoned the project. Equally his insistence on MPs conceding the fundamentals of the Instrument of Government and actions taken to ensure their compliance indicate that Cromwell did not

avoid upsetting the traditional ruling elite. Candidates may take the view that Cromwell became increasingly inclined to work with the traditional ruling elite – the civilian Cromwellians - and that this can be taken to indicate the decreasing importance of the Army and hence a realignment towards healing and settling rather than forcing the pace in creating a godly nation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Peter the Great**

- 10 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Peter's policy of westernization led to great changes in Russia during his reign. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passages **B**, **C** and **D** suggest some changes, in varying degrees. Passage **B** indicates a considerable change, calling it a *cultural revolution* and passage **D** refers to an *ambitious programme*, while Passage **C** indicates there were changes. Passage **A** argues that there was little real change. The detail in Passage **B** about the advancements in printing, the beginnings of museums and the theatre and the role of women are backed up by Passage **C**, notably on the issue of book production. This Passage suggests more than the others that the production of a new mind set in some individuals, even if in only a few, was a useful change. Passage **D** has a different argument, namely that the extent of the opposition to the changes in dress and to the calendar proves that the changes were considerable. On the other hand, the extent of change outlined in Passage **C** is not very great; the number of books published was small, the museum would only be available to those in St Petersburg, only elite women advanced their status and the theatre was short-lived. The strength of the opposition referred to in Passage **D** did slow down and hinder changes. Passage **A** supports this view drawing on the example of the entrenched civil service resistance which limited the reforms. Passages **A** and **C** mention less desirable changes. In **A** it is the greater oppression of the peasants and the rift between nobles in the Table of Ranks and those outside the reforms. Passage **C** agrees that in the provinces nobles were unchanged and that the rift between the elite and the rest of the population was an unwelcome change. Candidates could argue that the Table of Ranks, based on Swedish, Danish and Prussian models had a real impact in Russia, but that, as indicated in some of the Passages, only a very small proportion of the population was affected by western culture. There was some progress in technical and scientific education with the establishment of specialist schools on European models, but, again, these were for the minority, usually the aristocracy, and for military purposes. It could be argued that state control of the church was a westernizing reform which did lead to considerable change.

- 11 Assess the view that the seriousness of the problems Peter faced at the beginning of his reign has been over-stated. [45]**

Debate: the extent to which Peter was challenged by serious problems at his accession.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

Candidates can argue that Russia was in a weak position but they are not expected to have knowledge of events before Peter's accession. There was no access to the Baltic and Sweden and Turkey hemmed Russia in. Russia was seen as being of little importance in a European context. There was no tradition of diplomacy and no experienced ambassadors. Some efforts had been made to modernise but the church had strongly opposed them. The loyalty of the Streltsi was dubious. There was no real navy. The central government was ineffective and much of the administration was in the hands of the nobility. There were disputes about the succession.

On the other hand candidates could suggest that the situation was more promising. Some historians argue that Peter accelerated changes begun earlier, such as using western training methods in his army. Moreover the apparently threatening position of Sweden was dependent on military power being maintained by a country with a small economic base and an equally small population, while both Poland and the Ottoman

Empire were in decline. Peter was an autocrat and his personal drive and forceful character meant new zeal in the government. Candidates could argue that the achievements of the reign show that the problems Peter faced were far from being insuperable.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**12 Assess the success of Peter's foreign policy in making Russia a major European power. [45]**

Debate: How far did Peter's foreign policy make Russia into a power which could compete on the European stage or was it still a backwater when he died.

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The debate is likely to centre on how far Peter's foreign policy made Russia as strong as other European powers and how far it failed to make Russia of any more account. Peter certainly sought to bring his military administration up to European standards with a centralised command based on the College of War, military schools and improved recruitment. He recognised that the 17<sup>th</sup> century military revolution needed to be applied in Russia. He built up the Navy, using Dutch and English examples. The aims of Peter's foreign policy have a European context in his desire to acquire outlets to the Black Sea and to the Baltic and this shows his wish to be a European player and even his Persian policy can be seen as an attempt to challenge European control of Eastern trade and markets. Peter's successes against Sweden and the presence of his armies in Denmark, Sweden and northern Germany led to a European coalition being formed to prevent the Baltic from becoming a Russian lake. The Russian ruling family began to be accepted as a source of respectable mates for the European elite, while Russian ambassadors were accredited to the major European courts.

Alternatively it can be argued that Sweden was weakened as an enemy by the time of Peter, so it was less of an achievement of his foreign policy. His navy was no match for the Europeans and soon disintegrated. The strength of the army depended a good deal on its numerical superiority and unlimited reserves. He was forced to give up some of his gains at Nystad, and lost some as in the case of Azov. The Great Embassy of 1697 was largely a failure in making Russia count in Europe. His efforts at an alliance with France did not succeed. His initiatives in Persia to cut off the silk route to Turkey and hence Europe failed as well.

Candidates could take the view that Russia became a major European power as a result of other factors apart from foreign policies, such as the improved administration and finance.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

## 2589 Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955

### Napoleon I

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the main reason for Napoleon's downfall was the defeat in Russia. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

**Key issues:** The factors which best explain Napoleon's downfall are an issue of debate by historians. Candidates should discuss the role of Russia. Passages C and D offer different glosses on the role of Russia (one referring to the scale of French losses in 1812 and the other to the attitude and determination of the Tsar) and candidates can also draw inference from A and B that 1812 marked a turning point. They may support and develop such views in the light of their own knowledge of the impact of 1812. That said there is much in the passages that would support the claims of alternative factors. Passage A lends weight to the role of the Peninsular War, whilst it can be inferred from B and C that Napoleon played an important role in his own downfall by refusing peace offers, that the crucial decisions included those of Austria and Prussia to fight and of Britain to underpin a united alliance with funds. There is plenty here for candidates to develop in the light of their own knowledge. Other interpretations to which candidates may refer and develop include the role of the Continental System, the determination of Britain, the loss of support in France, the relative decline of the French army (and increasing prowess of enemy forces) and the growth of opposition across the Empire.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

**Band IV** answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

**Band V** answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

**Band VI** answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

**Band VII** answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.



Answer **either**

**2 Assess the view that Napoleon was the ‘heir to the French Revolution’.**

Focus: evaluation of the debate on Napoleon’s rule

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

**Key issues:** The relationship of Napoleon to the Revolution has been a central area of debate ever since Napoleon came to power. Many of his admirers saw him as the consolidator of the Revolution and stress his (limited) liberal credentials, constitutions and benevolent reforms. Marxists have seen him as the man who consolidated the position of the bourgeoisie. His detractors have tended to view him more cynically as unconcerned with the Revolution and motivated solely from a desire for power. In particular the view that Napoleon maintained and consolidated many of the principles of the Revolutionary years has found defenders as has the view that Napoleon should be seen as the product of revolutionary chaos and crisis (in Robespierre’s phrase ‘a messiah in army boots’ who brought stability and order back to France whilst keeping much of the revolution’s ‘gains’). It is not necessary for candidates to discuss all these views – most will probably concentrate on the links with revolutionary ideas and debate its relative merits (evidence of equality, liberty (freedom of conscience), meritocracy, property, popular sovereignty etc.) and setting this against evaluation of the case against (equality before the law tempered by different treatment for women and children, workers and those accused of sedition as well as the revival of ‘nobility’ under the Empire; lack of freedom of speech (censorship, propaganda and police) or association; careers open to talents rarely spread below the bourgeoisie, the sham of popular sovereignty in the constitutions (very indirect systems of election, lack of powers in constitutional bodies, the weaknesses of the plebiscites etc.).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points. In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

or

**3 Assess the view that Napoleon's military success in Europe up to 1809 is best explained by the weaknesses of his enemies.**

Focus: evaluation of the debate on Napoleon's military reputation

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

**Key issues:** This is a key area of debate and candidates should be aware of a range of different interpretations. They should, for example, discuss critics of Napoleon's prowess as a general who do point to the inadequacies of the enemies he faced – the failure to recognise the changing nature of warfare since the French Revolution, the nature of enemy armies and the variable quality of their leadership, tactics and organisation, the inability of allies to work effectively together or collectively in terms of strategy or aims. They may also discuss the views of historians who stress the developments in the French army as a result of reforms since the Seven Years' War and the French Revolution (divisions, mixed order, developments in artillery, living off the land, mass conscription, meritocratic officer corps etc.). Such interpretations should be balanced against the view that Napoleon was a great general – in harnessing French forces, in developing offensive strategy, in organising armies into corps, in motivating men, and so forth. To illustrate their discussion candidates may refer to different campaigns and battles.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**Band I** answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

**Band II** answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

**Band III** answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

**Band VI** answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

**Band VII** answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80**

- 4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Gladstone's policies in his Ministry of 1868-74 were not popular. [45]**

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **C** is the most supportive of the idea that Gladstone's policies were popular, referring to the *mass of the Irish people* seeing the grievances which he addressed as *justified*, leading to better relations between the Liberals and Irish Catholics. Passage **B** mentions the abolition of the University Tests as a worthwhile and by implication, popular reform and Passage **D** refers to the retrenchment in defence costs in 1869 and 1870 as well as to the increase in government receipts from taxation which pleased tax payers. Passage **D** suggests Gladstone even believed he could abolish income tax, which would certainly be popular with those who paid it as long as indirect taxation was not increased. On the other hand Passage **A** gives three examples of government policies, the Alabama arbitration, the Licensing act and the tax on matches, which were unpopular, although their aims were praiseworthy. Passage **B** shows how, even within his own party, Gladstone's measures were seen as not succeeding in delivering essential Liberal aims or were criticised as undermining property rights. This theme is taken up by Passage **D** which indicates how hard it was to balance the needs of different interest groups and how unforeseen outcomes could have a disruptive impact. Administrative problems also affected the popularity of the government.

Candidates could challenge these interpretations by arguing that the Irish Land Act was generally seen as too little too late and the *simple grievance of university education* brought down the government, thus limiting their popularity. Retrenchment was seen by some as an inglorious and humiliating policy for its impact on foreign affairs. The radicals and nonconformists were powerful within the Liberal party, but the National Education League and the Temperance movement were not necessarily universally popular. Equally they could argue that the measures passed in 1870 to 1872 were often useful reforms and some, like the Education Act and the Secret Ballot Act had far-reaching results and enjoyed some popularity. The moral aspects of foreign policy were popular with the thinking classes. There was some critical comment on the Trade Union legislation, which did not meet all the demands of the movement. Candidates might feel that the early years of the administration led to more popular measures than the later and might refer to a *range of exhausted volcanoes*.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have **a ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have **a ceiling of Band III**

- 5 Assess the view that Disraeli's rise to power in 1868 resulted mainly from the passing of the Second Reform Act in 1867. [45]**

Debate: the extent to which Disraeli came to power because of his manipulation of events over the Reform Act or how far other factors contributed.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The debate is centred on whether the Second Reform Act was crucial in propelling Disraeli to power or whether he had laid the foundations for his rise much earlier.

The first view can be supported by reference to the failure of the Conservatives to pass reform in 1859 and the need to be successful in 1867. Disraeli's own role in changing the terms of the bill, accepting amendments from anyone but Gladstone, notably Hodgkinson,

and his adept defence of his actions in the House of Commons can be seen as showing how fit he was to lead the party.

The alternative factors include the lack of other candidates, which can be defined as luck, the work done by Disraeli in both government and opposition, his persistence and perseverance, his defence of the Church of England's role as the Established church and his skills as an orator. But none of these had brought him power and he remained distrusted by many Tories as a devious adventurer of foreign race and habits. Thus the success and high profile he won in passing the Reform Act and speaking for it around the country was probably the decisive factor. He was of a similar age to Derby and not in particularly good health when he took over in 1868, so without a major success behind him he could well have been passed over again. The alternative view is that there was no alternative.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**6 To what extent was the defeat of the Conservatives in the 1880 election the result of Gladstone's Midlothian Campaign? [45]**

Debate: Was the Liberal victory more as a result of their own efforts or was it the outcome of Conservative failings ?

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

One view is that Gladstone's trenchant denunciation of Disraeli's policies in his speeches in 1879 had a vital impact. Gladstone claimed a system which he called Beaconsfieldism led to misrule and to immoral policies in Afghanistan and South Africa resulting in military atrocities against innocent tribesmen. It also resulted in heavy expenditure and a budget deficit, which, in turn, meant taxes had to increase and thus burden the economy and cause a depression in trade. There was some truth in Gladstone's accusations, although Disraeli argued that *men on the spot* were responsible for the military failings.

The other explanation is that the Conservatives, like the Liberals before them, had run out of steam. Disraeli in the House of Lords was less effective and his age and health did not help. The jingoism and triumphs at the Congress of Berlin had been overshadowed by the disasters of 1879. The social reforms passed by the Conservatives had a limited immediate effect. The timing of the election was misguided, led by some deceptive by-election results and Disraeli did not run an active campaign. Some have alleged that the party organisation was in some disrepair. Disraeli himself blamed *bad times*, that is the depression and certainly the farmers, usually staunch Tories, felt little had been done to alleviate the agricultural downturn.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-71**

- 7 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that by the time of the Luxembourg crisis of 1867 Bismarck was considering war with France. [45]**

Focus: To evaluate Bismarck's goals and the methods he used to achieve them

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates are likely to show an awareness of the debate surrounding Bismarck's claim to have a "master-plan" to fight and defeat France and unite Germany in this period. Likely alternatives to this view might include Taylor's argument that Bismarck was an opportunist merely reacting to events or Pflanze's claim that Bismarck had not just one plan but a number of alternatives ("two-irons"). Candidates may not discuss all the alternative theories in their answers but they must show that there is considerable debate and much contradictory evidence surrounding Bismarck's actions. Although the main focus of their answers should be on the Luxembourg Crisis itself candidates may want to broaden the context of the debate. They may well discuss key points such as the nature and terms of the Treaty of Prague, the Hohenzollern Candidature and the Ems Telegram. As such fuller answers to the question will require a consideration of Bismarck's intentions as early as 1866. Discussions of the events of 1867 alone are unlikely to produce a full analysis of the question.

In terms of the debate within the passages, they are split between those which claim that Bismarck was not acting with hostility towards France whilst others claim that he was deliberately provoking her – even wittingly to the point of war. **Passage A** suggests that the offer of Luxembourg was a conciliatory one and the hostile reaction of his fellow Germans was a real surprise to Bismarck. **Passage B** says that Bismarck was knowingly provoking the French (despite his words at the time) but not necessarily to the point of war. By contrast **Passage C** says that although Bismarck felt that a war with France was inevitable at some stage in the future, he had too many internal concerns to provoke one with Napoleon at this time and took steps to avoid it when it threatened. **Passage D** suggests that there was nothing conciliatory about Bismarck's manipulation of the crisis and he was prepared to go to the point of war if need be.

- 8 'Prussia's strengths were merely the weaknesses of her neighbours' To what extent do you agree with this view of Prussia in the period from 1858 to 1871? [45]**

Debate: Evaluation of the extent to which Prussian dominance in Germany was a result of internal strengths or the weakness of other German and European states.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates are required to discuss and evaluate the various factors which made Prussia predominant in this period. In support of the title, candidates may consider the decline of Austria after the revolutions of 1848/9 and her political isolation after the Crimean War of 1854-6. They may also mention the relative weakness of Napoleon III's regime and the apparent "disinterest" of Great Britain towards European events at this time. Candidates may also point out the economic dependence of the other German states (including the south German states) on Prussia – mainly through the Zollverein. Finally they may also demonstrate the relative military weakness of the other German states by mentioning their poor performance in the war of 1866. This view would suggest that Prussia's strengths

were more a result of favourable external circumstances i.e. that her rise happened at a time when little opposition could be mustered to prevent it.

Against the title, candidates could explore various internal factors leading to the rise of Prussia. These might include: the strength of her army; the strength of her economy; the developments of key industries such as coal, iron and railways; Bismarck's diplomacy; the fact that after 1866 National Liberals reconciled themselves to Bismarck; the role of the Prussian monarchy; the Nationalverein of 1859 and the writings of German philosophers and intellectuals - both supporting the leadership of Prussia. Such a list may suggest that Prussian strength and leadership within Germany was not reliant on external factors.

Good answers will show that there are relevant points to be made on both sides of the argument – the best answers may show an interdependence between the two sets e.g. Bismarck's diplomacy was primarily responsible for keeping the regime in France weak and powerless.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**9 'A triumph of Prussian conservatism over German liberalism.' Assess this view of the German Empire in 1871. [45]**

Debate: To evaluate how far the new Germany was based on the principles of liberalism and/or conservatism

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates should show an awareness of the underlying principles that defined liberalism and conservatism within this period and the debate surrounding their respective balance in the make-up of the new German State of 1871. Much of the debate is likely to be based around the Constitutions of 1867 and 1871 and to what extent they can be regarded as either a victory or a defeat for German Liberals.

Although a number of liberal features can be identified within the Constitutions (universal male suffrage, an elected Reichstag, parliamentary control of the budget and federal powers for the states), these are considered by some historians as of lesser importance than the more authoritarian principles emphasised by Prussian control. Bismarck's gestures to the Liberals may be seen as no more than cynical concessions to silence their criticisms. In Liebknecht's verdict they were just a *"fig leaf covering the nakedness of Absolutism"*. Candidates could also refer to the Indemnity bill after the defeat of Austria as being a sign that the Liberal opposition to Bismarck had finally accepted his version of German unification ("blood and iron"). Likewise, candidates could point out that unification was primarily achieved by the Prussian army and Prussian diplomacy and was led by the Prussian Chancellor and King whilst German Liberals watched on.

On the other hand, some historians argue that the liberal elements of the new Constitutions were real concessions (indeed even victories) and were far more than the Liberals could have hoped to have gained through their own efforts. Finally, rather than polarising the issue, some candidates might choose to present an evaluation which shows the Constitutions to be a synthesis of both liberal and conservative ideas presenting Bismarck as the "white revolutionary", i.e. as a moderniser yet at the same time a preserver. Some candidates may wish to discuss Liberalism as an economic principle as well as a political one and as such reference to the Zollverein and free trade agreements may fall within the scope of the question if argued relevantly.

**Roosevelt's America 1920-41**

- 10 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that there was a major change in US foreign policy with the start of FDR's presidency. [45]**

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

Passage A states, in final paragraph that FDR did little to change US foreign policy. Main changes were in relations to Latin America and relations with the USSR.

Passage C supports views in Source A concerning relations with Latin America and the USSR. However, it implies that FDR is an internationalist but was unwilling to go against what was perceived as an isolationist viewpoint among the American public.

Passage B suggests that FDR merely carried on policies begun by President Hoover in relation to Latin America. In essence he merely completed what his predecessor had begun.

Passage D suggest that FDR had a different outlook on foreign policy. However, he was reluctant to intervene initially. However, he was willing to intervene where it was required to defend US interests such as Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. He was also willing to intervene to aid the Allies when war came in 1939.

Also in implies FDR wanted to defend democracy and human rights.

Therefore, Passage D puts a mixed case for a change in 1933 but suggests by 1939 change had occurred.

Using outside knowledge candidates may state that FDR had to win over Congress and US public opinion if he was to adopt a more internationalist approach. This occurred only in the late 1930s.

- 11 Assess the view that the Wall Street Crash was not the main cause of the Depression. [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of debate on the causes of the Depression

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess the debate on the causes of the depression. They may state that the Stock Market Crash led directly to a banking collapse, which, in turn created the Depression. They may also state that share speculation prior to the Crash created an atmosphere in US where the concept of ever increasing prosperity was the norm. When the Stock Market Crash occurred it created a psychological effect which created the conditions for the Depression.

To counter this view, candidates may state that other causes were more important. The weakness of the US banking system; overproduction and under-consumption; the weakness of the international trading system following the First World War, exacerbated by US tariff policy; the impact of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff of 1931 on an already faltering world economy could all be cited as major weaknesses of US economy.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**12 Assess the view that the New Deal did little to aid US industrial recovery from 1933 to 1937 [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of debate on the impact of the New Deal.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates have the opportunities to assess the effectiveness of the New Deal in relation to industry. In doing so they may mention direct action by the FDR administration to aid industry or they may mention indirect actions which created demand and helped reduce unemployment. They may mention the National Industrial Recovery Act; 1933 and government schemes to aid the unemployed such as the Public Works Administration 1933; the Civil Works Administration 1933-4; the Civilian Conservation Corps; the Works Progress Administration (1935-1942); They may also mention regional aid to industry such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, 1933. Finally they may mention legislation assoc, with trade unions such as the Wagner Act, 1935.

In terms of impact candidates might state that the New Deal prevented a complete economic collapse but by 1937 US still in economic depression. Also, National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) which created the National Recovery Administration(NRA) was poorly managed and executed. It created hundreds of codes of behaviour for different industries which did not aid industrial recovery. Also candidates may state that New Deal agencies had overlapping areas of responsibility, were not properly co-ordinated and were very costly in terms of the results achieved.

Candidates may mention agriculture. However, they should be rewarded with marks only if this is linked directly to the issue of industrial recovery.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.



**Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24**

- 13 Using these four passages and your own knowledge assess the view that the October 1917 Revolution was more of a Bolshevik coup than a popular uprising. [45]**

Passages B and D both imply that the Bolshevik takeover was a carefully planned and well executed coup. Passage D refers to Lenin's 'unstoppable drive to seize power' whilst passage B talks of Lenin's desire to 'stage an exclusively Bolshevik coup'. Darby in passage D does concede that as well as having elements of a coup the October Revolution was also 'a response to popular demand'. This can be supported by passage A where Pipes argues that 'the Bolsheviks did not so much seize power over Russia as stake a claim to it'. In passage C McCauley, whilst arguing that Lenin and Trotsky planned the events of October 1917, also states that 'there was no way they could guarantee success' and that they needed the support of the Russian people thus indicating the presence of at least some elements of a popular uprising. In addition both passages A and C hint at elements of deception in the Bolshevik takeover with a clear discrepancy between what the Bolsheviks appeared to promise and what they actually delivered.

In terms of own knowledge candidates could emphasis the leadership of Lenin and the clear and attractive programme put forward by the Bolsheviks which proved to be increasingly attractive to workers and peasants who were becoming disillusioned with the failings of the Provisional Government and the inadequacies of other opposition parties. Many turned to the Bolsheviks not because they had been converted to communism but because the Bolsheviks seemed to offer the only realistic hope for the future. Thus, it can be argued that October 1917 saw elements of both a Bolshevik coup and a popular uprising.

- 14 Assess the view that the use of terror was the main reason for the Bolshevik success in defeating their enemies between October 1917 and 1920. [45]**

Focus: explanation of Bolshevik success in the Civil War.

Candidates should be able to comment on both internal and external enemies. In terms of internal enemies reference could be made to Lenin's ruthlessness in dealing with those he saw as a threat with the forced dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918 described by one historian as perhaps more important than the October 1917 coup itself. The use of 'Red Terror' to intimidate and remove opponents and the introduction of War Communism as a means of prosecuting the war could also be included as could the divisions amongst Lenin's opponents in both the Mensheviks and the SRs. External enemies were dealt with using the Red Army, organised and controlled by Trotsky; control of the railway system to move men and supplies; effective Bolshevik propaganda which portrayed the White armies as anti-Russian and the lack of effective leadership and common purpose amongst the White armies with outside intervention from the western allies becoming less and less effective. The debate could centre on the extent to which the Bolsheviks won the Civil War with the active support of the majority of the Russian people or whether, as some argue about October 1917, the Bolsheviks imposed their authority through force.

- 15 Assess the view that it was only the introduction of the New Economic Policy which kept the Bolshevik Party in power between 1921 and 1924. [45]**

Focus: reasons for the survival of the Bolshevik Party in power up to the death of Lenin.

From the communist point of view the introduction of the NEP was a backward step and to some extent an admission of failure. From a purely pragmatic point of view Lenin realised that it was a necessary step in order to avoid the danger of a complete collapse of Bolshevik authority. Candidates should be able to discuss how and why the NEP improved the situation in the countryside (abandonment of grain requisitioning; fixed taxes on the peasantry which allowed them to sell surplus produce on the open market and improvements in the harvests of 1922 and 1923). This, combined with the privatisation of small scale industry helped to turn around the fortunes of the Bolshevik Party. However, although some economic concessions were granted heavy industry remained firmly under state control and political repression was tightened. The decree on Party unity effectively gagged any potential opposition (thousands of 'opponents' including Mensheviks and SRs were arrested) and all political parties other than the Bolshevik Party were abolished. Thus, although the NEP rescued the economy the survival of the Bolsheviks in power owed as much to repression as reform. The debate is likely to centre around the extent to which it can be argued that Lenin was always in control of events and that the NEP was merely a temporary tactical manoeuvre or whether in fact Lenin had abandoned principle in favour of a more practical approach to politics.

**Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-1939**

- 16 Using these four passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Chamberlain was justified in pursuing the policy of appeasement at the Munich conference in 1938. [45]**

What matters is not the conclusion reached, but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate is about whether Chamberlain lost a valuable opportunity to confront Hitler when circumstances were favourable to Britain and was guilty of a shameful betrayal, or whether Chamberlain pursued a realistic policy given the limitations of Britain's defences, allies and public opinion.

The most virulent attack comes in **B** which dismisses the views of apologists entirely. **A** and **C** offer some balance – whether ironically or not, Taylor argues that the motives of Chamberlain had some justification, but the results were to encourage Hitler and to make Britain look morally weak. **C** argues that Chamberlain thwarted Hitler to some extent but at the cost of British prestige. **D** takes the line that Britain could not have made effective war in 1938 and had no real reason to anyway.

**A and C** agree that the settlement was not a triumph for Hitler – after all the rhetoric he had to accept a position close to Godesberg and sign an intention of peace. Far from being motivated by selfish ends, Chamberlain was genuinely seeking an enlightened revision to an unfair Treaty. This is open to agreement by pointing out the dislike of Versailles or challenge by pointing out the fears of war and the constraints on Britain in terms of her defences and economic problems. The view that Munich only encouraged Hitler is likely to be agreed with and could be supported by knowledge of subsequent developments. **C** brings in the argument that Munich bought time to rearm which some might agree with and some might contest by pointing out the loss of Czech resources and the faster pace of German preparations 1938-9. The prestige in the world might be challenged by reference to the approval of the Dominions and the USA for attempts to keep peace, Tokyo might not be typical.

**D** is highly contentious – candidates might agree that public opinion was relieved or challenge this; **D** also refers to the defence argument but the thrust is that Chamberlain was right because of Britain's lack of preparedness and because was 'unnecessary and pointless' – a view that Clark applied to the actual war itself, quite controversially. Chamberlain's private view might be thought justified or incredibly short-sighted – if Munich encouraged Germany to seek predominance in Europe, Britain was clearly affected and the issue was more than the Sudetenland.

- 17 Assess the view that British policy towards Germany between 1918 and 1936 was dominated by economic considerations. [45]**

Focus: evaluation of a major cause of trend in foreign policy

What matters is not the conclusion reached, but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The discussion here is whether concern for British trade and to establish European and world finances on a sound footing led to a conciliatory attitude towards Germany which persisted after Hitler's accession and dominated defence policy, or whether the motives had more to do with an idealistic concern for a new peace in Europe, a revulsion against Versailles and aggressive French policies. The alternative would be a retreat to a sort of Empire-based isolationism in a supposed C19 tradition.

Candidates might consider the desire to solve the reparations payment issue – Dawes, Young, the Lausanne Conference as being led by the concern for greater financial stability. Economic problems at home might be seen as leading defence cuts which in turn led to a desire for Anglo-German rapprochement. There is also the issue of trade – either with Germany or with the Empire, control of which would be imperiled by a war in Europe. Against this is a genuine desire for collective security, support for the League and desire for a agreement between France and Germany. The depression after 1929 might strengthen the argument for better relations. By 1936 other factors such as diplomatic isolation and weaknesses in defence might be stronger, so better answers might see a change.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

**18 To what extent did Britain's guarantee to Poland in March 1939 mark the end of appeasement? [45]**

Focus : evaluation of one major event as turning point in British policy

What matters is not the conclusion reached, but the quality and breadth of the discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The discussion here is about when appeasement ended – the guarantee can be seen as the first formal commitment and a distinct change in policy in its clear warning to Germany. Alternatively, the reaction to German racial violence in November by the public, or the disapproval of the occupation of Prague could be seen as marking the real end of appeasement being viable. Some may argue that none of these marks the end of appeasement which continued in Chamberlain's mind to be a possibility right up to the war or even beyond it.

Thus the guarantee could be seen as weak by only guaranteeing independence not Poland's existing borders; the weak attempts to ally with Russia could be seen as evidence that appeasement was not dead, as could the desire for discussion about Danzig and the delay in declaring war, as well as Chamberlain's obvious reluctance to take action. A wide variety of approaches is possible, but the Guarantee must be the focus of the discussion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

## Stalin and the development of the Cold War in Europe 1941-55

- 19 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the collapse of the Grand Alliance at the end of the Second World War was bound to happen. [45]

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **B** supports the view that the collapse of the Grand Alliance was bound to happen at the end of the Second World War. **Williamson** argues that the defeat of Hitler in 1945 brought the two superpowers (the USA and the Soviet Union) 'face to face' and likens the Cold War to placing a 'scorpion and a tarantula together in a bottle'. He states that Hitler saw conflict between them as 'inevitable'. He refers to the mistrust between the Soviets and the West since 1917 and candidates may support this by reference to their knowledge of events before 1939 (such as intervention by the West in the Russian Civil War). This should be credited but must not be expected. The sense that the breakdown of the alliance was inevitable is also largely supported by Passage **A**. Lynch describes the Grand Alliance as a 'marriage of convenience'. Lynch sees no purpose in the alliance beyond its wartime goals. 'What bound them together was their desire to defeat their common enemy. They had little else in common'. **Lynch** highlights their 'ideological differences' and 'fears' - 'in the Soviet Union that Britain and the USA would attempt to enlist Germany in a war against Soviet communism. On the western side, there was anxiety that the Soviet advance into Eastern Europe heralded the start of a new period of communist expansion.' The fact that the Grand Alliance was an alliance of convenience is also supported by **D**. In **D**, **Sewell** states 'It was an alliance of convenience, of desperation, not trust'. He also highlights ideological issues. However **Sewell** does not believe that this meant that the alliance was doomed to collapse. He states that 'Deals were possible, especially with the British as is shown by the agreement on percentages of influence in the Balkans in November 1944'. Sewell adds that 'The British and the Americans remained confident that they could do deals with Stalin'. He also points out that there were 'antagonisms' between the USA and Britain, especially over imperialism. Candidates may support this from own knowledge about Roosevelt's dislike of the British Empire. The differences between Roosevelt and Churchill are also referred to in **C**. **Edwards** states that 'Roosevelt thought that the Soviet Union might be a more important ally to the USA than Britain'. In **C** he does suggest that there were important differences between the post-war aims of Roosevelt and Stalin. 'Roosevelt's most cherished objective was the creation of the United Nations. Stalin's overriding concern was the security of the Soviet Union'. **Edwards** refers to the suffering of the Soviet Union during the war, and Stalin's wish to gain political and economic control over Eastern Europe. Candidates may choose to support these points from their own knowledge. However, **Edwards** does not see the collapse of the Grand Alliance as bound to happen. **Edwards** suggests that neither Roosevelt nor Stalin wanted the alliance to breakdown. 'Roosevelt and Stalin shared some post-war objectives. Stalin genuinely wanted to remain on good terms with the USA'. Candidates may choose to challenge the concept of historical inevitability and should be rewarded for doing so persuasively.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

**20 Assess the view that the USA's policies and actions in the period from 1945 to 1949 were motivated mainly by an American desire to protect Europe from communism.**

Debate: an evaluation of the interpretations of the motives behind USA's foreign policy in the period from 1945 to 1948 balancing the desire to protect Europe from communism against other factors.

What matters here is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The debate is centred on whether the USA developed the policy of containment to try to protect Europe from communism, or whether the USA had more selfish motives. Candidates may argue that the threat posed by Stalin's expansionism was so great that the USA had to develop containment in order to protect Europe. Candidates may choose to argue that US policy was aimed at preventing communism from spreading to certain parts of Europe (predominantly Western Europe) and that, despite the rhetoric, little was done to try to protect other parts (predominantly Eastern Europe). Candidates may also argue that the USA misunderstood the largely defensive nature of Stalin's actions and in turn that US policy was provocative and aimed at maintaining capitalism and acquiring a sphere of influence in Europe. Candidates may display an understanding of the different approaches of Roosevelt and Truman, and the significance of both Roosevelt's death and Truman's inexperience. The influence of 'hardliners', such as Kennan may be understood. The impact of Kennan's telegram of February 1946 and Mr. X article of July 1947 on the development of policy and Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' speech on US policy may be demonstrated. Candidates may have a clear understanding of both the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan and how they have been interpreted. Candidates may deal with a range of significant events, from Stalin's failure to implement agreements reached at Yalta, to the communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the Berlin Blockade of 1948 with confidence.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**21 Assess the view that Stalin's policies in Eastern Europe were more defensive than aggressive in the period from 1944 to 1948. [45]**

Debate: Did Stalin's policies in Eastern Europe reflect the need to protect the Soviet Union from any further attack or were they aimed at the ruthless expansion of his empire?

What matters here is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The debate is centred on whether Stalin was expansionist or defensive in relation to his actions in Eastern Europe from 1944 to 1948. An understanding of how and why Stalin's policies in Eastern Europe, can **both** be viewed as a reasonable response to the need for future Soviet security, **and** as a cold and brutal expansion of the Soviet Union's evil empire, should be displayed. Candidates may argue in favour of the interpretation in the title, and are likely to use revisionist and / or post-revisionist interpretations when doing so. Candidates may demonstrate a good knowledge of the extent of Soviet suffering during the Second World War and of Stalin's frustration at the delays in the launching of the Second Front in Western Europe. Candidates may also make the point that the Red Army freed much of Eastern Europe from the Nazis. They may support these arguments by

reference to Stalin's need to ensure the future security of the Soviet Union, his fear of his former allies and of a possible German revival. Candidates may use events such as the Warsaw Rising, the Czech coup and the Berlin blockade to argue against the revisionist interpretation in the title. Candidates are likely to discuss Stalin's attitudes and actions towards the countries of Eastern Europe and Germany. Candidates may also display knowledge of undemocratic developments in the satellite states of Eastern Europe. They should be able to exemplify their answers by reference to events in more than one country.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

## 2590 Themes in History 1066 – 1796

### England 1485-1603

- 7 To what extent were rebels in Tudor England trying to restore rather than overthrow the political order?**

Focus: Evaluation of the motives of rebels in Tudor England

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates can be expected to assess the political motives behind a good range of rebellions. Some rebels were set on solely overthrowing the government and implicitly the 'political order'. For instance, Simnel and Warbeck who aspired to remove Henry VII, Northumberland and Wyatt who wanted to displace Mary, and arguably the Northern earls who planned to remove Elizabeth. In other cases, the rebels wanted to restore the political order by replacing royal ministers and their unacceptable policies. Rebellions against Wolsey (1525), Cromwell, Cranmer, Rich (1536), Somerset (1549), Northumberland (1553), William Cecil (1569) and Robert Cecil (1601) fall into this category. Some candidates may point out that rebels' motives were not clear-cut and are therefore hard to discern. For example, the Pilgrims wished to restore Mary to the succession as well as restore the Roman Catholic faith but had no desire to overthrow Henry, and the Northern Earls also claimed that they wanted to restore the Catholic faith but to do this they first had to remove Elizabeth, which they always denied. Some candidates may also discuss the nature of the political order, the role of the magistrate in its maintenance and popular attitudes towards obedience and authority.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 8 'Economic and social rebellions were the most dangerous threat to Tudor governments.' How far do you agree with this statement?**

Focus: Comparative evaluation of types of rebellions that posed the greatest threat to Tudor governments

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Expect candidates to analyse rebellions that were caused by high and unjust taxation (Yorkshire, Cornish, Amicable, Pilgrimage), by poor landlord-tenant relations (Pilgrimage, Western, Ket), and by illegal enclosure (Pilgrimage, Ket, Oxfordshire) and to assess how far they presented a dangerous threat to the government. This may be done by evaluating a rebellion's size, location, duration, support, leadership, and objectives, as well as the condition of the government and the effectiveness of its responses. However candidates approach this statement, their argument should seek to compare rebellions which were inspired by economic and social grievances with rebellions that were largely caused by religious or political factors to determine the relative danger each category presented. Some candidates may argue that although most rebellions had an undercurrent of economic or social discontent, politically and religiously motivated rebellions were more dangerous. Simnel, Warbeck, the Pilgrimage, Western, Wyatt, Northern Earls and Essex may be cited as examples.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.



**9 How effectively did Tudor governments deal with the problem of rebellion?**

Focus: Evaluation of the success with which governments dealt with rebellions

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Given that Tudor governments had no standing army or police force, it may be contended that they did surprisingly well to suppress any serious disorder. No rebellion succeeded in overthrowing the monarch – Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth effectively quashed politically motivated rebellions. Only the Amicable Grant and Mary's removal of Northumberland were out and out successes for the perpetrators. Though some governments made concessions eg Henry to the Pilgrims, promises were rarely kept. Instead ringleaders were executed, harsh punishments were meted out to rebels as a deterrent, and noble-led armies crushed any residual opposition. Better candidates may suggest that the action taken by sheriffs, JPs, clergy and local officers to quell minor disturbances before they got out of hand, as well as measures taken by the central government in peacetime and times of unrest, proved very effective. The absence of rebellions for much of Elizabeth's reign may be used to illustrate this argument.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**10 Assess the importance of economic factors in influencing Tudor foreign policy**

Focus: Assessment of economic factors in the wider context of affecting Tudor foreign policy

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to assess a range of economic factors and compare them with other influences that affected foreign policy making. Essays are likely to stress the importance of finance which restricted the conduct of all administrations, though less so in the 1540s and 1580s. Limited finances resulted in defensive and prudent foreign policies and the increasing importance of continental allies. Better answers should examine trade issues, particularly in the reigns of Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth, and some candidates may reflect on England's industrial and commercial interests that were adversely affected by Henry VIII and Edward. To go beyond **Band III**, candidates must compare economic with other factors to gauge its relative importance. Areas for assessment may include religious, political, personal and dynastic factors. Some of these influences were at times more important than economic and of course some candidates may argue that economic factors were never predominant. The best essays may assess economic factors thematically or chronologically before reaching an argued conclusion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**11 How do you explain the changes in Anglo-Scottish relations during the period from 1485 to 1603?**

Focus: Explanation for the changing relations between England and Scotland.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

In 1485, and for much of the early period, Scotland was England's 'postern gate' that French troops might exploit and they were present in Scotland until 1560. English armies invaded Scotland in 1513, 1542, 1547 and 1560, and threatened invasion in 1497. Much of this enmity was traditional but under Henry VIII and Somerset, war was a result of personal

ambition. Conversely, Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth adopted a more diplomatic approach. Candidates may suggest the expulsion of the French court and troops in 1560 brought major changes since a Protestant and pro-English faction was installed in Edinburgh. Coming at the same time as Anglo-Spanish relations started to decline, Elizabeth cultivated friendly relations with the French regent, Catherine de Medici. Similarly the arrival in England of Mary Queen of Scots in 1568 brought a change in relations. Cecil tried to use Moray and Morton to secure a pro-English faction at the Scottish court, which worked until 1581. Relations with James VI were uneasy but never poor. He toyed with conversion to Catholicism and welcomed his French cousin Esmé Stuart to his court between 1579-81. Elizabeth was reluctant to acknowledge James as her heir; he was reluctant to abandon his mother. Matters were only resolved in 1586-7 when he accepted a pension and Mary was executed. Candidates should assess various reasons for change, including Henry VII's Treaty of Ayton, Henry VIII's and Somerset's determination to wage war, the Scottish Reformation, the arrival of Mary Stuart in England, and the consequences of the French Wars of Religion and the Dutch Revolt. Expect better candidates to cover most of these developments thematically.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**12 How far was Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon the main turning-point in Anglo-Spanish relations in the period from 1485 to 1603?**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of the divorce on Anglo-Spanish relations

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A turning-point may be taken to mean a significant change and candidates should be expected to assess the consequences of the divorce for Anglo-Spanish relations, as well as suggest alternative turning-points, such as Spain's acquisition of the Netherlands and policies towards it that were adopted by Philip II after 1556; or Drake's plundering of Spanish colonies and ships after 1570; or improvements in England's relations with Scotland and France after 1560, which placed less emphasis on England retaining her friendship with Spain. The divorce harmed dynastic relations until the accession of Mary but her marriage to Philip proved that amity could be restored albeit superficially. However the divorce also sparked Henry VIII's break from Rome and England's subsequent establishment of a Protestant church which led to hostility under Philip II. Some candidates may play down the significance of the divorce in favour of other turning-points, such as the Scottish rebellion, the French wars of religion, the Dutch Revolt and Drake's piratical activities, with perhaps the personalities of Elizabeth and Philip as pivotal. This approach is fine provided any elements of continuity and change are assessed from 1485 and beyond 1533.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**England 1558-1689****13 How far did opposition to the English monarchy change during the period from 1558 to 1689?**

Focus: Evaluation of changes in opposition groups

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The principal opposition to the English monarchs concerned political, financial and religious issues, and changed significantly in the course of the period. Under Elizabeth and James, the Church of England largely supported the crown but the rise of Arminianism (endorsed by James I and Charles I) and latent Catholicism (overtly espoused by Charles I and James II) and Charles II's support for non-conformity, saw Anglicans become opponents of the later Stuarts. Puritans and Roman Catholics opposed the crown at varying times and degrees, and candidates should identify the reasons for their opposition. Many MPs, gentry, merchants and lawyers also came to oppose the crown – usually in the Commons, law courts and in county administration – and whenever their livelihood, property or liberty were at risk. Opposition was rarely formalised or united but it could challenge government policies and ministers and, in 1642 and 1688 under exceptional circumstances, the monarch himself. Candidates should evaluate the manner in which opposition presented itself and explain how and why it changed over time. Some may focus on issues, some on groups and some on methods of opposition but it will not be necessary to evaluate all three equally to reach the highest bands.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**14 To what extent did English monarchs have unlimited power during the period from 1558 to 1688?**

Focus: Discussion of the development of monarchs' authority over time

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may find a working definition of 'unlimited power' helpful at the start. In 1558 there were few practical and even fewer theoretical limits to the monarch's authority and Elizabeth often called herself 'absolute'. Her constitutional powers were undefined and loosely applied, she was the Supreme Governor of the Church, ruled the state with considerable political strength and only relied on parliament for additional finances. Although theoretically 'absolute', she nevertheless governed with the consent of her subjects. James I spoke about the Divine Right of Kings, often behaved autocratically but understood that he was constitutionally restricted and so ruled according to the law. Charles I resisted attempts by the Church and parliament to limit his power and between 1629 and 1640, ruled arbitrarily perhaps even 'tyrannically'. Charles II's constitutional and political powers at the Restoration were restricted in financial, religious and political terms yet in the course of his reign he used his prerogative to evade many of these limitations, appointing his own ministers, calling, proroguing and dissolving parliament, and pursuing secretive policies. Some candidates may argue that James II more than any other monarch came close to exercising absolutism. He expanded the armed forces even in peacetime, used his prerogative to dispense with the law and prosecuted any who challenged him. He revised town charters, purged JPs and lords lieutenants, and compromised judicial independence. Parliament met once and after November 1685 was not convened again but his revenue was in excess of £1.2 million and Hales' case (1686) gave the crown the power to legislate without parliament.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**15 To what extent can financial factors explain developments in the role of parliament in the years from 1558 to 1689?**

Focus: Assessment of financial factors as a cause of parliament's development

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Limited royal revenue, unpopular taxation, use of the royal prerogative, rising expenditure due to court costs, war, inflation and an expanding administration, were frequent financial issues and a constant constraint upon the crown between 1558 and 1689. This became most evident in the 17<sup>th</sup> century due to the imprudent management of royal finances by the Stuarts, but parliament, who came to control the royal purse strings, also grew in self-confidence from James I's reign. Redress before supply was a key factor in parliament using financial restraints to limit the monarchy's political power. Some candidates might focus on particular financial problems (eg parliament's growing demand for 'redress before supply', or the royal prerogative over monopolies, tonnage and poundage, forest fines, ship money). Others might look at particular periods of financial difficulty (eg 1630s, 1660s) or contrast the problems confronting Elizabeth with those of more profligate monarchs such as James I and Charles II. Candidates should also consider other contributing factors, such as the Commons' desire to exercise more constitutional power, the government's religious, political and foreign policies that drove parliament into opposition in the 1640s and 1680s. Part of the Commons' assertiveness can be attributed to the rise of puritanism, which developed further in the 1630s and 1640s as parliament learned the art of opposition and then government. Some candidates may explain the change in terms of personalities, problems and policies, and if this thematic approach is sustained, they could score well.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**16 How effectively did English governments handle the problems presented by English Roman Catholics?**

Focus: Evaluation of the governments' management of Roman Catholic issues

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main problems presented by Roman Catholics were: (1) threats to the monarch by Catholic assassins – real in the case of Elizabeth and James I, alleged in the case of Charles II; (2) fear of foreign invasion aided by Catholic enemies – real in Elizabeth's reign and well handled, unlikely in James I's and Charles I's reigns but mishandled, and untrue in the case of Charles II and skilfully allayed; (3) concern that the English Church might return to Roman Catholicism – Elizabeth secured a Protestant succession but the Stuarts advocated tolerance and appointed Catholics to offices of state; (4) the Catholic Irish – Elizabeth and James handled the issues effectively but Charles I did not, and Cromwell exaggerated their threat and exacerbated the problem; (5) concern that the succession might pass to a Roman Catholic (Mary Queen of Scots, and James II) was well handled by Elizabeth and Charles II respectively. Candidates should assess how effectively governments dealt with these problems. Better candidates should evaluate the problems and government responses thematically and draw comparisons in the course of their evaluation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**17 At what point from 1558 to 1689 did the Church of England enjoy its greatest period of strength and unity? Explain your answer**

Focus: Evaluation of the strength and unity of the Church of England over time

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are required to evaluate the condition of the Church of England at chosen periods of time, the most likely of which may be the 1560s, 1580s-1590s, 1660s-1680s. 'Strength and unity' could be assessed in terms of support from the crown, parliament and laity, and the quality of bishops and lower clergy. The Church experienced strong leadership under Parker in the 1560s, a decade before Puritanism started to gather support and Catholics became recusants, and under Whitgift, Bancroft and Hooker in the 1580s-90s, when it effectively suppressed dissenting groups. Some candidates might view the 1630s as a strong decade when Archbishop Laud purged the Church of unorthodoxy and corruption in an attempt to establish his 'beauty of holiness', but his beliefs outraged many moderate Protestants and led to widespread criticism of the government in general and the Church in particular. By 1642 his policies had split the country into high and low church groups. Charles II's bishops took advantage of the Clarendon Code to ensure the dominance of the Church and suppress Presbyterian and other dissident voices. The 1660s thus saw the incorporation of many dissenters into a comprehensive Church. The strength and unity of the Church was evident in the 1670s and 1680s when it successfully resisted attempts by the crown to introduce Declarations of Indulgence. Most candidates are likely to evaluate a decade and compare it with other decades but Bands I and II candidates should recognise that strength and unity are not the same and evaluate each accordingly.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**18 Assess the reasons for developments in Protestant nonconformity from 1558 to 1689?**

Focus: Explanation for changes in the development of Protestant nonconformity

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The condition of Protestant nonconformity changed a great deal during this period. At first it lacked unity of leadership and purpose and widespread support, though it had the backing of some privy councillors, courtiers, bishops, nobles, gentry, MPs, clerics and academics. Mainstream puritans were moreover always loyal to Elizabeth if not her religious settlement and only radicals like the Separatists and Presbyterians were persecuted. Support for Protestant nonconformity in parliament grew in James' and Charles' reigns when it became more aggressive and challenged the threat of Arminianism on several fronts. The 1640s and 1650s saw the zenith of Puritan aspirations but its disillusionment under Cromwell and fragmentation into a number of non-conformist sects weakened its challenge to Anglicanism. At the Restoration moderate puritans were absorbed into the Church of England and Quakers, Baptists and Presbyterians were again marginalized. Toleration was only granted to particular sects in 1689. Candidates are likely to chart the development of Puritanism and nonconformity, probably chronologically, but good responses should evaluate reasons. Among these will be: (1) the concern about and at times fear of Catholicism which drove people into Protestant arms, notably in the 1570s-1580s; (2) the failure of Anglican bishops and clergy to address the needs of people cf. the Puritan alternative (eg. 1611-33); (3) the reaction to High Church Anglicanism, especially in the 1620s and 1630s; (4) the support for Protestant nonconformity by Cromwell in the 1650s; (5) the reaction from Anglicanism at the Restoration.

## Europe 1498-1610

**19 How far did the French government become more centralised in the years from 1498 to 1610?**

Focus: Evaluation of governmental centralisation over time

Candidates are likely to focus on central administration and in particular the contribution of Francis I to making the government more centralised. How he dealt with the States-General, the Paris and regional *parlements*, the *pays d'états* and *pays d'élections*, developed royal councils in administration, justice and finance (such as the *Epargne*), and expanded the number of royal officers and *élus*, may all be usefully assessed. As the crown increased its power at the centre, the government became more centralised, and vice versa. Louis XII, Henry II and Henry IV all contributed to this process, and they too should be assessed. Better responses will be aware that this development was not continuous, and the period between 1559 and 1589 for instance saw little progress. Regional and local resistance to change from the centre was also apparent throughout the period, and is illustrated by the independence of the *pays d'états* and the governors of provinces such as Normandy, Provence, Brittany, Burgundy, Languedoc and Dauphiné. Some candidates may turn the question into a discussion of royal absolutism but this is only one aspect associated with nascent centralisation and was not actually accomplished during this period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**20 To what extent was the French economy marked more by continuity than change in the years from 1498 to 1610?**

Focus: Evaluation of economic developments in terms of continuity and change

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should be able to comment usefully on a range of economic factors eg the effects of rising population levels, the impact of inflation on different social groups (notably the crown, nobility and peasantry), measures taken to overcome financial difficulties, the impact of war upon patterns of trade, and the development of commerce, transport and industry, especially under Sully. Most candidates are likely to discuss the state of royal finances during this period but higher responses should explain some of the key developments in industry, trade, commerce and agriculture as well. The main changes in **finance** occurred under Francis I who implemented reforms to centralise the system and raise revenue but he did not tackle issues of rising expenditure, corruption and tax exemption. Henry IV began to solve the difficulties caused by civil war by cancelling debts and gradually initiating reforms after 1598. The nobility and *officiers* had the wealth and potential to invest in **trade and industry** but throughout the period showed little interest as long as *rentes*, crown pensions and from 1604 the Paulette were more profitable. Continuity was the keynote here. There were few improvements in **agriculture** due to the depressed condition of the peasantry and disinterest among landowning nobility who preferred to hunt over the crops. There was little investment in either industry or agriculture until Henry IV and Sully began to encourage state subsidies. Major changes occurred in **population** levels - (17 million by 1610, the largest population in Europe) - which put pressure on urban employment and food supplies, and increased the likelihood of plague, poverty and revolts in the second half of the period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**21 Assess the reasons why civil war occurred in France in the second half of the sixteenth century but not in the first half of the century.**

Focus: Evaluation and explanation of contrasting domestic developments.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to compare the period before and after the outbreak of civil war in 1562 to explain the contrasting conditions. They should focus on assessing the reasons rather than narrating events (which may characterise weaker responses) and account for the influence or absence of key factors. These are most likely to comprise: (1) the strength and character of the monarchs before 1559, and perhaps after 1589, compared with the weak administrations of Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III; (2) the nobility's potential to foment civil disorder throughout the period which was largely unchecked between 1562 and 1598; (3) the religious conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism, which was mainly controlled before the 1550s but unleashed after 1560, and the consequences for the Church and state; (4) the consequences of engaging in foreign wars before 1559, and how the subsequent peace in Europe affected France domestically. The best essays should compare and contrast the two periods and make synoptic cross-references where appropriate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**22 Assess the reasons why the Catholic Church took so long to bring about a reformation in the years from 1500 to 1600.**

Focus: Evaluation of difficulties that prevented a speedy reformation

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may reflect on some of the following difficulties that faced the Church and hindered a Catholic reformation:

(1) Renaissance popes were materially minded and stood to lose political power and wealth from reform; (2) the scale of corruption in the Church in 1500 in most European countries as well as in the Papal States and Curia was extensive and took a long time to rectify; (3) very few training colleges meant that most clerics were poorly educated and the spiritual welfare of people could not be well served or quickly transformed; (4) the reluctance of many monasteries to reform and contribute more effectively to the communal and spiritual life ensured their wealth was not put to better use; (5) Papal anxiety about calling a general council delayed any papal-led reform until the 1540s, and Trent was not concluded until 1563; (6) uncertain support for reform from secular powers (eg Charles V and Francis I) whose involvement in Italy frightened many popes into a state of inertia; (7) only in the 1540s did the Church abandon its attempts to compromise with Lutheranism; (8) widespread appeal of alternative faiths, especially Lutheranism and Calvinism, made any Catholic recovery difficult to achieve quickly; (9) the spiritual understanding of most people remained very basic, especially in rural areas, and any spiritual reformation would take a long time. The better essays will probably examine a range of difficulties and explain why reform was slow to take off and patchy in its development.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.

**23 Who contributed more to the sixteenth-century Catholic Reformation: Pope Paul III or Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Comparative evaluation of Paul III and Loyola as contributors to the Catholic Reformation

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

This question requires candidates to compare the work of Paul III (1534-49) and Loyola (founder of the Jesuits in 1540). Paul was the first sixteenth-century pope to make a sustained effort at reforming the Church – he investigated clerical abuses and encouraged Italian bishops to reform their dioceses, he recognised the Jesuits, he established the Roman Inquisition and Index, and he called the first general council of the Church for over 100 years. Each of these features could be usefully assessed in respect of their impact in the period after 1534. Loyola, not only founded the Jesuits, but also drafted their constitution and a system of education that underpinned their work which won universal praise. The subsequent work and achievements of the Jesuits around the world can be attributed to Loyola. The impact of both individuals should be assessed and set against the condition of the Church in the first four decades of the century. Other factors in the Catholic Reformation are not needed to answer this question. The better essays will find common ground in comparing the legacy of the two men and set their achievements in the context of the whole century.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**24 To what extent was the Council of Trent a turning point in the sixteenth-century Catholic Reformation?**

Focus: Evaluation of the Council of Trent as a turning point in comparison with other factors in the Catholic Reformation

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should set the reforms decreed by the Council of Trent against other key developments in the 16th century to assess how far it was a turning point. Trent should be assessed in terms of what changed or continued as a result of its sessions and decrees, and this will entail looking at the period between 1563 and 1600 as well as the half-century before. The main arguments in favour of its significance are: (1) the implicit re-assertion of papal authority; (2) the affirmation and definition of Catholic doctrine and rejection of Protestantism; (3) the recognition of the pastoral role of bishops and the sacred authority of the clergy; (4) the importance given to confessionals, education and the establishment of seminaries; (5) the desire to stamp out clerical abuses. In theory the Church became a more united, confident and coherent organisation. Arguments supporting the view that it was not such an important turning point may include: (1) Trent had many limitations eg contentious issues (reform of the Breviary, Missal and Catechism) were not resolved by the Council; reforms would take time and money to implement (few seminaries were set up by 1600); little was said about the future role of the Index, Inquisition, regular orders and women, and the laity was not involved in the Catholic Reformation (2) its decrees depended entirely upon the quality of future popes (generally good) and support of secular rulers (variable); (3) other factors that preceded Trent were more important in the origins of the Reformation eg. Luther (1517-20), the sack of Rome (1527), the establishment of new orders and especially the Jesuits (1540) (4) the role of the Papacy was vital both before and after Trent.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.



**Europe 1598-1715****25 How far do you agree that Charles II's problems were largely the same as those facing other Spanish kings in the years from 1598 to 1700?**

Focus: Comparative evaluation of problems facing Charles and his predecessors

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to evaluate the problems in respect of continuity and change. Arguments in favour of continuous problems may be: (1) serious financial difficulties - inflation, debt, bullion shortages, rising expenditure, inequitable tax system, corruption, inefficiency (2) economic problems - dominance of foreign investors, loss of transatlantic trade, declining industry and agriculture (3) social problems – rising poverty, growing gap between rich and poor (4) separatism – resentment towards Castile from Aragon, Catalonia, Naples, Portugal and the Netherlands (5) envious and ambitious enemies – France, England and the United Provinces probed at Spain's military and naval weaknesses. On the other hand, candidates may point out that some of Charles' problems were unprecedented and on a larger scale: - his weak leadership and influence of foreign advisers contrasted with the more competent administrations of Philip III and Lerma, and Philip IV and Olivares. Periods of reform and recovery occurred between 1609-18, 1624-39, and 1659-72. Perceptive candidates may also indicate that there were some problems before 1665 that did not affect Charles eg. the Moriscos had been dealt with by Philip III ; the United Provinces were no longer in revolt after 1648 and the Thirty Years' War had ended.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**26 Assess the reasons for the changing condition of Spain's finances in the years from 1598 to 1700.**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for Spain's changing financial condition

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates can be expected to evaluate a range of financial difficulties and better responses should comment on the scale and persistence of particular problems. The main reasons are likely to comprise:

- (1) an inefficient and corrupt central and local administration eg Lerma, tax farming
- (2) inherited debts, asientos and juros payments
- (3) declining silver bullion - fluctuated but reached its peak in the 1620s
- (4) debasement and inflation - a constant problem after 1599
- (5) inequitable tax system and heavy reliance on indirect taxation
- (6) high expenditure due to court costs, fighting wars and defending overseas possessions
- (7) lack of political will to effect reforms proposed by Olivares, Haro, Medinaceli and Oropesa.

Better candidates should be aware of change as well as continuity, and that periods of improvement were always short-lived.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 27 To what extent were revolts in Spain and in its European possessions a symptom rather than a cause of Spain's internal decline in the seventeenth century?

Focus: Evaluation of revolts as a symptom or cause of internal decline compared with other factors

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main revolts likely to be covered are: (1) the Dutch Revolt (1598-1609, 1621-48) – both a cause and symptom. It encouraged France and Portugal to continue fighting after 1648 and weakened the economy (2) Portuguese Revolt (1640-68) – cause and symptom. This long war weakened Spain financially and militarily, and its inability to defeat the Portuguese was symptomatic of internal problems in the early 1660s

(3) Catalonia (1635-52, 1688-89) – a constant thorn in the side of Castile, allying with France, creating disunity in the peninsula, frustrating Olivares' attempts at raising taxation and creating a national army. These revolts were a reaction to billeting of troops and poor economic conditions and were both symptomatic and causation

(4) Naples and Sicily (1647-48, 1674) – more a symptom of decline than revolts occurred over economic and social grievances but they were suppressed and the uprisings had few long-term effects (5) Andalusia (1647, 1652) – uprisings in Cordoba, Seville and Granada against government taxation and war policies but they had little impact outside the province (6) Valencia (1693) – a symptom of poor economic conditions and threat of foreign invasion. Most candidates may conclude that the revolts contributed to the decline particularly in the period 1647-52, due to the financial, military and political costs to the government, but that revolts in Naples, Sicily and Andalusia were less significant and arguably more symptomatic. To reach **Bands III** and above, the impact of revolts must be set against other factors such as political leadership, military and naval defeats, economic and social issues.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 28 'The Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) was the most important turning-point in France becoming a major European power in the years from 1610 to 1715.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of the Pyrenees as one of two or more turning-points in the development of France

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might begin by determining what constituted a 'major European power'.

Military and naval strength, financial and economic resources, effective administration, strong leadership, weaker rival powers may be considered. An assessment of France's international position in 1659 will be the starting-point of some answers. The Peace of Pyrenees saw France acquire lands in Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the Pyrenees, and gave France a claim to the Spanish throne. It secured French dominance in Western Europe over Spain, and enabled her to compete with Dutch and English trade, seize Spanish territories and intervene in German politics in the course of the next 30 years. Prolonged war (1635-59) had left France with financial difficulties and in need of a respite but it gained further lands in 1668 and 1679, as well as an increase in debts. Expect candidates to compare its condition in 1659 and its aftermath with earlier and later periods, with reference to the development of other countries most notably Spain, England and the United Provinces. Some may challenge the premise, perhaps favouring Richelieu's accession to office (1624), victory at Westphalia (1648), or Louis XIV turning against the Dutch (1672). At least two turning-points are needed to meet the requirements of the question and achieve **Bands III** and above.

**29 How far do you agree that Colbert did more than any other minister to strengthen the economy of France in the years from 1610 to 1715?**

Focus: Comparison of Colbert with other ministers in strengthening the economy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Colbert had several distinctive qualities which set him apart from Richelieu, Mazarin, Tellier and other ministers. All were confronted with financial difficulties, and each tackled them in similar ways ie they tried to cut expenditure, increased existing taxation, borrowed money, sold offices, introduced and then reversed reforms, so that revenue increased but the tax and administrative system remained largely unchanged. However Colbert in the 1660s, unlike Richelieu and Mazarin, cut court expenditure, abolished sinecures, lowered interest rates, amalgamated tax farming, reclaimed royal lands, increased the *taille* paid by landowners and by 1672 had balanced the budget. Colbert also had a far wider view of the economy. He pursued mercantilist policies aimed at acquiring gold and silver bullion at the expense of the Dutch and English. He regulated industries, founded trading companies, established colonies in Canada and the West Indies, expanded the royal navy, maritime fleet and arsenals and naval stores. None of his predecessors since Sully had developed the economy so broadly. As a result, he enabled Louis to wage wars in the 1670s and to become the most powerful man in Europe by 1683. Nevertheless, although Colbert strengthened the economy, there was a limit as to how long the economy could sustain Louis' wars, he failed to reform the fiscal system and attempts to establish permanent trading companies. Candidates should compare Colbert with one or more ministers, and they are most likely to refer to Richelieu and Mazarin.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**30 To what extent were the problems faced by the crown during the reign of Louis XIII (1610-1643) similar to those faced by it during the reign of Louis XIV (1643-1715)?**

Focus: Comparative evaluation of problems facing Louis XIII and Louis XIV

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may compare the problems (thematic) or the rulers (chronological) before reaching a conclusion but arguments should seek to identify similarities and differences. Examples of similar problems may include (1) over mighty nobles (2) Huguenot dissenters (3) regency administrations (4) royal finances (5) peasant grievances (6) the sovereignty of *parlements* and *pays d'états* (7) mixed legal system. Each of these problems was tackled in Louis XIII's reign by Marie de Medici and Richelieu and each problem had to be re-addressed by Louis XIV and his advisers. There were some differences, however, which could be examined.

(1) Louis XIII saw the Habsburgs of Spain and Austria as France's main rivals in Europe but in the course of Louis XIV's reign the main enemies were England and the United Provinces (2) The Estates-General gave Louis XIII political problems in 1614 but not thereafter (3) Papal relations were good before 1643 but caused Louis XIV difficulties (4) Jansenism was not an issue in Louis XIII's reign but gave Louis XIV problems in the later years of his reign. Better answers will explain their examples of continuity and change. Not all problems need to be assessed to gain the top bands.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Europe 1661-1796****31 To what extent were political ideas in France marked more by continuity than change during the period from 1661 to 1789?**

Focus: Evaluation of continuity and change in political ideas in France over an extended period

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Political ideas that reflect elements of continuity need to be analysed, such as relations between church and state, crown and representative assemblies, theoretical and practical features of government. Most *philosophes* did not challenge absolutism as such but offered interpretations of how it should be exercised. Candidates should consider the nature of absolutism in terms of continuity and change across the whole period. In Louis XIV's reign, absolutism was lauded by Bossuet. Later Diderot and several *philosophes* used reason to justify change but he was intolerant of other writers. Voltaire attacked privilege and the sanctity of the church as well as abuses in the political system but upheld the principle of absolute monarchy. Rousseau in his *Du Contrat Social* argued that political power should rest on the general will rather than on divine right. These are likely to be the main writers and political ideas, and change rather than continuity may well be the focus of most essays.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**32 To what extent was the rule of Catherine the Great more absolute than that of Peter the Great?**

Focus: Evaluation of the power of two Russian rulers

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

In theory both Peter and Catherine were absolute monarchs but in practice their powers were restricted. Candidates should recognise that the extent and nature of their power fluctuated according to their personalities, the ability of Russians to resist their policies, and the changes in support for the rulers from the nobility, church, merchants and serfs. Answers should be reasonably balanced and may look at political and administrative reforms, finances and the economy, the church, the armed forces, and the amount of freedom that Russians enjoyed. It is important that a benchmark for absolutism is established for c.1698-1725 and compared with one for 1763-96. Most candidates might argue that Peter was more absolute than Catherine and that there was no effective opposition to absolutism but to particular policies that they tried to enforce. Better responses may make links and connections between developments in the reigns of Peter and Catherine to demonstrate change and continuity over time, and so compare their reigns.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**33 How far did the Enlightenment result in growing criticism of the Roman Catholic Church?**

Focus: Assessment of the effects of the Enlightenment on the Catholic church

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. The specification covers Austria, France and Russia, though Russia is not relevant to this question unless candidates use it as a comparison. Candidates may access the full range of marks by referring only to the Roman Catholic Church in just France or Austria, although answers in the top Band 1 should make some reference to the other state (eg. in Austria the policies of Joseph II). At the end of the seventeenth century, the position of the Church was secure. It had a close alliance with the state, providing important officials and defending absolutism. Its position in France was enhanced by the (mostly popular) Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. During the eighteenth century, the growing Enlightenment led to more criticism. Candidates may refer to the teachings of particular political thinkers but only Diderot, Rousseau and Voltaire are identified by name in the specification so wider references are not to be expected (although they should, of course, be given credit if included). The Church was increasingly seen by some as the champion of intolerant and unthinking authoritarianism and intolerance against new ideas that were based on Reason. Its privileges came under attack. Nevertheless, the bonds between Church and monarchy remained strong until the outbreak of the French Revolution.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

## 2591 Themes in History 1763 – 1996

Britain 1793-1921

Britain and Ireland 1798-1921

- 1 **How successful were the methods adopted by constitutional nationalism in securing its aims in Ireland in the period from 1798 to 1921? Explain your answer.**

Focus: An evaluation of constitutional nationalism's methods.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should be able to point to mixed success. Clearly there were some instances of 'achievement' (R.C. Emancipation in 1829; the conversion of Gladstone to Home Rule) but also many failures. Methods varied but a key feature of constitutional nationalism was a stress on moral force, parliamentary reforms, persuasion within the law and using the legal and political system as the way forward. The two crucial methods, building a campaign in Ireland and a political party at Westminster, had mixed results. O'Connell built a very successful **campaign** around emancipation in the 1820s through his own oratory and careful targeting of Catholic Clergy, tenant farmers and shopkeepers. The Roman Catholic Association and the Catholic Rent were able to survive legal persecution and, by using the political system itself, threatened a breakdown of patronage interest to secure emancipation. However O'Connell was to fail in the 1840s with his **Monster Meetings**, Repeal Campaign and National Repeal Association. Parnell was able to repeat this over Home Rule in the 1880s but Redmond failed to mobilise Ireland in the 1910s over the same issue. As to **building a party** at Westminster, O'Connell had some success, allegedly running Ireland for the Whigs post-Lichfield House Compact, but was unable to sustain it post-1841. Butt made some progress, but it was Parnell who created the most successful Irish Nationalist Party, treating it as a personal fiefdom until his own fall in the late 1880s. His tactics (**filibustering** and **holding the balance of power**) had mixed success. He gained Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule but not Home Rule itself. Redmond held a balance of power post-1910 but also failed to gain the implementation of Home Rule. The problem for all the leaders was their reluctance to call Britain's bluff and move to disobedience, civil or otherwise, although Parnell came very close via the Land League. Their methods involved playing the British system and thereby the Union 'game' which divorced them from their Irish roots.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 2 **To what extent did religious issues hinder the progress of Irish nationalism in the period from 1798 to 1921?**

Focus: An evaluation of the role of religion in Irish nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Better candidates will realise that religious issues helped to promote two different Irish identities and nationalisms – Irish Catholic Nationalism and Ulster Unionism. In terms of a whole Ireland approach religion was bound to be a hindrance. However some candidates may argue that religion helped nationalism by feeding a sectarian identity to North and South. Roman Catholicism provided much of southern culture outside the Protestant Ascendancy. Government ran along these lines as did the historic land settlement (seen

as one of confiscation) and the religious supremacy of the Anglican Church of Ireland. In the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century this 'Alien church' acted as a rallying point for opposition, whether it was emancipation (1820s), tithe war (1830s) or Disestablishment (1869). Its importance was recognised by Peel's attempt to neutralise the Catholic Church and win its acquiescence over emancipation, charity (Bequests Bill) and education (Maynooth Grant 1845). Until the politicisation of Ulster Presbyterianism in the 1880s, religion was less high profile as the Catholic Church pocketed its gain. However many candidates may agree with the question's assertion that throughout the period religion **hindered** Irish nationalism. In the 1790s and the early 19<sup>th</sup> century many leaders did not want to associate their cause with religion, particularly Roman Catholicism, a religion which disapproved of 19<sup>th</sup> century nationalism. Earlier leaders were often 18<sup>th</sup> century rationalists or moderate Protestants. O'Connell did not want emancipation to be seen as a sectarian triumph but as one of liberty and justice. Butt and Parnell were protestants, the latter much condemned by the church over the O'Shea divorce case. Tone, Emmet and later the Fenians drew on revolutionary and secular radicalism, stressing non-religious issues. The church opposed their violent rebellion and was socially conservative. It disapproved of the Land League, the Easter Rising and Sinn Féin, although DeValera was careful to court it. Candidates might point to a revival of religious issues when Ulster resisted what it saw as 'Rome Rule' after 1886, leading ultimately to partition on sectarian lines. Better candidates will realise that religious issues were not simple in their effect on Irish Nationalism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**3 'Ireland's problems were mainly economic.' How far would you agree in the period from 1798 to 1921?**

Focus: An assessment of Ireland's problems.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

This is a wide-ranging question so detailed example is not expected, although candidates will need to assess economic problems in relation to religious, political or cultural ones. It could be argued that **political issues** concerned only a few (Tone, O'Connell, Butt, Parnell etc) and thus the political systems only represented that minority (there were no parliamentary or franchise reform campaigns to match that on the mainland during the period; witness O'Connell's disappointment over his failure to 'raise a cry' over the disenfranchisement of the Irish freeholders). However the Monster Meetings in the 1840s over repeal did demonstrate popular interest in political solutions. Politics was of much greater interest from the 1880s onwards (Home Rule). Home Rule created more aggression in Ulster than in the rest of Ireland. **Religious issues** could be important (and were in the 1820s), although Disestablishment in 1869 was hardly the result of popular Irish pressure. Candidates may argue with the assertion in the question that **economic issues** were the key to Irish problems. Governments feared the linking of economic issues with religious and political ones and moved, as Balfour said, to uncouple the Land Reform engine from the Home Rule train. For most Irish, economic problems loomed large, whether landless labourers or landlords. Only at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century did Irish poverty recede. In the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century agricultural backwardness, over-population, over-dependence on the potato and poor relations between landlord and tenant, (made worse by difficult conceptions of 'tenant rights') hindered Irish economic development (linked to a rapidly industrialising mainland in the grip of laissez faire). The Famine took the pressure off, at great human expense, accelerating emigration, but left untouched poor landlord tenant relations which culminated in Davitt's Land League and agrarian violence. These were addressed between 1870 and 1903. It was these issues that Irish leaders used to rally support for political causes and which later British

governments wished to 'kill by kindness'. From 1903 the problems were less economic (Ireland did well out of the 1<sup>st</sup> world war) and arguably became more political.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.



**War and Society in Britain 1793-1918****4 How far did reform of the army and navy reflect changes in British society in the period from 1793 to 1918?**

Focus: An assessment of the link between change in British Society and army and naval reform.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates can take a varied approach here. They will need to establish the main changes in British society and the linkage to the armed forces. A clear change is the move to an **industrial** and **urban society**. The army continued to recruit largely from the rural counties (and indeed became county based) and non-industrial Ireland, partly through tradition, partly through poverty and partly through the perceived health of agricultural labourers. Urban recruitment from 1899 produced only tales of horror, although Kitchener very much targeted the cities for his volunteer army of 1914-16. A **literate** army post-1870 could be advantageous but also problematic (censorship had to be applied during the 1<sup>st</sup> World War). Reform on **standards** of **discipline** and **conditions** also occurred post-1870 given rising standards of living, pay and the unacceptability of the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> century press gangs. The British Army was no longer Wellington's scum of the earth regimented by drink. The **officer class** also changed, although a General Staff was long resisted. Cardwell's reforms removed purchase of commission and installed merit as part of a liberal society that made the army accountable and put it firmly under political control. Nonetheless aristocrat control of the army remained and the perceived importance of cavalry was still there in 1914. Haldane's reforms helped to link the officer training corps to the public schools. **Gender changes** were making themselves felt by the 1<sup>st</sup> World War with women seen in non-combatant roles and as part of a Home Front (Munitions and Land Armies). Yet an examination of the Napoleonic Wars and the Crimean War would demonstrate the resistance to change. In the latter industrialists despaired over the adherence to aristocratic tradition. The management of resources remained inefficient. Some candidates may discuss the role of the media and communication. Conclusions are therefore likely to be varied.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**5 Assess which of Britain's wars was the most successfully managed in the period from 1793 to 1918.**

Focus: A comparison of which war was most successfully managed.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Britain won the wars of the period despite losing battles and campaigns. The question focuses on management, of men, logistics, communications, weapons, propaganda, finance and leadership. How effectively these were deployed determined relative success. Candidates are most likely to argue for the **1<sup>st</sup> World War**. Although 1914-15 saw shell shortages, uncertain generalship, the problems of trench warfare and uncertain progress; these were quickly resolved and Britain's Home Front was especially well managed. Naval blockades, surface supremacy and even the U-Boat menace were dealt with. A new Air Force was created, tanks and gas experimented with and a huge army was supplied. Rationing was minimal and propaganda and civilian support maintained, in contrast to many of her continental allies and rivals. However there is also a case for the **Napoleonic Wars**. Britain's ability to raise and pay for armies and coalitions became legendary, the Peninsular army was greatly expanded and the Navy became an extremely well managed,

supplied and almost self-supporting, military tool. This effort was maintained for a quarter of a century. **Colonial** wars were also reasonably successful and certainly maintained on a shoe-string budget. Defeats were 'managed' as heroic stands (Zulus; Sudan). The least successful wars were the **Crimea** and the **2<sup>nd</sup> Boer War**. The Crimea was marked by lack of control over the new press (Russell's despatches) which exposed poor supplies, inadequate hospitals, disease and a foolish tactical and strategic approach by the generals and officers. The Boer War saw unpreparedness, an inability to adapt to both the terrain and guerrilla warfare and another public relations disaster over 'methods of barbarism'.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**6 To what extent would you agree that war had little impact on British society in the period from 1793 to 1918?**

Focus: An evaluation of the impact of war on British Society

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Given that Britain herself was not a battleground and that most 19<sup>th</sup> century wars were limited, colonial and thus 'far away', many candidates are likely to agree with the question. Those who also approved war or wished to make it an issue often had an uphill struggle. Wars remained 18<sup>th</sup> century in nature for most of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars had little impact, despite fears about British 'jacobins'. There was economic dislocation (The Continental System) after 1807 but for agriculture there were high prices, expansion and profit. Politically the monarchy was safe and the pro-war Tories remained in power. Income Tax from the rich was unwelcome but accepted. Arguably the end of war in 1815 had a much greater impact, at least economically, although Britain was left a legacy of heroes, great moments and supremacy. Colonial wars had little impact beyond the growing media's tendency to sensationalise in the second half of the period. The same was true of the Crimean War although the scandals associated with it reverberated more strongly. The Boer War, it could be argued, did have a much greater impact, especially on the political classes and on the debate about national efficiency and ensuing welfare reforms. It discredited the Conservative government. However few candidates are likely to dispute that the 1<sup>st</sup> World War had an immense impact. Casualties in a new attritional war were huge, personal loss incalculable. Restrictions and propaganda campaigns were legion. The state became very intrusive whilst conscription had to be accepted post-1916. There were major changes for younger women, both middle and working class. The economy was disrupted. Censorship took over and accepted values were challenged.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948****7 To what extent was the First World War (1914-18) the most important factor in changing housing policy during this period?**

Focus: an assessment of the impact of the First World War on housing policy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Responses should begin with a discussion of the impact of the war (rising real incomes and expectations, attempts at rent control, housing shortages, promises of 'Homes fit for Heroes') and the link with inter-war developments starting with Addison's housing act. Although the shortcomings of the 1919 legislation soon became apparent, it was a brave attempt to provide a large amount of good quality housing quickly. It also set something of a precedent, as the Wheatley and Greenwood acts also attempted to boost the housing stock on a scale not witnessed before, and the reforms of the later 1930s focused on widespread slum clearance in a further attempt to improve living conditions. Some candidates might argue that progress in the inter-war period was rather slow and limited, due to the need for governments to reduce public expenditure. A case could certainly be made for World War Two being more significant as a turning point, with the resultant New Towns Act (1946), Housing Act (1946), and Town And Country Planning Act (1947). Most candidates should attempt to compare what went after 1914-18 with before. The last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed some significant improvements via the introduction of the Artisans Dwellings Act (1875), and the Housing of the Working Classes Act (1885), both of which laid something of a platform for future administrations to work from. Also, candidates may point to the innovative work of Chamberlain, philanthropic industrialists, and housing charities in influencing some of the work carried out after the war. A basic, even if detailed, narrative of housing developments should not be awarded a mark above Band III.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**8 'State intervention in education was largely ineffective until 1944.' How far do you agree with this judgement of the period from 1834 to 1948?**

Focus: an assessment of the impact of government education policies.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Better candidates should give some indication of how effectiveness can be measured, probably by comparing what governments aimed to do with their achievements. Aims and achievements quite clearly changed throughout the period. From 1833 to 1902 the aim was to provide more and better elementary education for the masses, although there was always a certain amount of opposition to this from various quarters (individual politicians, employers, religious groups and parents). From the 1860s onwards another aim was to make provision efficient ('payment by results') and to supplement a system that was working quite effectively through voluntary effort (hence the 1870 act). However, by 1900 there was still a patchwork of provision at elementary level and a very mixed bag of secondary schools available. This was considered inadequate at the time, given that the USA and Germany both had state education systems up to secondary level and had become Britain's greatest economic rivals. The aims changed in the twentieth century with Balfour's act and Fisher's act, but progress was still hampered by a mixture of opposition to extension, retrenchment and the impact of war. Butler's act was the first attempt to provide a universal, free education system for all, although the tripartite approach adopted by many local authorities had its critics even before 1948. Candidates may also point out

that a dual system of education (state and independent) persisted, which arguably, not only reflected social divides, but continued to reinforce them.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**9 To what extent was laissez-faire thinking the main reason why it took so long for the welfare state to be established during the period from 1834 to 1948?**

Focus: the influence of laissez-faire ideology on attempts to introduce the welfare state.  
No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should take a broad view of what constituted a welfare state. They may well argue that laissez-faire thinking continued throughout the period and, by definition, restricted state intervention. Thus, welfare legislation of the nineteenth century was largely permissive, as a result of individualism and 'self help' dominating views about how social progress could be made. The apparent contradiction between some attempt to intervene and laissez-faire was explained by Benthamites using utilitarianism (ie Intervention was fine as long as it created the greatest happiness of the greatest number). The Liberal social reforms (1906-1914) appeared to be a move towards a welfare state of a kind, but a universal and comprehensive form of provision would not have been politically, economically and socially acceptable at the time. The 1911 constitutional crisis was evidence of this. Extensions to welfare provision were made in the interwar period, but were again limited by a perceived need to be financially cautious and a continuation of the idea that, to a large extent, the masses could do much to help themselves. It was not surprising that a means test was introduced. The Poor Law continued to 1928, education reforms were non-existent, the best health care was available through Poor Law infirmaries and housing reforms were variable in terms of impact. It took the Second World War to finally push politicians into providing an optimum programme of welfare benefits. Answers should therefore display an awareness of the continuity of laissez-faire thinking, but also an indication that there were other factors, particularly of an economic nature, that also influenced developments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992**

**10 Assess the reasons for the reform of the franchise from 1868 to 1992.**

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for the reform of the franchise.  
No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to attempt a thematic approach and reach a judgement about the relative importance of factors if they are to reach Bands I and II. Political factors were undoubtedly very important. There might be discussion about Disraeli's motives in 1867 (did he 'dish Gladstone', or was he swayed by external pressures for reform?), the consolidatory nature of the Third Reform Act, the giving in to pressure group activity in 1918 and 1928, and the removal in 1948 of 'bias' in a voting system that seemed to support the Conservatives. However, it could be argued that franchise reform was generally a reflection of social change, making reference to class based politics, the changing role of women in society, developments in education and media influence. It is also possible to put a case for economic influences being most important, especially when linked to social stratification (as in 1862 and 1884) and war (as in 1918 and 1948).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 11 'The quality of leadership was the most important factor in the changing fortunes of the Conservative party.' How far do you agree with this statement during the period 1868 to 1992?**

Focus: an assessment of the changing fortunes of the Conservative party.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Some might simply agree with the assertion in the statement and argue that the Conservatives did particularly well when they had strong, charismatic, effective leaders. This could easily be supported with reference to the premierships of Disraeli, Churchill, Macmillan and Thatcher. During other periods when leaders were considered to be less charismatic, dynamic and strong, the party was less effective (although not necessarily out of power). This would be true of Balfour, Baldwin, Chamberlain, Heath and Major. Better candidates are likely to base their judgement on a clear exposition of what qualities they consider 'good' leaders should have possessed. They should also balance their analysis against other issues. These might include other internal factors (eg grassroots administration, organisation and support), and external developments (eg the weakness of opposition parties, particular events, economic trends, and social change).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 12 To what extent was the rise of the mass media a reason for the development of democracy during the period 1868 to 1992?**

Focus: an assessment of the contribution of the mass media to the development of democracy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

One line of argument could be that key events in the development of democracy seemed to precede the rise of the mass media. Thus, the first three reform acts occurred before technological developments, which enabled the production of cheap tabloids for the masses and the beginning of radio broadcasts. This pattern continued to some extent in the twentieth century. The 1911 Parliament Act and the 1918 Representation of the People Act came before the incorporation of the BBC and the reforms of 1948 were in place well before the popularisation of television. Thus, it would be tempting to suggest that the growth of the mass media simply reflected the widening of the franchise and political change more generally. Alternatively, it could be viewed that changes to the media forced developments to democracy as the bulk of the population found it easier to voice their concerns and pressure governments for reform. This could be illustrated with reference to pressure group activity (eg. trade union activity, the Suffragettes), specific campaigns, and manipulation by parties not holding office.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996****13 Assess the importance of the mass media in shaping public opinion during periods of national crisis in the period from 1896 to 1996.**

Focus: the role of the press and broadcasting in times of national crisis.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A number of 'periods of national crisis' are referred to in the specification: both World Wars, the General Strike, appeasement, Suez, the Falklands War, and the 'Troubles' in Ireland for example, and it is reasonable to assume that candidates should be able to use evidence from all of these, but other crises that may be used include the Boer War; the pre-WWI Suffragette agitation and industrial and Irish unrest; the Depression of the 1930s. Candidates are not expected to have a detailed knowledge of any of these national crises, but they are expected to be able to demonstrate an understanding of the role the media played in influencing public opinion while they lasted. An awareness that 'public opinion' is multi-layered and never monolithic may also be found and rewarded in the answers of the best candidates. The real challenge however is to find a coherent analytical, thematic structure for this essay: weaker answers are likely to look at different national crises separately and perhaps even chronologically, while more effective answers will find ways of breaking down 'the shaping of public opinion' into different aspects (such as rallying support for government; informing public; ensuring public co-operation in measures to be taken; entertaining and sustaining morale etc), and find various ways of assessing 'importance'.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**14 Assess the importance of the 'press barons' in shaping the development of the mass media in the period from 1896 to 1996.**

Focus: the rise of the 'press barons' and other factors that have influenced the new media.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The 'press barons' include later moguls such as Murdoch as well as those of the earlier Beaverbrook era, but successful essays are also likely to pick up the distinction between the early moguls' control of just one type of media with later figures' acquisition of a whole range of media opportunities. Certainly better candidates will be able to deconstruct 'shaping the development' into a number of different criteria or elements to provide an analytical structure for the essay. Such criteria or elements may include general control/ownership; specific interventions or influence over particular news stories or periods of national crisis; type of content and look/approach/organisation of newspapers and broadcast programmes; technology; number and reach of newspapers and broadcast stations etc. Although candidates may achieve good marks by largely focussing on an evaluation of the press/media barons, the very best answers are likely to set the importance of these in the context of the influence of other factors or people, such as governments, popular culture changes etc. Weaker answers are likely to look at individual press/media barons individually, instead of finding a way as indicated above to consider overall impact.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**15 To what extent did the press respond successfully to the challenge of radio and television in this period?**

Focus: the press in the era of radio and television.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

It is often assumed that the printed media suffered as a result of the competing appeal of the broadcast media, firstly in the 1920s with the establishment of the BBC and radio, and then post-war with the development of television. Arguments and evidence in support of this may include the decline in the numbers of newspapers, especially in the 1950s and then again in the 1980s, the erosion especially of local newspapers, and the steady post-war decline in circulation figures. The Second World War period can be used as evidence too, in that radio was increasingly preferred for more up-to-date news (especially as the war opened out 1944-5) and for entertainment in difficult circumstances. However, counter-arguments may include the view that decline in the Second World War was more to do with paper rationing and supply difficulties than to decreased appeal, and that certain forms of printed media have enjoyed periods of renaissance and stability ('magazines' in 1930s and 1940s; celebrity and specialist/age-group targeted publications in more recent times; 'free' newspapers also from the late 1980s). The press also found ways of responding in design and content : advertisements disappearing from front pages; increased sports and entertainment coverage (especially after WW2); the use of colour in newspapers from the 1980s; magazine supplements with newspapers; and of course complementing the growth of the other media by giving their rivals' programme details and information about their stars and presenters.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Europe 1792-1919****The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1918****16 To what extent was there continuity in the strategy and tactics used in war in the period from 1792 to 1918?**

Focus: Evaluation of the development of strategy and tactics in war

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

An argument for continuity might focus on the developments in strategy and tactics in the Napoleonic era and argue that there was basically no change to these principles on a fundamental level until the very end of the period. Candidates might discuss the development of the corps system and Napoleon's methods of warfare on a strategic and tactical level. There are good arguments that these were applied consistently throughout the period. The Italian War of 1859 saw both sides fighting Napoleonic warfare. In the Crimea the British army clung to the tactical methods it used under Wellington. The American Civil War has been described as the last war to use Napoleonic principles. The period of potential change comes in the Wars of German Unification. Candidates might argue that the strategic plans used by both sides were essentially Napoleonic or that the use of railways and the creation of the Prussian general staff caused radical change at least in the operations of one of the combatants. The First World War will obviously test the argument for continuity to its limits.

An alternative position is to argue that strategy and tactics in war were constantly changing throughout the period. The developments of the middle part of the century have already been advanced. The American Civil War could be seen as a radical departure in strategy and tactics. The First World War is obvious evidence for the alternative position. In the area of tactics the impact of technology could be used as a means to argue rapid change.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**17 Assess the importance of changes in communications and transport in the development of warfare in the period from 1792 to 1918?**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of specific technologies on warfare.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Although other factors might be used in the essay, the central thrust must engage the key prompts of the question. Both communications and transport must be addressed to move above Band III. The issues posed by the question should be evaluated across the entire period. Transport will probably concentrate on the application of steam power in the form of railways (and steam ships where their use applies to land warfare – the Crimean War springs to mind). The response must use this knowledge analytically to discuss the impact this technology had on the conduct of war. Examples might be rapid strategic movement, the ability to mobilize large numbers of soldiers, an ability to concentrate more rapidly. The obvious examples are the 1866 Austro-Prussian War and the opening months of WW1. Better candidates might argue that the railway only took armies so far and once separated from rail networks soldiers moved as fast as their 18<sup>th</sup> century forebears had done. We might also expect discussion of the impact of the internal combustion engine in WW1. For pre-steam technologies, use of waterways to transport troops or mass use of horse drawn carts. The former was a common feature of war in the later 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries;



the latter was used on occasion by Napoleon, for example to move part of his army in 1805.

Communications will probably concentrate on the developments of the second half of the period i.e. telegraph, telephone and early radio. Telegraph first starts to make an impact with the Crimean War, with the telephone we move to the Boer War and Russo-Japanese War, and radio is a feature of WWI. Semaphore or related techniques were used right from the start of the period. There are obvious applications of evidence from the American Civil War to both parts of the question. Better candidates should balance these two factors against others, but a discussion of communications and transport must form the core of the essay.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**18 To what extent did superior manpower determine the outcome of wars in the period from 1792 to 1918?**

Focus: Evaluation of a given factor in bringing success in war.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The development of 'a nation in arms' by France in the early part of the Revolutionary Wars developed into more regulated conscription in the later Revolutionary period. This might be contrasted with the use of long service professionals and mercenaries by the dynastic armies of France's enemies. The reaction of France's enemies to conscription might include the tentative use of *Frei Korps* and *Landwehr* by Austria or the traditional conscription of serfs into Russia's long service army. A good topic for discussion would be the development of the *Krumper* system in Prussia after 1808. Candidates might note that Britain never embraced conscription in this period and yet her army was generally successful. For the period of unification the different systems used by the combatant powers might be examined, generally candidates will point to the superior organisation of manpower by Prussia and the resulting large size of her army in proportion to her population. The defeat of France's long service army by Prussia's reservists despite superior French weapons technology in the 'Imperial' phase of the Franco-Prussian War is a good example. There were changes in conscription arrangements in European states at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup>, especially changes in France to create a large reserve army. The First World War is an obvious example of conscription playing a key role in success in war. Note that Britain used a long service professional army supported by Territorials at the start of the conflict, replacing this with Kitchener's army of volunteers and finally conscription. The American Civil War falls into the mainstream of the debate, the north having a preponderance in manpower. Better candidates will balance these two factors against others, but a discussion of manpower must form the core of the essay.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815-1919****19 Assess the reasons why Prussia was more successful in dominating the German states from 1866 to 1919 than from 1815 to 1865.**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons why Prussia was more successful at dominating the German states from 1866 than previously in this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the reasons why Prussia was less successful in dominating the German states and less successful at challenging Austria's dominance of Germany in the first half of the period 1815 to 1865, and for Austria's replacement by Prussia as the dominant German power from 1866. In terms of Austria's domination, the impact of decisions taken at Vienna and Austria's role within the Diet might be usefully discussed. The role of Metternich through to 1848 could be usefully explored. Candidates may wish to discuss how Austria regained control, imposing the 'humiliation' of Olmutz, after the tumultuous days of 1848 / 49 and Prussia's establishment of the Erfurt Union. Candidates should be able to explain why the balance of power within Germany changed: Olmutz probably represents Austria's last assertion of dominance. The importance of economic factors, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and eventual dominance over the German states might usefully be explored. Candidates may well explain how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Candidates may also want to place importance on the role played by the army reforms in developing Prussia's military strength. The role played by Bismarck will almost certainly be highlighted by many candidates in terms of explaining the reasons for Prussia's dominance over the other German states. How the German Constitution enabled Prussia to dominate the other German states after 1871 may be explored, as may the leadership of Wilhelm II.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**20 Assess the impact of economic factors on the development of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919.**

Focus: An assessment of the relative importance of economic factors within the development of German nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the relative importance of economic factors within the development of German Nationalism in this period. Candidates should explain the importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Military strength depended upon economic strength. 'Coal & Iron' rather than 'Blood & Iron' could be usefully debated. The development of the railways may be seen as significant. The impact of the extraordinary developments in the German economy after 1871 should be discussed. Candidates must however show that they understand that economic factors were not the sole factors determining the fortunes of German nationalism in this period. For example, the Great War left Germany broken and half-starved despite the German economic domination of continental Europe in 1914. Economic factors undeniably contributed to Prussia's domination of Germany from 1866, but opportunistic and skilful leadership, both for and against German nationalism, should not be overlooked.

Candidates may wish to place considerable importance on the diplomatic abilities of Bismarck both in terms of the unification of Germany and his management of German nationalism. The development and impact of ideas on the emergence and development of nationalism may also be usefully explored.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**21 How far do you agree that the aims of German nationalists remained the same throughout the period from 1815 to 1919?**

Focus: An assessment of the extent to which the aims of German nationalists remained the same throughout the period from 1815 to 1919.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the dominant aims of German nationalists during this period, from the aims of the growing emergent nationalist movement after 1815 to the aims of more radical nationalists in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. The development and impact of ideas on the aims of nationalism should be explored. Candidates might well demonstrate understanding of the debate about Grossdeutschland or Kleindeutschland in the period 1815 – 1871 and the reasons for the development of more radical nationalism in the remainder of the period. Candidates might explain the importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Bismarck's opportunistic and skilful leadership clearly had a significant impact on developments within German nationalism too. The change of heart from 1866 when liberals became national liberals may well be stressed by some candidates. The impact of the foundation of the Second Reich from 1871 clearly had a profound effect on the development of nationalism during the latter part of this period as did the accession to the throne of Wilhelm II. Candidates may focus on the more radical nationalism of the Wilhelmine period and its ultimately disastrous impact on the German nation. The Great War left Germany broken and half-starved with the aims of German nationalists in tatters.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Europe 1855 – 1956****Russian Dictatorship 1855 – 1956****22 Assess the view that Russia's rulers were opposed to change during the period from 1855 to 1956.**

Focus: Comparative assessment of the extent to which the rulers of Russia were opposed to change in the period 1855 - 1956.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the extent to which the rulers of Russia were opposed to change. In agreeing with this assertion, candidates might well choose to argue that the Romanov Tsars were all basically opposed to change (with particular emphasis on Alexander III and Nicholas II) - determined to maintain the status quo, with their reliance on divine right and the Orthodox Church to define their right to rule. Candidates may also assert that despite the revolutionary nature of their doctrine, Lenin and Stalin both exhibited reactionary tendencies, pursuing policies that have led many historians to refer to communist dictatorship as simply another version of autocratic authoritarianism. Other candidates may choose to assert that the Tsars were predominantly opposed to change whereas the communist dictators introduced sweeping changes. Lenin seized power in 1917 during the October Revolution and his Marxist-Leninist creed rid Russia of most of the trappings of the Romanov regime. Candidates could argue that Stalin was even more revolutionary, arguing that his economic & social policies in the 1930s utterly transformed the USSR which post-1945 was emerging as a global super-power. Candidates may also choose to suggest that Alexander II began his reign with the promise of 'revolution from above' and that his reforms of the 1860s, most especially the emancipation of the serfs, represented a real change. Some candidates may consider different types of change, for example by arguing that whilst Alexander III was resolutely opposed to political change he allowed Witte to introduce significant economic change.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**23 How far do you agree that the communist takeover in 1917 was the most important turning-point in the development of Russian government in the period from 1855 to 1956?**

Focus: An assessment of the relative significance of the communist takeover in 1917 as a turning point in the development of Russian government in the period 1855 - 1956.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the phrase 'most important turning point' and 'the development of Russian government' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the communist takeover in 1917 as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. What follows is not an exclusive list, but consideration could be given to 1855, 1866, 1881, 1905 / 1906, February 1917, 1924, or Stalin's gaining total power by 1929 or Stalin's death in 1953. For example, candidates might argue that the assassination of Alexander II in 1881 marked the end of any hope of meaningful reform from above by the Romanov dynasty, and set the Romanovs on course for revolution and their downfall. Candidates may argue that the end of over 300 years of Romanov rule in February 1917 was the most significant turning point as it ended the 304 year old Romanov dynasty, but may argue that ultimately this led to the replacement of 'Romanov Tsars' by 'red Tsars'. Many candidates will undoubtedly argue that October

1917 and the triumph of Bolshevism was the most important turning point as it crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia and transformed Russia into the Soviet Union – the world's first communist state. Candidates however may well consider that Lenin's death in 1924 was the most significant turning point, perverting the true course of the Russian Revolution because circumstances enabled Stalin to succeed Lenin. Candidates who argue this are likely to suggest that Stalin's victory in the ensuing power struggle led Russia down a very different road than that being paved by Lenin. Other candidates may use a counter-argument based on more recent archival evidence to suggest that there was significant continuity between Lenin and Stalin.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**24 To what extent were the living and working conditions of the Russian peasants consistently miserable in the period from 1855 to 1956?**

Focus: An assessment of the living and working conditions of the peasantry throughout this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the similarities and differences between the condition of the peasantry and the treatment the peasants received, both before and after 1917. 'Consistently miserable' is the key phrase in this title; candidates may well consider how valid this premise is. It could be argued that the peasantry made little progress in many ways during this period and that predominantly their living and working conditions were miserable. Peasants were only serfs under the Romanovs, but some candidates may argue that there was little real improvement and / or that collectivization was a 'second serfdom'. Before and after 1917 there was harsh treatment of the peasantry by both regimes; 'squeezed dry' to finance industrialization. Famine hit, eg 1891, 1921 & 1932, regardless of regime, although arguably Stalin's denial of the famine of the 1930s made its impact worse. Control over their lives, whether exercised through the Mir, the Land Captains & the Kolkhoz was a common feature, although distinctions may clearly be made. However there were periods of reform both before and after 1917 that should enable candidates to successfully challenge this assertion. The peasants were given glimpses of reform, eg Emancipation in 1861, the Peasants' Land Bank from the 1880s, the Decree on Land in 1917 and the NEP from 1921. All of these changes led to improvements, although some were temporary, in their living and working conditions. Both regimes had a temporary Kulak policy under Stolypin from 1906 & under the NEP from 1921-28 as peasants were encouraged to 'enrich themselves'. Arguably the communists did much more to introduce social reform, for example in the sphere of education, than the Tsars.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**America 1763-1980****25 Assess the significance of the separation of powers in the development of the Constitution from 1787 to 1877.**

Focus: The significance of the separation of powers in the development of the US Constitution and US history.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to explain how the separation of powers affected the United States. The separation of powers is central to understanding the US political system. Enshrined in the 1787 Constitution, Federal power was divided between a President (head of the Executive), the Congress (legislature) and a Supreme Court (judiciary). Also power was divided between the Federal Government and state governments (the Federal System). In the development of the US, candidates may mention that presidential power increased over the period, in particular under presidents such as Jackson and Lincoln. They may also mention the increasing role of the US Supreme Court, in particular under Chief Justices Marshall and Taney. Finally, they may mention how the separation powers caused friction between the Federal and state governments which ultimately led to Civil War in 1861.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**26 To what extent was sectional conflict successfully managed from 1763 to 1877?**

Focus: The significance of sectional conflict in the development of US constitutional history.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should decide whether or not conflict was inevitable. Candidates may mention the divisions between colonists and the British colonial administration in the lead up to the Revolutionary War. They may also mention conflict between Patriots and Loyalists in Revolutionary War. Other factors which may be considered are the nature and functioning of the US Constitution created in 1787. It created the tension between State and Federal Government. Candidates may mention examples of this such as the Second Bank of the US crisis of the early 1830s. It could be argued that, at some stage, conflict would break out. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 and the Great Compromise of 1850 merely put off something which inevitably would occur. Alternatively, they may state that the US political system was based on the concept of compromise and the events of 1860-61 were an aberration. They may also mention the issue of slavery and how it caused great tension between North and South as the country moved westward in the 19th century. They may state that slavery was so crucial to southern society and the southern economy that the South was bound to go to war to defend it. Even after the Civil War tension still existed between North and South during Reconstruction. The end of Reconstruction in 1877 temporarily brought this to an end.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 27 To what extent was the presidency of Andrew Jackson (1829-1837) the most important turning-point in the development of presidential power from 1789 to 1877?**

Focus: The changing role of the presidency and the importance of turning-points.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess a turning-point in the development of presidential power. Jackson is one of the presidents identified in the specification. In support of the Jackson presidency as a turning-point, candidates may mention the conflict with South Carolina over the South Carolina nullification ordinance against the tariff acts of 1828 and 1832. The crisis was a prelude to Federal/State conflict that resulted in Civil War in 1861. Jackson's resolute action and the threat of military force helped end the crisis. Jackson had upheld the supremacy of Federal power. Also Jackson's role in the removal of the Five Civilised tribes of Native Americans from the South East in the early 1830s, in the face of Supreme Court disapproval of the removal of the Cherokee tribe, (*Cherokee Nation v Georgia*, 1831) offers another example of Jackson's use of presidential power. Finally the rechartering of the Bank of the United States in 1832 displayed his presidential power.

Against the view that Jackson's presidency was a turning-point, candidates may mention other presidents. Examples are: Washington (1789-1797). Washington, as first president, laid down the basis of the presidency. He ensured that the position would be primarily that of head of state, above party. Candidates may take an alternative turning-point. They may cite Lincoln (1861-1865) who increased greatly presidential power. He exploited his position as commander-in-chief to call up troops in 1861. He also used presidential power to preserve the Union such as suspension of Habeas Corpus. As Schlesinger points out in 'The Imperial Presidency', Lincoln established the basis of modern presidential power. They may also mention US Grant (1869-1877), who enforced Reconstruction on the former Confederate states. Whatever turning-point is highlighted candidates are expected to cover the whole period from 1787 to 1877.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

**Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980**

- 28 'African Americans played little part in gaining their civil rights.' How far do you agree with this view from 1865 to 1980?**

Focus: Assessment of the development of African American Rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess the role of African Americans in gaining their own civil rights. Candidates are likely to mention Booker T Washington for the 1890s era, Marcus Garvey in the 1920s, A Philip Randolph for the 1940s and Martin Luther King and Malcolm X for the 1950s and 1960s.

Candidates may mention in particular the role of King and the Civil Rights Movement in the late 1950s and early 1960s - Bus Boycotts, Freedom Rides, Marches etc. All these acts helped raise the national and international profile of the plight of African Americans.

To support the view candidates may mention the role of the Federal Government (President, Congress and Supreme Court). They may state that that real progress was made only when the three branches of the Federal Government acted on the issue of civil rights. In terms of the President, they may mention FDR in World War II, Truman in desegregating armed forces and creating a Civil Rights Commission, Eisenhower at Little Rock in 1957, JFK over the University of Mississippi in 1961-2 and LBJ in Civil Rights legislation of 1964-5. Candidates may also mention actions of US Supreme Court on segregation in 1950s and 1960s.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

- 29 To what extent was the New Deal era (1933 to 1945) the most important turning-point in the development of trade union rights, in the period 1865 to 1980?**

Focus: Assessment of a turning-point in development of trade union rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess the New Deal era as a turning-point in trade union rights. In the 1933-1941 era Unions received rights under the National Industrial Recovery Act 1933 in terms of implementing the Blue Eagle code. In the Wagner Act of 1935 unions received full Federal recognition and gained the rights of collective bargaining. The 1938 Labour Standards Act allowed for Federal supervision of certain industrial disputes in an arbitration capacity. Also the New Deal era saw a rapid growth in trade union membership culminating in the creation of the Congress of Industrial Organisations. Candidates may also mention that trade unions benefited from participation in many New Deal initiatives such as the WPA. During the Second World War, trade unions worked closely with the Federal Government and employers in developing the US war economy. Candidates may mention that following this period trade union rights declined, in particular with the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, during the Truman administration. Alternative turning- points might include: the 1860s down to the Haymarket Affair of 1886 (i.e. 1869 foundation of Knights of Labour and 1881 Gompers' American Federation of Labour) or the 1960s (i.e. 1962 foundation of National Farmworkers' Association, 1963 Equal Pay Act, 1964 end of discrimination in jobs, 1968 Age Discrimination Act).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.



**30 To what extent was the USA a 'melting pot' of different ethnic groups in the period 1865 to 1980?**

Focus: To assess the concept of the 'melting pot' and the idea of civil rights' equality in the USA.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess the idea of the 'melting pot' as stated in the specification. They may state that the US allegedly is a society made up of immigrants from a wide variety of countries, cultures and ethnic groups. Under the mantle of the US Constitution, and in particular, the Bill of Rights of 1791, they are all guaranteed civil rights. However, certain groups have, over time, missed out on this idea. African Americans, Native Americans, Asian and Hispanic Americans have all suffered ethnic discrimination. For much of the period and for a variety of reasons these groups faced discrimination in education, housing, employment etc. It could be argued that from the 1950s, discrimination began to recede. Supreme Court judgement against racial discrimination in the 1950s and 1960s and in favour of women's and gay rights in the 1970s meant that by 1980 the US was a melting pot. Also Congressional legislation, in particular, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ended most discrimination on ethnic and gender grounds.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History (7835)  
Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3873)  
June 2009 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2580	Raw	60	42	36	31	26	21	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2581	Raw	60	42	36	31	26	21	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2582	Raw	60	42	36	31	26	21	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2583	Raw	45	33	29	25	21	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2584	Raw	45	33	29	25	21	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2585	Raw	45	33	29	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2586	Raw	45	34	31	28	25	22	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2587	Raw	90	65	59	53	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2588	Raw	90	65	59	53	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2589	Raw	90	65	59	53	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2590	Raw	120	85	76	67	58	50	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2591	Raw	120	85	76	67	58	50	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2592	Raw	90	71	63	55	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2593	Raw	90	70	62	54	47	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3835	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7835	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total Number of Candidates</b>
<b>3835</b>	29.3	60.3	81.8	93.9	99.3	100.0	3365
<b>7835</b>	25.0	55.6	81.0	95.2	99.5	100.0	12823

**16188 candidates aggregated this series**

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**