

GCE A2
History
Summer 2009

Mark Schemes

Issued: October 2009

**NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION (GCSE)
AND NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION (GCE)**

MARK SCHEMES (2009)

Foreword

Introduction

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

The Purpose of Mark Schemes

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of 16- and 18-year-old students in schools and colleges. The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

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

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

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

The Council hopes that the mark schemes will be viewed and used in a constructive way as a further support to the teaching and learning processes.

CONTENTS

	Page
A2 1: Module 4	1
A2 2: Module 5	33
A2 3: Module 6	59



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
Summer 2009**

History

Assessment Unit A2 1

assessing

Module 4

[A2H11]

WEDNESDAY 13 MAY, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

Level of response mark grid

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

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

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

AO2 In relation to historical context:

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

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

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers may provide an incomplete description about Philip II's contribution to Spain's cultural achievements in the period 1556–1592. Answers may refer to the work of Cervantes, Lope de Vega, St. Teresa or El Greco. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may refer to Philip II's attitude to culture and religion or write in general, descriptive terms on aspects of Spanish culture as expressed, perhaps, in the work of Cervantes, Lope de Vega, St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross or El Greco but there will be limited analysis of the issue raised in the question. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers may be one sided and deal exclusively with Philip's contribution. They may argue that Philip was a lover of books and art. He was a passionate collector of paintings and a generous patron. In fact, Spain's Golden Age of Culture is associated with his reign. Philip's promotion of the Counter-Reformation in Spain may have helped to nourish the Spanish mystical tradition expressed in the work of Teresa and St. John of the Cross. However, Philip preferred less ornamental structures and patronised architects such as Juan de Herrera who erected imposing structures of gloomy and pompous grandeur, in keeping with Philip's own spirit and temperament. In general, the Inquisition and the censorship measures of 1558–1559 cut off Spain from the mainstream of European culture and created a Counter-Reformation cultural fortress. The supply of foreign books was curtailed and Spaniards were prohibited from studying abroad. Philip failed to appreciate the genius of El Greco. Philip II's contribution to Spain's cultural achievements can therefore be seen as both positive and negative. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will discuss other factors which contributed to Spain’s cultural achievements in this period. The replacement of Valdes as Inquisitor General by Cardinal Espinosa in 1566 led to some modification of the earlier severity. This was accelerated under Cardinal Quiroga after 1573. The defeat of the Turks at Lepanto and the successful clampdown on new Protestant ideas led to a relaxation and confidence, especially in Castile. The fusion of earlier Renaissance and Counter-Reformation ideals stirred writers in philosophy and literature. Quiroga ordered the acquittal of Luis de Leon and extended his protection to an important group of scholars – Montano, Brocense and de Salinas who introduced modern methods of scholarship into Spanish intellectual life. He allowed acceptance of the Copernican revolution. The ecclesiastical authorities of Toledo and the Castilian grandees of the region appreciated the genius of El Greco: Toledo was the spiritual centre of Spanish Catholicism and this proved the perfect setting for El Greco’s work. Intellectual contacts between Flanders and Spain and especially between Italy and Spain remained very close. Answers will be very well informed and present a balanced conclusion. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may provide a narrative of a few of the internal problems Philip II faced as ruler of Spain but they may not directly address the issue raised in the question. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may, for example, focus solely on Philip's personal rule but provide little knowledge or understanding of the other internal problems he faced (factions, the revolt of the Moriscos, the Perez Affair or the revolt of Aragon). Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will begin to assess how effectively Philip II dealt with the internal problems he faced. Philip II was a hard working and conscientious ruler who, however, found it difficult to delegate power and spent much of his time working on administrative detail rather than formulating policy. Philip's rule encouraged factions and answers are likely to argue that this did not lead to effective government since Philip's court became notorious for the bitterness of its faction fights. A notable example of this is the Perez Affair. Antonio Perez became one of Philip's most powerful secretaries and enjoyed considerable influence over the management of government. He became head of the Eboli faction which sought a negotiated settlement of the Netherlands and an "Aragonese" federalist solution to Spain's governmental problems. Perez sold state secrets and may have even been conducting serious negotiations with the Dutch rebels and conspiring to secure the Portuguese throne for the princess of Eboli rather than Philip. Philip responded by ordering his arrest in 1579. Perez was discredited, arrested each time he caused problems and was ultimately forced to flee to France. It could be argued that the growth of factions poisoned the whole system of government in Spain and contributed to the revolt of the Moriscos (1568–1570) and the revolt in Aragon (1591–1592). Philip in some respects provoked the revolt of the Moriscos and did not deal effectively with it. Fearing that the Moriscos of Granada might help a Turkish invasion of Spain, he issued a royal decree in 1567 which brought to an end official toleration of 'Moorish' ways. This led to a revolt which proved difficult to crush and lasted for two years. It revealed the poor state of preparedness of the royal forces and Philip's most successful commander, the Count of Tendilla, was deprived of his command due to the intrigues of his enemies. Eventually, however, the royal troops prevailed. Answers may conclude that Philip dealt effectively with the revolt in Aragon. This revolt was due to deep-seated problems. The upper classes

distrusted the Castilian influence on royal policy and insisted on the maintenance of the Kingdom's privileges. This came to a head when the King's principal minister in Aragon (Count of Chinchon) was replaced by the non-Aragonese Marquis of Almenara and the upper classes feared a further loss of freedom. Philip sent an army of 12,000 men and crushed the revolt. The ringleaders were killed. While Philip secured the right to appoint non-Aragonese viceroys and dismiss the Justicia, he issued a general pardon and decided to leave Aragon in an essentially semi-autonomous state. This combination of toughness and compromise proved successful and Philip did not encounter any more trouble from Aragon. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will discuss how effectively Philip II responded to the various internal crises he faced and reach a clear, reasoned conclusion, supported by appropriate evidence. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

30

AVAILABLE
MARKS

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may provide a general outline of some aspects of Spanish foreign policy but be unable to relate the description to the demands of the question. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may display limited knowledge about the role economic considerations played in Philip II's foreign policy towards France and the Netherlands. Answers at the top of this level may begin to refer to some of the other issues such as religion and dynastic factors. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more comprehensive analysis of the relative importance of economic considerations in explaining Spanish foreign policy towards France and the Netherlands. They may argue that the Netherlands was one of Spain's most prized possessions and represented the economically innovative part of Philip II's inheritance. Answers may also argue that, against the background of economic troubles at home, Philip II became increasingly reliant on the taxes on sales from the Netherlands. Answers at this level may also begin to discuss the importance of religious considerations, showing how Spain, a Catholic country, saw the rebellion of Protestant rebels in the northern Netherlands as a religious revolt. There is no doubt that Philip II had very strong views on the religious policies to be implemented in the Netherlands and was unwilling to change the heresy laws. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that Philip sometimes reached agreements with princes who did not subscribe to the Catholic faith and in 1566–1567 used a Lutheran army to put down a Calvinist uprising in the Netherlands. In fact, he even offered financial inducements to the head of the French Huguenots, Henry of Navarre, in 1583–1584 to engage in military conflict with Henry III of France who was Catholic. Answers may also begin to explore dynastic influences on Philip's foreign policy. In France, for example, it could be argued that he pursued a traditional dynastic foreign policy to ensure a Habsburg succession through his third wife, Elizabeth de Valois. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will compare the relative importance of economic considerations in influencing Spanish foreign policy towards France and the Netherlands in relation to other factors and justify their conclusions with appropriate evidence. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

60

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative or recall some of the terms of the Treaty of Ryswick of 1697. These answers will be generalised (AO1b). The answers will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will have difficulty consistently engaging with the question on its own terms, focusing in a descriptive manner on the terms of the Treaty or the actions of Louis XIV and the reaction of his opponents before or after the war. Answers at this level may communicate some knowledge of the extent to which France's opponents achieved their war aim of checking French ascendancy. Some of the following powers will be considered: Austria, Spain, German rulers such as the Electors of Bavaria and the Palatinate, and England (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a)

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be able to show that France's ascendancy was checked but not decisively ended. France chose to conclude the war and made major concessions to its opponents. It conceded the Palatinate to William of Neuberg; Cologne to Prince Clement of Bavaria; Lorraine to its original powers: Luxembourg, Charleroi, Mons, Courtrai and Barcelona to Spain; many of the gains made by the reunion policies were returned; and, finally, France had to recognise William as King of England, withdraw support for James II and return Canadian conquests. All these concessions went a large way to meeting the specific war aims of France's opponents. But ascendancy was not ended for France still came out of the war holding on to some of its recent acquisitions: Strasbourg, Alsace, Metz, Toulon, Verdun and Franche Comté (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers will cover most of the points mentioned in Level 3 and reach relevant conclusions about the extent to which the aims of France’s opponents (to end the hegemony of France) were met. Underlying fears of French ascendancy were not removed. France had not been successfully resisted militarily; it had not lost the war. France ended it early in order to be better placed to secure a share in the Spanish Succession. Answers at this level would be expected to range beyond 1697 showing how France sought to increase its power by securing a share in the Spanish Empire. The War of Spanish Succession shows that much more had to be done by France’s opponents to end French ascendancy and it took over 10 years of warfare to accomplish this. The answer will be well informed (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may present an incomplete narrative of Marlborough's campaigns (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation and legibility. (AO1a)

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level will have more detail and focus on Marlborough's successes and know some of the reasons for them. There will be an awareness that after 1708 Marlborough's achievements were less spectacular and, in the case of Malplaquet, even debated (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a)

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers may argue that each of Marlborough's great successes were achieved before 1708 and that this year can be regarded as a turning point in his career. Examples are: saving the United Provinces by clearing the river lines of the Spanish Netherlands of French troops in 1702, Blenheim, Ramillies and Oudenarde. Answers at the top of this level should directly engage with the quotation and demonstrate that even in 1708 it might be claimed that, while Oudenarde was technically a battle victory, it did not much advance the allied cause strategically and that hereafter Marlborough's tactics were to erode French positions on the northern frontier by sieges and manoeuvres. However, there were no defeats after 1708 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers should assess the nature of Marlborough's success before and after 1708 and assess to what extent this year was a turning point in his campaigns against France. Before 1708 Marlborough sought to achieve dramatic battle victories and impose terms on France but after 1708 he seemed to settle for less spectacular progress by a war of attrition which bore little fruit even though there were no defeats. However, Marlborough experienced no success in 1703, 1705 and 1707, while his 1709–1711 campaigns yielded a string of fortresses and the famous "Ne Plus Ultra" campaign of which Marlborough was personally most proud (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b [22]

AO1a [8]

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers will offer a description of some of the terms of the peace of Utrecht that ended the War of the Spanish Succession but may be unable to relate the descriptions to the demands of the question. These answers may be inaccurate and offer only basic knowledge and limited understanding (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers may know more of the terms of the treaties of Utrecht and make some attempt to relate knowledge to the question. There should be an appreciation that France's opponents wanted a balance of power by a reduction of France's power (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a)

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers should show how the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht affected the balance of power. The ascendancy of France was ended. France lost many of its colonial gains in North America and was exhausted from the long years of war. France returned Nice, Savoy and all conquests on the right bank of the Rhine. France had been checked militarily. Also, its ally in the war, Spain, was much reduced, losing Gelderland, Gibraltar, Minorca, Naples, Sardinia and the Spanish Netherlands. All these territories went to the powers of the Grand Alliance, especially England and Austria who were correspondingly strengthened. Thus, France's enemies were strengthened while it was weakened (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers will be well informed and will be able to finely judge whether a proper balance of power had been achieved by the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713. Answers at this level may question if a stable balance of power had been achieved. France was not humiliated in Europe, losing very little, and Spain did retain its Bourbon monarch and its overseas empire. The Electors of Cologne and Bavaria were restored. Although all the powers of the Grand Alliance had gained, they had fallen out over the peace process and all of them, the Dutch in particular, had been weakened by war. This made a united front against France and its allies

very difficult (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

60

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative of Louis XVI and the crisis in France in 1789. (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar. (AO1a)

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level will have more relevant detail and will start to assess to what extent the weaknesses of Louis XVI were to blame for the crisis in France in 1789. They could start to refer to some of his actions, e.g. calling the Estates-General in 1789. Candidates may also refer to other causes such as economic problems and political unrest. (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a)

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will examine the extent to which the weaknesses of Louis XVI were to blame for the crisis in France in 1789 in relation to other relevant factors. Candidates could refer to some of the following points: mistakes made by the King, unpopular ministers, royal finances and the role of the Third Estates. By 1789 France was on the verge of bankruptcy which was linked to the failure to modernise the ancien regime. Candidates could also refer to the role of Necker and Comte Renou which along with the taxation problem forced the King to summons the Estates-General in 1789. They could also refer to the influence of the Enlightenment and discuss to what extent the growing demands for political reforms and a Constitution contributed to the crisis of 1789 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be more comprehensive. They will clearly evaluate the importance of the role played by the weaknesses of Louis XVI in relation to other relevant factors that eventually led to the 1789 revolution. Good responses could refer to growing opposition from the nobility from 1789 onwards which increased pressure upon the King and his government to take effective action. By 1788 the French treasury was in crisis, whilst France was hit by poor harvests and this, along with the poor taxation system, forced Louis XVI to recall the Estates-General. The meeting of the Estates-General in May 1789 led quickly to

the Tennis Court Oath, the National Assembly and the dismissal of Necker. The authority of the King had been weakened by his own actions and poor decisions which contributed to the crisis in France by 1789. Finally good candidates could point out how the financial problems of Louis XVI combined with growing economic problems such as poor harvests led to growing political unrest across many sections of French society by 1789. The King's role as an absolute monarch and his actions undermined support for his regime during the crisis in France in 1789. (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative of the main events between 1793 and 1799 with references to the role of the war (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar. (AO1a)

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level will have more relevant detail and will start to indicate to what extent war was the greatest problem facing revolutionary governments in France during this period. Candidates may start to refer to other problems such as political unrest and the economic difficulties facing France (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a)

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will examine the extent to which war was the most important problem facing revolutionary governments between 1793 and 1799. In 1793 the king was executed and a committee for public safety set up to mobilize France for war. There were royalist revolts in the Vendee and the Sans Culottes emerged as a political force when they protested at food prices due to war. Candidates should refer to some of the other problems facing revolutionary governments such as the terror, the risings of 1795, the failure of the Directory and the growing role of the army by 1799. From 1793 onwards war had helped to bring about radical political changes in how France was governed and created economic problems which led to social unrest. War also increased the power and political influence of the army, allowing Napoleon to seize power in 1799 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level should fully discuss the extent to which war was the greatest problem facing revolutionary governments between 1793 and 1799. Between 1793 and 1795 revolutionary governments had to deal with political divisions, uprisings and the efforts of the terror which made France very unstable at a time it was also fighting a war. From 1795 to 1799 the Directory had to deal with a range of problems that affected its stability such as economic crisis, the legacy of the terror, political divisions as well as war which increased the influence of the army by 1799. Good responses could also note that revolutionary governments had to win the war to ensure the survival of the new republic which led to drastic measures being used by the army and National Guard. The royalist threat remained and the constitution of 1795 led to deep divisions over how France should be governed, e.g. the Jacobins. From 1795 the Directory enjoyed

military success but political failure in domestic affairs, e.g. unpopular economic policies. The best responses will be aware that war was a major problem for all revolutionary governments, but other problems affected stability throughout this period (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers will provide little more than a narrative about Napoleon I's domestic policies in this period (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar. (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level will have more relevant detail about Napoleon I's religious policies. They may start to discuss in a limited manner whether some of these policies were more successful than his other domestic policies in this period (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be better informed and examine to what extent that Napoleon's religious policies were the most successful aspect of his domestic policies. Good responses will discuss his main religious policies such as the Concordat with the Catholic Church in 1800, his recognition of the Pope's position in 1801 in return for the Church not demanding the return of their lands. In 1804 the Pope even attended the Coronation of Napoleon as Emperor. However, the Catholic Church was not always happy with Napoleon's religious policies. In 1802 he guaranteed religious toleration in the Organic Articles and in 1806 Napoleon standardised the church catechism and introduced a St. Napoleon day. Relations with the church reached their lowest point in 1808 when he imprisoned the Pope and annexed the Papal Estates. Overall his religious policies were not a complete success, especially in the later years of his reign. Good responses could also refer to other aspects of his domestic policies such as his education reforms, the Civil Code, the centralisation of government, the economy and the importance of the 1799 Constitution (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be more comprehensive. They should be fully aware of the extent to which his religious policy was the most successful aspect of Napoleon's domestic policies. Some candidates may claim that his religious policies shared a common trait with many of his other domestic policies, i.e. that in his early years in power his policies were successful before becoming less successful in the latter years of his rule. Some candidates may argue that his administrative changes which revolutionised how France was governed represented his most successful policy or that his economic policies with the creation of a Central Treasury from 1800 constituted his most successful policy. They could also refer to the importance of his legal reforms, e.g. the best

responses will have a full awareness of Napoleon's religious policies and his other domestic policies across the whole period to reach a sustained judgement (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

60

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Level 1 answers may provide a narrative account of Austro-Prussian relations during part of this period and may focus entirely on events after 1862. They may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will begin to address the issues raised by the question but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may refer to Bismarck's diplomacy in the years leading up to the Austro-Prussian War but may not directly discuss the extent to which Bismarck's appointment as Minister-President in 1862 marked the major turning point in Austro-Prussian relations. Answers at this level are likely to pay insufficient attention to relations between the two powers in the period 1848–62. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more detailed analysis of Austro-Prussian relations during this period. The majority of answers will adopt a chronological approach and this is perfectly acceptable as long as they present an argument as opposed to a narration of events. After the revolutions of 1848, Austria re-established the German Diet in Frankfurt in May 1850 and achieved a notable triumph over Prussia in Olmütz in December of the same year. However, the 1850s witnessed a series of setbacks for Austria at the expense of Prussia. The first was the Crimean War. Bismarck succeeded in persuading the Diet in Frankfurt that it was not in German interests to mobilise an army in support of Austria against Russia in the Crimea, despite Austria's request to the Diet in January 1855. This was particularly significant because it was the first time that Austria found itself isolated in the Frankfurt Diet. Another landmark occurred in October 1858 when Crown Prince William became regent of Prussia in place of his terminally ill brother, Frederick William IV. William was deeply distrustful of Austria and wanted to gain revenge for the humiliation of Olmütz. The Italian War of 1859 constituted another turning point in Austro-Prussian relations. Against the background of a war between France and Austria in Italy, Prussia made its support for Austria dependent on it taking control of the armies on the Rhine if France launched an attack. The failure of Austria to give in to this demand resulted in its loss of Lombardy in July 1859. This not only weakened the prestige of Austria but led to a further deterioration in its relations with Prussia. The shortcomings identified in Prussia's mobilisation in

1859 led to the introduction of reforms in the Prussian army which laid the basis for its military success over Austria in 1866. Against this background, it is clear that Prussia had already achieved a measure of political dominance over Austria before Bismarck's appointment as Minister-President in 1862. At the same time, Bismarck was without doubt the greatest politician of his day and answers may give examples of his diplomatic skill. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will present a clear and coherent argument about the extent to which Bismarck's appointment as Prussian Minister-President in 1862 can be regarded as the major turning point in Austro-Prussian relations. Answers at this level may adopt a thematic rather than chronological approach, discussing perhaps whether Prussia's growing economic dominance over Austria after 1848 was a more significant influence over Austro-Prussian relations than changes in political leadership. They may also refer to economic landmarks in Austro-Prussian relations during this period, referring perhaps to Bruck's unsuccessful attempt to establish a rival customs union to the Zollverein in 1851 and Prussia's success in renewing the Zollverein for a further twelve years on 1 January 1866 despite opposition from Austria. Answers may refute the proposition advanced in the question, arguing perhaps that Prussia's response to the Italian War of 1859 was a more important turning point in its relations with Austria than Bismarck's appointment in September 1862. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b	[22]	
AO1a	[8]	

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may provide a narrative about Prussia's military superiority in the period 1862–1871, making little or no reference to economic factors. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will begin to assess to what extent Prussia's military dominance was due to its economic strength but there will be gaps in knowledge. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more detailed analysis of the extent to which Prussia's military superiority was due to its economic strength. The best answers at this level should demonstrate a link between Prussia's growing economic dominance and its military superiority. Prussia was fortunate to have coal supplies and its strong economic position was based on a significant increase in coal production which meant that by 1870 it produced three times as much coal as Austria. A key factor which promoted German economic expansion was the Zollverein, from which, of course, its key rival Austria was excluded. Its share of world manufacturing output rose from 3.5 per cent in 1830 to 4.9 per cent in 1860. Its population rose from 15.1 million in 1841 to 19.5 million in 1866. In 1865–1866 only 45 per cent of Prussians but 70 per cent of Austrians still worked on the land. While Prussia's finances in 1866 were on a sound footing, the national debt in Austria trebled between 1848 and 1866. Its railway network expanded rapidly. In 1841 it had just 375 kilometres of railways. By 1847 this figure had gone up to 2,325, by 1860 it was 5,762 and by 1865 this had risen to 6,895. The development of railways contributed significantly to Prussia's military superiority because it enabled troops and military equipment to be transported swiftly to the battlefield. In fact, some railways were built for military reasons. Similarly, Prussia's superior weaponry (especially the needle-gun which made an important contribution to its victory in the Austro-Prussian War in 1866) was also at least partly the result of its economic strength. Answers at this level should begin to mention the 'non-economic' factors which contributed to Prussia's military superiority such as the very important role played by Helmuth von Moltke, who took up the post of Prussia's Chief of Staff in 1858, and the part played by General Albrecht von Roon, who was appointed as Prussian War Minister in 1859. Reference should also be made to the excellence of Prussia's political leadership, quoting perhaps a few examples of Bismarck's diplomatic skill. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will provide a clear and coherent argument about the extent to which Prussia’s economic strength was responsible for its military superiority. Answers at this level will have more detail on ‘non-economic factors’. In terms of political leadership, Prussia was very well served by Otto von Bismarck. He was the leading politician of his day and his Austrian counterparts were no match for him. Prussia’s military leaders were also of a very high calibre. Helmuth von Moltke distinguished himself as Prussian Chief of General Staff and played a very important part in Prussia’s military success in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. He established a body whose task was to organise the transportation of troops to the battlefield, making effective use of the railway network. This proved very successful and Prussia mobilised its troops more quickly than the Austrians. Answers should also discuss the importance of General Albrecht von Roon in modernising the Prussian army. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, show understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantial judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Level 1 answers may provide little more than a narrative about the steps by which German unification came about, making little reference to the issue raised in the question. Answers may contain some superficiality and generalisations. They will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will make a number of relevant points but there will be gaps in knowledge. They may give some examples of Bismarck's diplomatic skills, referring perhaps to the Schleswig-Holstein question or the Hohenzollern Candidature Crisis, but may make only passing reference to the 'unusually favourable international climate' in the 1860s. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will make a more detailed analysis of the extent to which Bismarck's diplomatic skills and the unusually favourable international climate were responsible for German unification. Answers at this level will provide a range of examples in discussing the issue raised by the question. They may refer to the Danish War to illustrate Bismarck's diplomatic skills, noting perhaps that he himself regarded this as his greatest diplomatic triumph. It is certainly true that during this war he adhered rigidly to international treaties to avoid giving the powers any pretext for intervention. Similarly, Bismarck succeeded in portraying France as the aggressor in the Franco-Prussian War. Answers may focus on the Ems telegram and Bismarck's motives for editing it, referring perhaps to his claim in 1892 that the changes he made to the telegram were designed to provoke a war with France. Answers may also discuss to what extent Bismarck's skilful diplomacy was responsible for Napoleon III's failure to support Austria in the Austro-Prussian War. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Bismarck was certainly helped by the very favourable international climate during the 1860s. Answers may illustrate this by reference to the Danish War, the Austro-Prussian War and the Franco-Prussian War. For example, in the Danish War Britain's inclination was to help Denmark but this sympathy was largely lost as a result of Denmark's refusal to consider the partition of Schleswig. France's interests were not directly affected by the conflict and it hoped that the other powers would be weakened by their involvement in the war. Russia had sympathy with Denmark but expressed concern at the increasingly radical stance adopted by the Danish Government. In addition, Russia wanted to remain on good terms with Austria and Prussia following the Polish insurrection of 1863. Answers may also illustrate the 'unusually favourable international climate in the 1860s' by referring to the

unwillingness of the powers to become involved in the Austro-Prussian War. They may refer to the breakdown of the Austro-Russian alliance in the Crimean War, British suspicions of France due to Napoleon's acquisition of Nice and Savoy and the tense relations between France and Austria after France's support for Italian ambitions concerning Venetia. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will be very well informed and display clarity of argument. They will compare the relative importance of the 'unusually favourable international climate in the 1860s' and Bismarck's 'skilful diplomacy' in bringing about German unification. While it does not matter what conclusions answers reach, essays at this level should do justice to both sides of the argument. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

30

Option 4

60

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

(Answer **two** questions)

1 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:

Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level will provide a superficial account of German foreign policy in the period 1919–1941 (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will be more detailed and begin to discuss foreign policy under Weimar or Hitler but there will be gaps in knowledge or a lack of focus on the question (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be better informed and will address the question in a more confident manner, providing a satisfactory assessment of the level of consistency in German foreign policy in the period 1919–1941. Answers at this level should discuss both Weimar and Nazi foreign policy but they may lack balance with one area predominating or they may fail to address the whole time period in question, perhaps omitting 1929–1933 or 1939–1941. Candidates may refer to some of the common and consistent aims that Weimar and Nazi Germany shared such as the desire to reverse the Treaty of Versailles, the desire for rearmament and expansion to the East and the desire to regain lost territory and unite all German speakers. Candidates could also discuss how there were some differences in aims such as Hitler's racial theories and his desire to expand beyond the pre-1918 borders to create Lebensraum in the East. The answers may additionally discuss the differences in the methods used in Weimar and Nazi foreign policies. Weimar largely attempted to cooperate with the Western powers, adopting the policy of fulfilment under Wirth and Stresemann and joining the League of Nations in 1926, while Hitler followed a much more aggressive policy, leaving the League of Nations in October 1933 and becoming increasingly annexationist in the late 1930s. Top-level answers may begin to discuss the similarities in methods such as the desire to have good relations with Britain (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will address the extent to which German foreign policy in the period 1919–1941 was consistent in a more comprehensive and confident manner. Candidates must discuss the foreign policies of both Weimar and Nazi Germany and cover the whole time period in question. Candidates should demonstrate that there are clear similarities in both the aims and methods of Weimar and Nazi foreign policy while also discussing the differences. Both Weimar and Nazi Germany saw the revision of Versailles as a major policy aim. However, while Weimar politicians predominately attempted to work with the western powers to gradually bring about treaty revision, Hitler was much more aggressive and deliberately broke the Treaty of Versailles on numerous occasions such as the declaration of rearmament, the invasion of the Rhineland and the annexation of Austria. Both regimes were clearly nationalist with Stresemann advocating Eastern expansion in his letter to the Crown Prince, Brüning proposing a Customs-Union with Austria, von Papen embarking on secret rearmament in 1932 and Hitler actively pursuing territory in the East. Candidates should demonstrate that Hitler clearly did not want to be confined to the frontiers of Imperial Germany and that his quest for Lebensraum, the desire to eradicate European Jewry and Bolshevism and to eventually compete with the USA for world domination were not consistent with the aims of Weimar politicians. The methods used in carrying out their foreign policies while having some similarities also clearly diverged when Hitler got involved in the Spanish Civil War and undertook the aggressive occupations of the Rhineland, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland. Candidates can examine the question chronologically or thematically but clear links/differences between Weimar and Nazi Germany must be established (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

2 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Answers will provide a superficial account of Hitler's foreign policy in the period, perhaps describing key events, e.g. invasion of the Rhineland, Austrian Anschluss (AO1b). The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will be more detailed and start to present more relevant details on foreign policy, perhaps giving a partial account of some of the successes and failures of Hitler's foreign policy (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar and punctuation, and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be better informed and will address the question in a more confident manner, beginning to provide a satisfactory assessment of the degree of success Hitler experienced in his foreign policy. However, answers at this level may lack balance, perhaps omitting a key phase such as 1939–1941 or focusing primarily on either success or failure. Up to the invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 Hitler experienced many successes such as overturning the military and territorial limitations of Versailles through rearming, occupying the Rhineland, completing the Anschluss with Austria and the occupation of the Sudetenland following the Munich Conference. He also experienced failures such as the failure to produce a deeper alliance with Britain following the Ribbentrop mission to London, the failed attempt to complete an Anschluss with Austria and the error of focusing on an alliance with Japan rather than China despite the advice of Neurath. The years 1939–1941 could also be discussed with examples of both success and failure. The invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 was successful in gaining territory but undoubtedly saw the end of the policy of appeasement by both Britain and France. There were military successes over Poland, Holland, Belgium and France yet failure to conquer Britain in 1940. The invasion of Russia in 1941 was the beginning of Hitler's attempt to fulfil his aim of gaining Lebensraum in the East and to destroy Bolshevism. However, this proved to be a major drain on resources and ultimately led to a two-front war which Hitler had always wanted to avoid (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Level 4 answers will be more comprehensive and will discuss the successes and failures before and after the invasion of Czechoslovakia in a more confident manner. Candidates may choose to make a link with Hitler’s overall objectives such as removing Versailles, creating a Greater Germany by uniting all German speakers, gaining alliances and expansion to the East. Answers may demonstrate that Hitler experienced both success and failure in his foreign policy such as gaining alliances with Italy and Japan which seemed beneficial before the outbreak of war but which proved to be disappointing. The Munich conference of 1938 ceded the Sudetenland to Germany without a shot being fired yet left Hitler upset that he had been denied his racial war with Czechoslovakia. The Nazi-Soviet Pact and the subsequent invasion of Poland left Hitler allied with the country he hated the most and at war with the power he admired the most. By the end of 1940 Hitler had defeated Denmark, Holland, Norway and France yet he had failed to defeat Britain which proved to have long-term significance in the war. By the end of 1941 Hitler had embarked on his ideologically driven invasion of the USSR but by December German troops were on the retreat from Moscow and Hitler’s alliance with Japan had led to his involvement in war with the USA (AO1b). The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b

[22]

AO1a

[8]

30

AVAILABLE
MARKS

3 This question targets:

- (i) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.
- (ii) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

Indicative content:**Level 1 AO1b ([1]–[5]), AO1a ([1]–[2])**

Answers will provide a superficial account on the failure of the League of Nations. (AO1b) The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar (AO1a).

Level 2 AO1b ([6]–[11]), AO1a ([3]–[4])

Level 2 answers will be more detailed and start to appreciate the significance of the role of the League of Nations (AO1b). The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling; grammar and punctuation, and legibility (AO1a).

Level 3 AO1b ([12]–[17]), AO1a ([5]–[6])

Level 3 answers will be better informed and will address the question in a more confident manner, providing a satisfactory assessment of some examples of the failure of the League of Nations to enforce collective security in this period. The idea of collective security was flawed from the start. The machinery of the League was clumsy and slow with any action taken by the League having to be agreed unanimously. If action was to be taken this would be in the form of economic sanctions, which would not only hurt the aggressor and which could not stop countries outside of the League from trading with the aggressive power. As a last resort the member countries of the League could agree to joint military action. However, this idea was flawed due to the lack of a permanent armed force. Candidates could discuss how the Manchurian Crisis of 1931 highlighted the weaknesses of collective security. When confronted with the aggressive actions of one of its own member states, indeed one of the four permanent Council members, the League appeared powerless. It had been slow to react, due to its cumbersome machinery for handling disputes and due also to the impact of the economic crisis at the time. It also found itself very short of military forces from its leading members in this remote area and unable to react effectively once Japan resigned from the League. The Italian invasion of Abyssinia could also be discussed as a demonstration of the weakness of collective security. On this occasion the League reacted more swiftly, declaring Italy the aggressor only four days after the invasion began. Economic sanctions were placed on Italy; however, the actions of Britain and France in attempting to negotiate the Hoare-Laval Pact completely undermined the collective response of the League resulting in Italy successfully completing its invasion. Good candidates could also demonstrate other weaknesses in the League of Nations such as the absence of major powers such as the USA, USSR and Germany and its predominately European focus. In addition, answers at the top of this level could begin to discuss other causes of the Second World War such as the Treaty of Versailles or the economic depression, although this will be in an incomplete manner. (AO1b) The answer

will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses (AO1a).

Level 4 AO1b ([18]–[22]), AO1a ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will address the extent that the failure of the League of Nations to enforce collective security led to the outbreak of the Second World War in a more comprehensive and confident manner. Some answers at the bottom of this level may refer to issues such as the League’s handling of the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises which demonstrate the weaknesses of collective security, without explicitly dealing with the issue of collective security itself. In addition, candidates will assess the role played by other causal factors such as the global impact of the Wall St Crash which led to the rise of aggressive nationalism in Germany, Japan and Italy. The depression also severely affected the ability of Britain and France to respond to the actions of the aforementioned states, leading to the policy of appeasement and to the construction of the Maginot line in France. Candidates could discuss the importance of the absence of the USA and USSR from European affairs which arguably allowed Hitler to proceed with his aggressive foreign policy and contributed directly to the policy of appeasement. The development of anti-war feeling could be discussed as could the failure of the Treaty of Versailles to create a firm and lasting settlement in Europe. (AO1b) The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility (AO1a).

AO1b [22]

AO1a [8]

Option 5

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

60

60



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
Summer 2009**

History

Assessment Unit A2 2

assessing

Module 5

[A2H21]

FRIDAY 29 MAY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

Level of response mark grid

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

- AO1a** recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner;
- AO1b** present historical explanations, showing understanding of appropriate concepts, and arrive at substantiated judgements;
- AO2** In relation to historical context:
- interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material;
 - explain and evaluate interpretations of historical events and topics studied.

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

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

Notes concerning Synoptic assessment

1. Examiners should assess the candidate's ability to draw together knowledge and skills in order to demonstrate overall historical understanding. Candidates' answers should demonstrate **breadth** of historical knowledge and understanding by ranging comprehensively across the period of study **as a whole**. They should **make links and comparisons** which are properly developed and analysed and thus indicate understanding of the process of historical change. The emphasis is on continuity and change within the topic, developing a broad overview of the period studied, centred on links and comparison between different aspects of the topic studied. We cannot expect detailed depth of knowledge.
2. The knowledge and understanding of the subject should come from **more than one perspective** – political or cultural or economic – and there should be understanding demonstrated of the **connections or inter-relationship** between these perspectives.
3. The indicative content for each answer is not provided in a “levels of response” format. Examiners should consult the generic levels of response before deciding on the mark to be awarded.

GENERIC LEVELS OF RESPONSE FOR SYNOPTIC ASSESSMENT

Table of marks allocated to each assessment objective in the synoptic essay

Level	AO1a Marks	AO1b Marks	AO2 Marks
1	1–2	1–4	1–3
2	3–4	5–8	4–7
3	5–6	9–13	8–11
4	7–8	14–17	12–15

The generic levels of response should be used in conjunction with the information on the indicative content outlined for each answer.

Level 1

Answers at this level may recall and deploy some accurate knowledge mostly about one part of the period and mostly from one perspective – political, economic or cultural. The answer will be characterised throughout by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar and punctuation, and legibility. **(AO1a)**

Answers may provide information in a descriptive and/or narrative form with limited explanations. There may be a few links and comparisons made between different parts of the periods or perspectives with some understanding of the key historical terms and concepts. Answers may be in the form of assertions and there may be some attempt at illustration or substantiation. **(AO1b)**

There is some recognition of the possibilities of a debate on the subject but the answer may focus on only one interpretation. **(AO2)**

Level 2

Answers at this level may recall and deploy knowledge that is mostly accurate, and drawn from more than one part of the period and from one perspective. The answer will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, the use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar and punctuation, and legibility. **(AO1a)**

Answers may provide some explanations, though with digressions into a descriptive and/or narrative form. There may be some links and comparisons made between different parts of the periods and perspectives, but these may not be fully developed and analysed. There is some understanding of the key historical terms and concepts. Answers may contain assertions that have some appropriate illustration or substantiation. **(AO1b)**

Although there is an awareness of a debate about the subject, the attempt to explain different approaches to, and interpretations of, the events may be generalised or incomplete. **(AO2)**

Level 3

Answers at this level will recall and deploy knowledge accurately about this subject, drawn from all parts of the period. The answer will be characterised by accuracy, good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar and punctuation as well as legibility, though there may be occasional lapses. **(AO1a)**

Answers provide focused explanations and make links and comparisons that are developed and analysed, indicating an understanding of the process of historical change. There is an ability to make connections and identify interrelationships between perspectives. Answers contain judgements that are appropriately illustrated or substantiated. **(AO1b)**

There is a discussion of the subject with an evaluation of alternative interpretations. **(AO2)**

Level 4

Answers at this level will demonstrate accurate recall of the full breadth of historical knowledge across the period as a whole. The answer will be characterised by accuracy, consistently very good organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar and punctuation as well as legibility. **(AO1a)**

Answers provide focused and insightful explanations concerning the period as a whole and make links and comparisons which are properly developed and analysed, indicating good understanding of the process of historical change. The knowledge and understanding of the subject is from more than one perspective and there is full understanding of the connections or inter-relationships between these perspectives. Understanding of the key historical terms and concepts is excellent. Judgements are fully substantiated. **(AO1b)**

There is a full discussion of the subject with an insightful evaluation of alternative interpretations. **(AO2)**

(Answer **one** question)

- 1** This question asks the candidate to consider how important was the role played by governments in establishing and developing colonies in the New World in the period 1500–1600. Candidates need to examine the role played by the governments of both England and Spain in the establishment and development of colonies in the New World across the whole period. They need to compare the roles of both governments and assess the reasons why Spain had more success in the colonisation of the New World in this period. Candidates also need to examine not just the role of governments but need to refer to other relevant factors affecting the colonisation of the New World in this period.
- (a)** How the Spanish colonies were established and administered by the Spanish government.
- The Spanish had the advantage of being early in the setting up of colonies. Their explorers had the opportunity to encounter the seemingly limited possibilities of the Americas without any prior claims having to be acknowledged. Tordeseillas and Pope Alexander VI neutralised the only possible threat to Spanish hegemony in the region, i.e. Portugal.
 - The activities of the conquistadores showed the ease with which conquest could be made and crucially revealed the possibilities of the New World for immediate and long-term monetary and economic gain. The incentive existed for the government of Castile to take and control what was there.
 - The Spanish government was involved in the process from the outset. The original expeditions were government resourced with the crown taking a keen interest in the outcomes.
 - The Spanish crown did not allow the conquistadores to become the arbiters of New World government. Charles V had no wish to see autonomous or semi autonomous settlements developing in the Americas far away from the heart of both Spanish and imperial power. Also when it became apparent that the Americas were to be a key source of wealth for the crown, especially after the discovery of Potosi, then orderly development of the colonies under effective and efficient royal government became even more of a necessity.
 - The establishment of the Council of the Indies and the development of a Castilian form of government there ensured an administration and bureaucracy capable of sustaining structured growth. Criticisms can be levelled at this for stifling local initiative but it meant that the colonies would remain firmly under the control of the crown and would develop according to the crown's wishes.
- (b)** The English attempts to establish colonies in the New World.
- The English had the disadvantage of coming late into the business of colonisation. Exploration had been an “on-off” affair since the time of Henry VII. Attempts at settlement in the New World had to wait until the second half of the sixteenth century. Changed diplomatic and religious circumstances allowed the English to take a new view of outward expansion. As a Protestant country, and no longer in the Spanish orbit, England no longer felt bound by papal brokered treaties or the sensitivities of the Spanish crown. There were now in England individuals who felt empowered to challenge Spain's claims on the other side of the Atlantic.

- (c) Assessment of roles of both governments and other relevant factors.
- A crucial difference between English and Spanish efforts at colonisation was that the former did not have the same degree of state sponsorship as the latter. English attempts in the New World were the result of privately financed initiatives rather than fully crown backed undertakings. Not surprisingly the main motive became profit and the possibility of a quick return on investment. The English attempts in North America lacked any of the ideology of the earlier Spanish moves where profit was at least tempered by a sense of religious mission and the need to treat the New World with a justice akin to that of Europe. It was in this respect that the involvement of the Spanish government and through it the church was so important in ensuring orderly development. This was the case despite the philosophical basis applied to the idea by the likes of John Dee.
 - This lack of crown involvement, of planning and structure even of commitment, made English efforts at the end of the sixteenth century appear haphazard in comparison to what Spain had achieved earlier.
 - There is scope in this question to look at the way in which Spain's presence in the New World developed over the course of the century. Attention would be given to the ways in which the crown assumed control and the nature and structure of imperial government there.
 - On the English side, it would be useful to examine the thinking behind their attempts and recount the difficulties faced, focusing, on the Virginia experience. [40]

40

2 This question asks candidates to consider if political reasons explain overseas rivalry between England and Spain in the course of the sixteenth century. An explanation for the rivalry is multi-causal and the better answers will be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the political, religious and economic reasons of the rivalry. Given the nature of the period, it is difficult to disentangle political and religious motivation. Politics is about the distribution of power and contemporaries believed that power was given to them by God and should be used, in a manner accountable to God, for the furtherance of His work. Another complication is that the rivalry intensified as the century progressed. Overseas rivalry caused, not so much by events that took place overseas, but by events in Europe itself.

- (a) Political reasons for the rivalry could focus on:
- the changing dynastic links between the two countries. Henry VIII divorced Catherine of Aragon, the aunt of Charles V, and Elizabeth refused to marry Philip II. Philip meddled in English politics in order to topple Elizabeth, supporting Mary Stuart, the Revolt of the Northern Earls, the Ridolfi and Babington Plots.
 - During the course of the century the role of France in shaping Anglo-Spanish relations changed. In the first half of the century France was a common enemy that united the two countries but when France was consumed by the Wars of Religion each side interfered in France to further their own interests and this increased tension. For example, Elizabeth interfered in France with the intention of inducing France to intervene in the Netherlands against Spain. Money was given to the Duke of Anjou and troops were sent to the aid of Henry of Navarre for this purpose.

- Whoever controlled the Netherlands was of interest to England because it was the natural invasion route from the continent. The ports of the Netherlands were only a day's sailing away from England. For such interests of national security, England preferred the Netherlands to be largely self-governing. Spain's increasing military presence from the Dutch rebels in the Treaty of Nonsuch (1585) was a trigger for the war between Spain and England. The treaty committed England to sending a force of 6000 under the Earl of Leicester.
 - English privateering raids from Hawkins and Drake in the New World were an attack on Philip's authority and prestige, revealing the vulnerability of his overseas empire and forcing him into costly projects for their defence.
- (b) Religious reasons for the rivalry could include some of the following:
- Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon initiated the English Reformation. This was resisted by Charles V and this added religious differences to the dynastic and political ones.
 - Philip II saw himself as "the sword" of the Catholic Reformation while England saw itself as an "Elect nation". Both countries believed that they had a divine mission to further God's will and work. Philip II supported the papal excommunication of Elizabeth.
 - After the English Reformation, and especially in Elizabeth's reign, Englishmen were no longer prepared to accept the papal division of the non-European world. Their privateering was justified as a response to an injustice while Philip saw the privateers as heretics and their activities added insult to injury. Also he had a sense of mission to "catholicise" the New World.
 - England, a Protestant country, sympathised with the Protestant rebels of the northern Netherlands, while Spain, a Catholic country, saw the rebellion as a religious revolt.
 - Events in France also had religious dimensions. As the Dutch revolt matured Calvinism became identified with resistance. Philip feared a France controlled by the Calvinist Huguenots would be anti-Spanish and would intervene in the Netherlands to support their co-religionists. Similarly, Elizabeth was concerned that France led by the Catholic Guise would support Spain and allow Philip to complete the re-conquest of the Netherlands.
- (c) Economic reasons for the rivalry might mention the following:
- Spain's economic problems: the dependence on pastoral farming; the size of estates; the parasitical nature of the nobility and clergy; the lack of industry; the contempt for commerce; the absence of significant middle class; investment directed towards government bonds or the purchase of titles and offices. The cost of Philip's foreign policies exacerbated this situation. This created a balance of payments problem and also resulted in heavy taxation burdens on the cultivator, craftsmen and merchant. Consequently agriculture and industry were starved of capital. He had an empire to defend; most of it (Sicily, Naples, Milan and the Low Countries) was unwilling to pay for its own defence. In fact, even in Spain only Castile made a substantial contribution. This led to an over-reliance on bullion from the New World. When English privateers raided Spanish treasures it interfered with this lifeline.

- England wanted to expand trade by establishing new markets and sources of raw materials and find new homes for a surplus population. They were not content to let Spain have the New World more or less to itself. England was also concerned for the security of its traditional markets in the Netherlands. It was a market for English exports. Antwerp was the European base for the Merchant Adventurers who controlled the vital woollen trade. [40]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

(Answer **one** question)

1 The answer should examine and explain how Parliament's role and status changed between 1603 and 1702 and if it was an "equal partner" with the Crown after 1660. In general, one would expect candidates to argue that, in some areas, Parliament's role and status had changed considerably; in others change was less significant; and, in a few respects, Parliament remained subordinate to the Crown. Issues of finance, as well as politics and religion, should be mentioned. Some of the following issues are anticipated.

(a) Finance

- *Sole authority for taxation.* In 1603 the King was expected to "live off his own" and could not raise money without the consent of Parliament. This was tested by the early Stuart monarchs but firmly established by Parliament in 1641. Parliament's role and status was expanded further at the Restoration: in 1660, Parliament fixed the King's income at £1.2 million and sought to provide this revenue for him. In the 1690s Parliament provided the king with money for a Civil List out of which he ran the government. They were careful to authorise taxation for a much shorter period of time and by undertaking to guarantee the interest payments of the National Debt they maintained their indispensability. After 1689, Parliament met annually. One might argue that Parliament's power over royal revenue had been transformed.
- *Methods of taxation.* In 1603 Parliament approved the customs at the start of each reign and authorised subsidies to augment ancient forms of royal income. By 1641 Parliament had insisted that the King abandon raising revenue by prerogative methods of revenue. After 1660, Parliament authorised Excise, which first appeared in 1643, and a Land Tax as well which was a variation on the ancient subsidy method of assessing income from property. The Crown was now dependent on Parliament and could not resort to independent sources of income.
- *Appropriation of supply.* Although it appeared radical when this principle was put forward by the 1690s this feature was customary.

(b) Politics

- *Appointment of ministers.* Parliament had no say in this in 1603. By 1700 the Crown was coming under pressure to appoint ministers who could command a majority in the House of Commons but even at this late stage there was no legal obligation to do so.
- *Determination of the succession to the throne.* This had long been a forbidden area for Parliament. There was a failed attempt by Parliament to determine the succession in the Exclusion Crisis of 1679–1681. It was not until 1689 that Parliament was strong enough to stipulate a Protestant Succession on the Bill of Rights and the Hanoverian Succession in the Act of Settlement of 1701.
- *The making of foreign policy.* This was the prerogative of the Crown in 1603 and remained so until the end of the century; but by the Act of Settlement of 1701 Parliament dictated that the Crown could not go to war in defence of its foreign dominions and Parliament was upset when the Partition Treaties of 1698 and 1699 were not shown to them. In 1701 William thought it best to ask Parliament's approval for his treaty of Grand Alliance.

(c) Religion

- *The monarch's religion.* Parliament was helpless to insist on the religion of the monarch before 1660 and was still so by 1685. It was not until the Bill of Rights of 1689 that Parliament insisted that the monarch had to be Protestant.
- *Parliament and the Church of England.* Parliament established (or in its view, re-established) its right to share in the determination of church policy in 1640 when it condemned Laud's canons and asserted the principle that Convocation had no right to bind the church without the consent of Parliament. After 1660, the Clarendon Code, the Test Acts and the Toleration Act of 1689 indicated the supremacy of Parliament over the church, belief and practice. [40]

40

2 The power of the monarchy greatly diminished in the course of the seventeenth century. Answers that reach the highest levels should consider the ways in which the Restoration Settlement might be considered a turning point in the powers and prerogatives of the crown in this period. Having examined this proposition, the best answers will suggest alternative turning points, such as the period covering the first two sessions of the Long Parliament 1640–1642, the “Glorious Revolution” of 1689 or the reign of William III (c. 1690–1702). It would be legitimate to argue that no single period might be called a turning point but that the change in the powers and prerogatives of the monarchy was gradual; or that it was diminished rather erratically with some periods of apparent growth.

(a) The Restoration Settlement 1660–c.1665.

- Since King Charles I had been defeated in the Civil War and executed, and his son and heir had been invited back on terms dictated by Parliament, it might be expected that this settlement marked a crucial point in the downward power of the monarchy. All the reforms passed by Parliament up to the end of the 1641 session were confirmed. The prerogative taxation and courts of Charles I's reign remained illegal. The King could no longer collect taxes without Parliament's consent. The King's permanent revenue was set at a level which would ensure the need for Parliament to meet and vote additional supply. But in the early 1680s, the permanent ordinary revenue actually rose and made the King financially independent of Parliament. Also many fundamental prerogatives of the monarchy remained intact and, indeed, in some ways, the monarchy was even stronger than before.

(b) The “constitutional revolution” of 1640–1641.

- It might be argued that this was a more critical turning point. Successful attempts were made to impose severe limits on royal power. The Triennial Act of 1641 and the Act Against Own Dissolution placed an important restriction on the royal prerogative to control the existence of parliament. This “constitutional revolution” also saw the abolition of the prerogative financial devices and courts. Parliament demanded control of ministerial appointments and the armed forces and a share in controlling the Church of England. However, there were limits to what was achieved in each of these areas in the period 1640–1642. The demand that appointments of royal ministers should be subject to parliamentary approval was never agreed by either the Crown or Parliament. The “Root and Branch” petition that would have abolished episcopacy was never implemented. Parliament did not insist on a General election if it was

still in session. There was nothing to prevent a monarch from becoming financially independent if his revenues increased due to an expansion of trade. There was no widespread acceptance that the armed forces of the state should be subject to Parliament rather than the King. Such demands were too radical for many MPs and even those critics who pressed for such changes were ultimately conservative in many other respects.

(c) The Revolution Settlement 1689.

The significance of some of the following for the power of the crown could be examined:

- The offer of Joint Monarchy to William and Mary by Parliament
- The new coronation oath
- The Bill of Rights
- The Mutiny Act
- The Toleration Act
- The financial arrangements

In every case the Crown had retained power and resources.

(d) Changes to the powers of the Crown during the reign of William III.

At the end of the century, Parliament asserted itself more decisively in the realm of finance achieving royal dependence and accountability through the Commission of Accounts. The Act of Settlement achieved the independence of the judiciary, determined the religion of the monarch and the succession to the throne and a new Triennial Act determined the duration of a Parliament as three years. [40]

Option 2

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

(Answer **one** question)

- 1 Candidates will, in general, concur with this proposition, pointing to the spasmodic and unsuccessful efforts of liberals to bring about change through revolution in the first half of the period, culminating in the humiliations of 1848, but also drawing attention to the advance of personal freedom, representative government and free trade in ensuing years. More thoughtful answers, however, will point to some liberal success *before* 1850, and will realise that the image of the inexorable advance of liberal values up to 1914 has to be tempered, both politically and economically, where the swing of the pendulum back towards protectionism, coupled with the rise of the state, were both inimical to classical liberalism.

The Vienna Settlement will be seen as a setback for those who espoused liberal beliefs, especially in the wake of their heightened expectations after the promise, as they saw it, of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic years. But liberals were as yet too few in number to make a dent in the conservative consensus of the post-war governing classes, and were easily curbed by Metternich and his political allies in Naples and Piedmont in 1820, in Parma and Modena in 1831, within the Habsburg Empire, where spying and censorship kept things quiet, and in Germany when first the Carlsbad Decrees and later the Six Articles hampered freedom in universities, a hotbed of liberal activity. In France Charles X was able to defy the spirit of the 1814 Charter, and although he was overthrown, his successor, Louis Philippe's regime, finally proved too narrow, selfish and venal to fulfil liberal expectations, or, indeed, to survive. In 1848 liberal pretensions to govern were exposed when they snatched defeat from the jaws of victory by failing to capitalise on the collapse of the old regimes. At Frankfurt they debated incessantly but indecisively, failing to secure military support, becoming bogged down in ethnic disputes and allowing a breathing space for the former rulers to regroup. These flaws were arguably the result of inexperience, and were often repeated across those areas where revolution briefly placed liberals in the seat of power, while a more serious, long term dilemma was revealed in the predominantly bourgeois movement's fear of democracy, based on a belief that only property owners should be enfranchised, and displayed in the middle class hostility to National Workshops in Vienna and Paris, and their subsequent acceptance of the return of the former regimes for fear of worse.

Better answers should qualify this picture with examples of the occasional liberal successes before 1850. Baden and Württemberg took seriously their obligation (under the terms of the Treaty of Vienna), to provide a constitution for their subjects. The French charters of 1814 and 1830, despite their limitations, made France the most liberal country on the continent, while in Britain the Whig reforms of the 1830s moved the middle classes to a position where they could supplant the landed classes in both central and local government. Economically the liberal belief in laissez-faire made considerable progress with the establishment and growth of the Zollverein and the free trade reforms of Huskisson and the later Peel in England, while the unrestricted growth of industrialisation, even though it afforded little protection to the proletariat, met with approval from those classical liberals who believed in unfettered market forces.

In the immediate aftermath of 1848 liberalism again appeared to be on the back foot. Frederick William's Prussian constitution was seriously diminished by the introduction of the three-class voting system. In Austria the 1850s, the Bach era, saw a return to authoritarianism, while Napoleon III bluntly told Frenchmen that he offered "order first, liberty later". Yet paradoxically the liberal tide was beginning to turn. Free trade continued to expand, 1848 had secured the principle of universal male suffrage in France, Piedmont had retained the Statuto even after Charles Albert's defeat by the Austrians, and, arguably most crucial of all, there was a realisation on the part of governments that change had to come. This was engendered in part by the scare they had received in 1848, and also by an instinct for self-preservation that told them to ally and offer political concessions to a class that now seemed to dominate economic power. The liberals themselves abandoned the idea of revolution, and would seek political accommodation with existing regimes. In Cavour they produced, at last, a hard-headed pragmatist who made Piedmont a model liberal state to the extent that republicans and papal federalists were converted to offer their support to the House of Savoy. Pressure on Napoleon III helped produce the "liberal Empire" of the late 1860s, while the United Kingdom saw continued extension of the franchise and the introduction of secret voting. When the Third Republic faced a federalist revolt which imperilled the unity of France, and resurgent royalists sought a restoration, it was the impeccably liberal Thiers who determinedly faced down both threats. In Prussia and later in Germany the Liberals swallowed their objections to Bismarck's illegal tax-gathering to form a marriage of convenience with the Chancellor, while Italy moved as far towards male suffrage as was compatible with its high rate of illiteracy. Even in Russia the 1860s saw reforming activity under Alexander II, although this stopped short of granting the essential liberal demand of an elected parliament.

The best answers will perceive that, despite the gradual increase in individual rights and the survival of the Third Republic in the face of attacks from both left and right, there were examples of regression for liberals. In Prussia the National Liberals shamefully approved the Kulturkampf, only to be abandoned by Bismarck when he eventually sought an accommodation with the Catholic Centre Party. The achievement of Italian unification was tarnished by parliamentary corruption and the condemnation of Pius IX. In Austria-Hungary the extension of parliamentary government which followed the Ausgleich was wound down, and by the turn of the century Franz Joseph was once again an authoritarian Emperor. The Czechs were denied their own assembly, while in Russia the Duma, only introduced after a revolution in 1905, was at the mercy of tinkering from a Tsar who kept tweaking the franchise to ensure a docile elected body. Economically the widespread return of tariff barriers, a result of the depression which set in after 1875, was a blow, as were the rise of socialist parties and the introduction of "State Socialism", an attempt to neutralise the appeal of those parties.

The candidates should recognise that, although in some ways liberalism made significant progress across the period in question, progress was uneven, with western Europe in advance of eastern, and that some earlier gains were lost. It is important that the whole century is covered, and that examples are offered from a selection of countries.

Any other relevant material should be appropriately rewarded.

[40]

40

- 2 Answers will almost certainly compare nationalism's lack of success before 1850 with the triumphs of the succeeding decades, particularly in Italy, Germany and Hungary. Better answers will go on to suggest that thereafter nationalist successes were relatively minor. Discussion of the character of nationalism should point out that after 1848 the movement became less idealistic and more ruthless, and, compared with its previous strong links with liberalism, became more conservative, even jingoistic. Some candidates may disagree with the quotation, drawing attention to similarities in nationalism throughout the period. Although the events of 1848 may be touched upon, better answers will concentrate on the consequences of the failure of nationalism in 1848, particularly the lessons learnt by governments and by the nationalists themselves.

The Treaty of Vienna, which re-divided Italy, Germany and Poland, placed Belgium under foreign rule, and re-established the hegemony of the Habsburg Empire, will be seen as a bitter blow for nationalism. Most answers will go on to point to Metternich's domination of nationalism in succeeding decades, with the Holy Alliance powers snuffing out nationalist outbreaks in Germany, Italy and Spain. Nationalists themselves, usually an educated elite, struggled to convince others, especially the peasantry, their task further hampered by linguistic, religious and geographical barriers. Despite Mazzini's attempts to cut through the tangle of competing Italian secret societies and to establish a template for a modern nationalist movement, Young Italy became characterised as a mixture of the idealistic and the incompetent. Between the Treaty of Vienna and the Crimean War no serious conflict took place in Europe: as later events were to show, without the catalyst of war, nationalism was not strong enough to muster a serious threat.

Yet there were successes before 1848. Greece and Belgium both emerged as independent states, in each case the crucial factor being the support of a combination of Great Powers, with religion this time working as a unifying factor for nationalism rather than as a divisive force against it. The emergence of the Zollverein has been seen as a step towards the eventual political unification of the German states, while the growth of railways from the 1840s may have acted as another unifying factor.

In 1848 itself early success came to nothing. Various factors led to this – the Pope's condemnation of Italian nationalism, coupled with the well-meaning but ineffective leadership of Charles Albert, the similar lack of strong leadership in Germany, the ability of the Austrian government to divide and conquer, the superior military might of the old regimes. But perhaps of crucial importance was the failure of the nationalist movement to secure Great Power backing. Widespread nationalist success in 1848 could have upset the existing balance and plunged Europe into turmoil: recognising this, the Powers were unlikely to offer the diplomatic or military assistance necessary to establish any nation state.

Yet for all the failures of 1848, nationalism at least raised its profile, and this factor may be linked with the fact that the ensuing years witnessed the most spectacular nationalist successes of the century. Leaders of real stature emerged. In Italy Cavour broke with the proud but vain cry of Young Italy "Italia fara da se" and gained the assistance of Napoleon III in his quest to expel Austria. Garibaldi, an essential ally if the whole of Italy were to be united, was more in tune with Mazzini's more traditional nationalist ideals, but Cavour's military muscle and diplomatic nous brought victory for a new, more pragmatic and less romantic

version of nationalism. Similarly Bismarck, a hard-headed realist, succeeded where the well-meaning but impractical Frankfurt Parliament had failed. In 1867 Hungary achieved what might best be described as home rule within the Habsburg Empire, this only in the wake of the Austrian defeat in the Seven Weeks War, suggesting, as had the Italian War of 1859 and the triple Prussian victories over Denmark, Austria and France, that war was necessary to break what would otherwise have been a stalemate. The decline in power of an overstretched Austria was also of assistance to nationalism in the 1860s.

After 1870 there were further successes for nationalism, with Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and Norway all achieving independence or self-government. Yet arguably these victories were hollow ones. Valuable though they were to the inhabitants of the countries involved, none of these states was of the first rank, and their freedom was comparatively easily won, at the expense mainly of the terminally decaying Romanov and Ottoman empires. The higher profile cases of Poland, Ireland, the Czechs and the South Slavs remained unresolved in 1914, and it would only be as a direct result of the Great War that these countries would achieve freedom.

After 1848 the nature of nationalism certainly changed. To a large extent nationalism cut its pre-1848 ties with liberalism. As nationalism grew in popularity, nationalists were no longer idealists mainly drawn from the professional classes. More and more they were joined and eventually supplanted by a commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, and eventually by the lower middle and working class. Initially this meant that nationalists were better organised, often more ruthless than their idealistic predecessors. The contrast could be made between Mazzini, who believed that nationalism, once satisfied, would lead to an era of peace, and Bismarck, who accepted the necessity of bloody war to achieve his ends. Some answers may point out that Bismarck and Cavour were not true nationalists at all, but Prussian and Piedmontese expansionists who were only interested in extending the influence of their own states.

In the last decades before 1914 nationalism moved even further away from the “brotherhood of man” ideology propounded by Mazzini. In those countries that had already achieved nationhood, nationalism, hitherto a danger and a threat to the status quo, was now taken over by the state and promoted as patriotism. In an era when an increasingly enfranchised working class was being lured by the attractions of socialism or radicalism, this was an attempt by governments to offer a counter-attraction which would wean the workers away from dangerous left wing ideas. In addition, nationalism took on elements of racialism and anti-semitism (the latter not only in Russia and the Austrian Empire, but even in the West, in France, as witnessed in the Dreyfus Affair), and some have argued that the resultant over-heated racial rivalries played some part in the approach of war in 1914.

A number of aspects of nationalism were present before and after 1848. Some nations “yearning to be free” did not achieve independence throughout the period. Candidates should draw attention to the writers, artists and musicians who continued to build a sense of identity within their own nation on both sides of the supposed watershed year. Population continued to grow and industrialisation carried on apace, with cities, a fertile seedbed for new ideas, witnessing a growing working class enthusiasm for nationalist ideology.

There is much material that candidates can refer to in order to answer this question: what is important is that the whole period up to 1914 is addressed, and that the actual question is confronted. Any relevant and factually correct material will receive favourable consideration.

Any other relevant and appropriate material should be rewarded.

[40]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

(Answer **one** question)

- 1** This question invites candidates to assess the role played by the various leaders of Irish nationalism in relation to their level of success and failure. While the term “leaders” may be interpreted broadly, one cannot expect a catalogue of the actions of every prominent figure in Irish nationalism in the period. Specific reference to individuals as Daniel O’Connell, Parnell, and *comments about the leadership* of such movements as Young Ireland and the Fenians are quite acceptable.

Top band candidates will comment on the significance of the contribution of leaders to the success and failure of Irish nationalists, and will also refer to other factors, such as the role of government. A sustained discussion of two strands of nationalism is required; constitutional and revolutionary. A thematic or chronological approach is acceptable.

- (a) The successes and failures of constitutional nationalists can be attributed to the role of their leaders as well as other factors.**

Daniel O’Connell provided leadership qualities which significantly contributed to the success of the campaign to achieve Catholic emancipation by 1829. A charismatic figure, O’Connell mobilised the masses, attracted thousands at huge rallies, inspired the unity of the middle class, peasantry and clergy, and provided inspirational rhetoric. *However, O’Connell’s leadership was not the only factor in his success, and good answers should reflect on the weaknesses of the British Government after the departure of Lord Liverpool.* Candidates can comment on the role O’Connell played in the achievements and disappointments of the Lichfield House compact with the Whigs. Regarding O’Connell’s failure to Repeal the Act of Union, there is no doubt that he exhibited flaws in leadership, such as his divisive quarrel with the Young Irelanders, and his duplication of tactics from the 1820s. *Yet good quality answers will also remark on the role played by Peel who, backed by a united parliament and a strong government, was able to face down the O’Connell challenge.*

Parnell’s leadership both aided and hindered the progress of constitutional nationalism. Parnell deserves great credit for his liaison with the Land League and ex-Fenians in creating a new Departure, which resulted in the Land Act of 1881 and the Arrears Act of 1882. Even Gladstone acknowledged the role of Parnell in these events. Moreover, Parnell created a united pledge-bound Home Rule Party that contributed to the political conversion of Gladstone to home rule for Ireland. While the Home Rule bills of 1886 and 1893 failed, the legacy of Parnell was evident in the early years of the twentieth century under Redmond. *Good candidates will also note that Parnell’s success was tarnished by the circumstances of his downfall over the O’Shea affair. Moreover, leaders like Davitt and those behind the Land League created the mass mobilisation needed for the “Land War” which pushed the government towards land reform.*

- (b) **The leaders of revolutionary nationalism played a role in their failed attempts to undo the Union by means of physical force. Yet these leaders also bestowed legacies which were to contribute to the success of revolutionary nationalists in the twentieth century.**

Inadequate planning by their respective leaderships undermined the failed attempts at revolution in 1803 under Emmett, 1848 by the Young Irelanders and in 1867 with the Fenians. In the case of the latter, for example, leadership quarrels damaged the prospects of the Fenians acquiring sufficient aid from the USA. The immediate aftermath of the Famine offered very poor choice of timing by the Young Ireland leaders for their uprising, which ended in circumstances of an unwitting farce.

However, good answers will refer to the role of government in suppressing revolutionary nationalists, by a combination of overt force of arms, legal means and the use of spies. Top band answers may comment on the hostility of the Catholic Church towards the Fenians.

It is also acceptable for candidates to argue that all of the leaders of these failed revolts left a legacy of success. Emmett's oratory inspired Pearse; the Young Irelanders' cultural links encouraged the literary tradition of 1916, while the failure of the Fenians to curb government infiltration influenced the planning of the Rising at Easter 1916. Indeed, the Proclamation read by Pearse paid tribute to the actions of these latter insurrections. [40]

40

- 2 This question invites candidates to examine, by way of comparison and contrast, Ulster and southern unionists in this period. The terms “differences and similarities” may be interpreted broadly by candidates. Answers should assess the motives and methods of unionists in the north and south of Ireland, making a sustained comparison and contrast as they proceed. Top band candidates may present a wider analysis, and embrace such issues as the social composition of unionism, geographical distribution and self-perception, in addition to making regular comments as to links.
- (a) Similarities and differences emerge in examining the **motives** of Ulster and southern unionists in wishing to uphold the union. Both shared a **common economic** concern if the Union was broken, with the only difference being in their emphasis: industry in the north, agriculture in the south. While religious issues were also evident, **religion was more of an issue in the north than the south**. However, the welfare of the **empire was more notable in the literature of southern unionists**.
- (b) The **methods** used by unionists reveal many **contrasts**. In the south, the production of propaganda, the contesting of elections and the use of political connections at Westminster for lobbying were evident. Top band candidates may comment on the actions of organisations such as the ILPU or the Property Defence Association. While these activities were also apparent in the north, unionists there had a tendency to hint at the use of force in order to resist any tampering with the Union. Good answers may refer to Ulster-based organisations such as the Ulster Clubs, Young Ulster or the Protestant Defence Association.

(c) **Sustained links between the perspectives explains the similarities and differences in unionism.** For example, the **geographical distribution** of unionism impacted on the methods used. Additionally, **geographical considerations** had an effect on religion, as the southern unionist minority sought to embrace their numerically dominant Catholic neighbours into any calculations about the benefits of the Union. This explains why Catholic unionists like **William Kenny** were more commonplace in the south, while **Denis Henry** was such a rarity in the north. The **social structure** of unionism links with both **method and economic** concerns. In the former instance, southern unionists utilised the advantages of having, by 1886, over 140 peers with Irish interests at Westminster. Thomas Sinclair was from a prominent business family in Belfast, who took a leading role in Ulster unionist opposition to home rule. In the south, key members of the land-owning class like Dunraven led organisations pledged to defend the Union. **Self-perception** is indicative of a contrast. Ulster unionists, as the titles of their organisations suggested, displayed a more narrow outlook, while their southern counterparts focused more on the empire and the gains from the Union for both Catholics and Protestants. [40]

Option 4

AVAILABLE
MARKS

40

40

(Answer **one** question)

- 1** Candidates should select appropriate evidence from Soviet foreign policy in Europe after 1917 to illustrate the different perspectives influencing it at different times such as: ideological, economic, strategic and also pragmatic. The proposition of this question is that to a small extent the foreign policy of the USSR from 1917 to 1991 was aggressively trying to promote worldwide revolution and to a large extent was concerned defensively with survival. Most candidates will probably qualify such a broad generalisation and select evidence to illustrate the varied motives of Soviet foreign policy during particular phases.

In such a broad topic, candidates have to be selective with their historical evidence. The following evidence from each phase is, therefore, only a suggestion as to what could be included.

(a) 1917–1924

According to Marxist ideology, Russia was not the most appropriate country to stage a communist revolution in 1917. Lenin justified staging a revolution in a relatively underdeveloped capitalist country by claiming that, if a communist revolution succeeded in Russia, this would inspire proletarian class based communist revolutions in advanced industrial societies. By 1919, it was clear that the USSR was the only communist regime in Europe. Lenin set up the Comintern in 1919 with the ideological goal of trying to spread communism internationally. However, temporary capitalist intervention from western countries in the Civil War also demonstrated to the Bolsheviks that an isolated USSR was vulnerable and for a communist regime to survive it would have to ensure its security in the future. Survival was the main priority in this phase and in 1922 with the Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany the USSR showed that it could be pragmatic and work with capitalist states if necessary for survival.

(b) 1924–1941

Stalin continued the inward looking policies of Lenin and concentrated upon the economic reconstruction of the USSR. The policy of “Socialism in One Country” focused partly on industrialisation to develop its ability to increase its levels of rearmament to protect from potential attacks by capitalist states. By 1933 with the rise of power of Hitler the USSR recognised the potential threat of Nazism. In 1934 the USSR joined the League of Nations to try to co-operate with capitalist states such as the UK and France to achieve collective security. Self-preservation was the clear motive. After the Munich Conference in 1938 the USSR gradually realised that the West could not be relied upon and in 1939 it agreed the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact with its ideological enemy Nazism. Such pragmatism revealed that the USSR needed to gain time to rearm more but also partly in the interests of security it would be beneficial to acquire the Baltic states and eastern Poland as a potential buffer zone against possible attack from the West. The USSR was also able to recover territory lost by the 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

(c) 1941–1945

The Nazi invasion of the USSR in June 1941 forced it into a temporary alliance with capitalist states to defeat the forces of Fascism but at some point during the Second World War Stalin decided that after victory had been achieved the USSR would never again have to depend on others for its own strategic security.

(d) 1945–1964

The traditional interpretation of the origins of the Cold War suggests the USSR occupied the states of Eastern Europe it liberated from Nazi Germany for ideological motives to spread communism. Revisionist interpretations suggest that Stalin broke the 1945 Yalta Agreement more for reasons of security and survival. The USSR only narrowly escaped defeat during the Second World War and by 1945 it was near economic ruin. Its security needs led it to seek governments in nearby states which were not anti-Soviet and to ensure that no military threat ever emanated from German soil again. Stalin not only wanted to maintain a sphere of influence in eastern Europe amongst the People's Democracies through the Cominform in 1947 and Comecon in 1949 but he also wanted to prevent a united capitalist Germany rising up again to threaten the USSR. This represents the background to the disagreements with the west over Germany culminating in the 1948–1949 Berlin crisis. After the creation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 the USSR was determined to maintain the Iron Curtain. The 1956 Hungarian revolution was crushed to prevent states in eastern Europe from leaving the alliance.

(e) 1964–1982

After the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 the Brezhnev Doctrine revived the potential influence of ideology in Soviet foreign policy by stressing that the USSR would protect and maintain any states which had become communist. However, other motives also explain Soviet foreign policy in the Brezhnev era. Co-existence with the west through Détente, such as the SALT agreement of 1972, was partly pursued due to the stagnation of the Soviet economy which could not sustain high levels of rearmament, while the 1975 Helsinki Accords were signed by the Soviets to get recognition from the West of the Soviet Bloc for security reasons. The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan led to the end of Détente and was justified by the Soviets on the ideological grounds of the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine.

(f) 1982–1991

Soviet foreign policy was transformed after Gorbachev became the new leader in 1985. He was not prepared to shore up a USSR dominated structure in Eastern Europe which was failing economically and threatened to bankrupt the USSR itself if it continued to try to match the USA as a military force. In a speech to the United Nations in 1988, Gorbachev had committed himself to ending the Cold War, had renounced the emphasis in the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution on trying to export communist doctrine abroad and the 1968 Brezhnev Doctrine, and had committed the USSR to disarmament. From 1986 to 1989 he withdrew troops from Afghanistan, in 1987 he reached agreement with President Reagan to destroy all stocks of intermediate nuclear weapons and in 1989 did not intervene to prop up unpopular communist regimes in the former Warsaw Pact. Gorbachev was not interested in spreading communism or maintaining the balance of power in Europe. He wanted to reform communism within the USSR but his policies resulted in the disintegration of the USSR in 1991. [40]

- 2 Answers that reach the higher level should discuss Fascist and Democratic opponents of Communism over the whole period from 1917 to 1991. Balanced answers must discuss both the 1917–1945 and the 1945–1991 periods.

(a) 1917–1945

Democratic hostility towards the USSR by intervention by western powers during the civil war was not very successful as the Bolsheviks were victorious. Despite the initial isolation of the USSR at Versailles and the League of Nations, democratic regimes reluctantly accepted the existence of the USSR as the 1922 Treaty of Rapallo with Weimar Germany showed rather than actively attempt to bring down the regime in Moscow. From 1933 the main threat to the USSR was not from democratic regimes but from Nazi Germany. Hitler made no secret of his loathing of Bolshevism and considered it to be an ideology that had to be destroyed. The invasion of the USSR would bring the territorial expansion needed to gain the living space needed for the German people and regions of eastern Europe would provide many of the raw materials needed for Germany to gain self-sufficiency. Fascist opposition developed with the Anti-Comintern pacts in 1936 between Germany and Japan and in 1937 when Italy, under Mussolini, joined. The 1939 Nazi-Soviet pact failed to prevent the Nazi invasion of the USSR in 1941 which was an attempt to try to destroy the communist state by force. This led to Stalin joining forces with the democratic regimes in a marriage of convenience to defeat the Axis powers, which ultimately failed to destroy the USSR. Towards the end of the Second World War the democratic regimes were unable to prevent Stalin from liberating countries in eastern Europe from Hitler.

(b) 1945–1991

Democratic governments soon distrusted Stalin as he broke the 1945 Yalta Agreement and did not allow free elections in the states of eastern Europe. The creation of a soviet satellite empire behind an iron curtain led the capitalist democratic western powers to adopt a policy of containment of communism as the Cold War escalated. The domino theory now appeared – if one state falls under Soviet influence its neighbour will not be far behind. The 1947 Truman Doctrine illustrated America's determination to contain the spread of communism in Western Europe and the Marshall Plan of 1947 gave vital economic aid to democratic states in Western Europe to produce stable economies and thus reduce the chances of internal communist revolutions. The 1948–1949 Berlin Airlift prevented Stalin taking the whole of Berlin and the formation of NATO in 1949 showed that the West was determined to contain communism to Eastern Europe. The West was not prepared to intervene in the Soviet sphere of influence behind the iron curtain in Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968 when the Soviets invaded. The acceptance of Eastern Europe as a soviet sphere of influence was acknowledged in the 1975 Helsinki Accords. The era of Détente came to an end when Reagan and Thatcher denounced the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979. The collapse of the Soviet empire in 1989 and the collapse of the USSR in 1991 were primarily due to the policies of Gorbachev who was not prepared to engage in an expensive arms race with NATO led by Reagan. Despite the fears of many, NATO and the Warsaw Pact were essentially defensive alliances and neither was planning a surprise attack on the other, which would almost certainly have escalated into mutual nuclear destruction. The West won the Cold War because the USSR withered away. In the long term the policy of containment was quite successful. Had it not been for the arms race, the USSR might have

survived. Gorbachev believed that they could not continue to devote so much of their economy to the military. The USSR collapsed when opposed by democratic regimes rather than when opposed by Fascist regimes. [40]

Option 5

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

40

40

40



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
Summer 2009**

History

Assessment Unit A2 3

assessing

[A2H31]

TUESDAY 2 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

Level of response mark grid

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

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

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

AO2 In relation to historical context:

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

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

Level	Assessment Objective 1a	Assessment Objective 1b	Assessment Objective 2
	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:	Answers at this level will:
1	recall, select and deploy some accurate factual knowledge and communicate limited understanding in narrative form. There will be evidence of an attempt to structure and present answers in a coherent manner.	display a basic understanding of the topic; some comments may be relevant, but general and there may be assertions and judgements which require supporting evidence.	limited recognition of the possibility of debate surrounding an event or topic.
2	be quite accurate, contain some detail and show understanding through a mainly narrative approach. Communication may have occasional lapses of clarity and/or coherence.	display general understanding of the topic and its associated concepts and offer explanations which are mostly relevant, although there may be limited analysis and a tendency to digress. There will be some supporting evidence for assertions and judgements.	an attempt to explain different approaches to and interpretations of the event or topic. Evaluation may be limited.
3	contain appropriate examples with illustrative and supportive factual evidence and show understanding and ability to engage with the issues raised by the question in a clear and coherent manner.	display good breadth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Analysis is generally informed and suitably illustrated to support explanations and judgements.	there will be an ability to present and evaluate different arguments for and against particular interpretations of an event or topic.
4	be accurate and well-informed and show ability to engage fully with the demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding will be expressed with clarity and precision.	display breadth and depth of understanding of the topic and its associated concepts. Explanations will be well-informed with arguments and judgements well-substantiated, illustrated and informed by factual evidence.	there will be appropriate explanation, insightful interpretation and well-argued evaluation of particular interpretations of an event or topic.

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

- 1 (a) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2])**

Answer will typically paraphrase each source.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will explain more fully the detail in the sources and make some direct comparisons. Some of the following points may be made. Wentworth is determined to promote MPs' right to freedom of speech. He is concerned that if MPs are not permitted to use this liberty then the House will become a house of flattery. Elizabeth is represented by Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who also addresses the House on the question of liberty of speech. He believes that this right has always existed and should be preserved. However, he reminds Parliament that freedom of speech should not be mistaken for the right to be disrespectful and discuss any matter.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will make a fuller comparison and provide some explanation of the differing views. Wentworth is a Puritan MP who by 1576 is beginning to display self-confidence within the House of Commons and will become a principal figure of opposition in the Commons. His intention is to gain support from his fellow MPs. The tone of his speech displays the growing confidence of certain Members of Parliament. By implying that Elizabeth is at fault the source suggests there is tension between Elizabeth and the Commons. The source, however, may exaggerate Elizabeth's misdemeanours for the purpose of attracting support. Mildmay addresses the Commons after Wentworth's forceful speech. As Chancellor of the Exchequer he is Elizabeth's spokesperson in Parliament therefore this is not a direct response from Elizabeth. He is working under Elizabeth's instruction with the intention of reminding the Commons of their loyalty towards Elizabeth. He, too, recognises the Commons' right to liberty and freedom of speech. However, he implies that this is granted with certain conditions.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers may use contextual knowledge to more fully explain the views expressed and question just how representative Wentworth is of the views of Parliament. Wentworth becomes an advocate of Parliamentary privileges and Puritan ideals which leads to his eventual imprisonment. Answers may demonstrate an informed understanding of why there is conflict on the issue of free speech. By 1576 many MPs are weary of Elizabeth's management of the Commons and are frustrated with certain areas of her rule such as the question of marriage and her Church Settlement. Elizabeth, through representatives such as Mildmay, on occasion has to remind the Commons of their position and their responsibility of loyalty. Although some of the Commons were unhappy with aspects of Elizabeth's policies this is 16th century England where much is controlled by the divine right of Kings.

AO2

[10]

- (b) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers may make some of the following points. Source 1 suggests that Elizabeth is at fault for disagreements between Crown and Parliament. Source 2 suggests that the Commons is at fault for its failure to acknowledge the difference between discussion and disrespect. Source 3 suggests that Parliament is growing in confidence however Elizabeth is also at fault for disagreements between Crown and Parliament as she summoned her Parliament less than her predecessors.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers at this level must use more contextual knowledge to interpret the sources. They may also comment on the adequacy of the sources. At the top of this level they may question how representative Wentworth's view is. Most MPs were happy with their position. Answers should also comment on how Wentworth's religious views might motivate this speech. The tone of this speech does imply that the Commons is growing in confidence. Source 2 blames Parliament for the disagreements between Crown and Parliament and their failure to differentiate between liberty of speech and disrespectful speech. However, as Elizabeth's spokesperson, the source may not present an accurate view of the relationship between Crown and Parliament. AGR Smith in Source 3 presents a balanced view of relations. He refers to changes occurring in Parliament both in quality, size and self-confidence and Elizabeth's determination to deny further concessions to Parliament. He uses the example of the Norfolk election in 1586 to illustrate that Wentworth's outburst in 1576 was not a one-off occurrence. He highlights how Elizabeth's refusal to summon Parliament regularly might cause resentment.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context.

AO2

[10]

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers at this level will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints: Wentworth gives the view of a disgruntled Puritan MP who reminds Parliament that it is a House of free speech and should not become a mere House of flattery. Mildmay represents the Crown and warns the Commons against disrespectful debate. He reminds them that they have been granted the privilege of freedom of speech but with conditions. AGR Smith provides an impartial, objective assessment. He reveals that there is debate regarding the power enjoyed by Parliament. The Commons is growing in number and strength which leads to a growth in self-confidence and on occasion a formidable front of opposition. However, he also states that Elizabeth on occasion failed to call Parliament which would affect its power.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will go into more detail demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the power enjoyed by Elizabeth's Parliament. Answers at this level discuss utility, not just for the information it provides, but also for the quality of the evidence – author, date and audience. Wentworth, a contemporary, gives the view of a disgruntled member of Parliament. However, his motive is to attract support and it is uncertain just how representative his view is. Source 2 provides the view of Elizabeth through her Chancellor of the Exchequer and candidates may appreciate that this is a classic statement of the Crown's traditional position regarding the privileges of Parliament. He addresses Parliament with a tone of rebuke, reminding them of their conditions of power. AGR Smith writes as an historian, and is concerned with the academic argument regarding the relationship between Elizabeth and her Parliament.

Level 4 ([12]–[14])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Contextual information may be introduced to enhance the answer.

AO2

[14]

34

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will offer mainly a descriptive, often superficial account of Elizabethan foreign policy with limited reference to evaluating its success. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may provide a more detailed account of Elizabethan foreign policy though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, a suitable vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will identify the main themes of Elizabethan foreign policy such as her commitment to Protestantism and her defensive policy. Candidates will look at her policy regarding relations with Scotland, France and Spain. They will begin to assess her successes and attempt to produce a balanced argument. They may highlight that she was successful in her dealings with Scotland and France and that she won the Spanish Armada. They may begin to assess just how successful she was with this. Arguments at this level may lack balance. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will demonstrate a good interpretation and assessment of Elizabethan foreign policy. Answers will appreciate the short and long term effects of her policy as well as the twists and turns. They will assess just how successful she was and produce a balanced argument backed by contextual knowledge. They will reach a sound conclusion as to whether they believe her policy was a success. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

(b) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of Elizabethan agriculture, industry and trade with limited reference to the changes which occurred. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may only look at one aspect of the question or may be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. For instance, they might look at development of industry or trade throughout the period. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, a suitable vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will take a more comprehensive view. There will be treatment of more than one aspect of the question. Candidates will attempt to evaluate the degree of change which took place during this period. They will mention change and continuity. In agriculture, for example, sheep farming and wool production continued to dominate even though this era saw extensive economic changes and innovations. They will look at the significance of overseas and internal trade. They will mention the effect population growth had on agriculture, trade and industry, as well as the significance of foreign relations. They should look at how government intervention affected agriculture, trade and industry. They should also look at the changing dynamics of London and the effect this had. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will demonstrate a good interpretation and assessment of the extent to which agriculture, trade and industry changed. They should demonstrate a clear awareness of change as well as continuity. They will also deal with the significance of external factors. In industry the outbreak of disturbances in the Netherlands from the mid 1560s and the French Wars of Religion led to large numbers of Protestant refugees with new skills in textile manufacture, which English manufacturers began to copy. In trade the embargoes on English goods between 1568–1573 and 1586–1588 forced English merchants to seek new outlets for English goods. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

26

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

- 1 (a) This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will typically paraphrase each source.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will explain more fully the detail in the sources and make some direct comparisons, e.g. James states that the Church of England is in no danger from a Catholic monarch and has a positive attitude to toleration whereas Sir John Reresby is suggesting that the King's objective is to promote Catholic interests.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will make a fuller comparison and provide some explanation of the differing views. James is wishing to allay Protestant fears at the outset of his reign, pointing out that the Church of England is his natural base of support and acknowledging the smooth transition to power that he has experienced. On the other hand, just over a year later Reresby presents a number of points that suggest that the King's priority is not defence of the Church of England but the promotion of the Catholic Church, e.g. opening diplomatic relations with the Vatican

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers may use contextual knowledge to more fully explain the views expressed. Candidates might argue that the King's address is intended to give Protestants a false sense of security and that his true intentions are only revealed over the next year with the promotion of Tyrconnell in Ireland, the revelation that Charles II died a Catholic, the King's public celebration of Mass, his "Directions to Preachers" which forbade them attacking the Catholic Church" etc, all events of the type that alarm Church supporters such as Reresby.

AO2

[10]

- (b) This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers may make note that in fact only Source 3 mentions the King's policy of religious toleration while the other two sources suggest other priorities, i.e. stating the King's support for the Church of England, and advancing the position of Catholicism.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers use more contextual knowledge to interpret the sources and at the top of this level may argue that James at the beginning of his reign is primarily intent on offering assurance to the Church of England as to his support for its position, while Source 2 would suggest that it is the promotion of Catholic interests that is his priority. The policy of religious toleration, referred to in Source 3, only officially takes shape in April 1687 with the issuing of the Declaration of Indulgence and the suspension of the Test and Corporation Acts and penal laws, but by this stage James has already been actively progressing the Catholic cause by promoting his co-religionists in both civil and military office, e.g. Tyrconnell to Lieutenant General of the Irish Army and then Lord Deputy of Ireland, four Catholics appointed to the Privy Council etc. Therefore it could be argued that the policy of religious toleration was simply a retrospective attempt to legitimise his pro-Catholic policy.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context. In addition to covering and developing the points already referred to, candidates might point out that by his own actions, as outlined in Source 2, James has begun to alienate those to whom he had offered assurances (in Source 1), thereby exposing the policy of religious toleration as arguably a fraud, there simply to conceal the aim of promoting the Catholic Church. It is also important to note the sensitivities of the nation on this point, bearing in mind the Popish Plot crisis of the previous reign.

AO2

[10]

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

Answers will paraphrase each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints: a monarch, a supporter of the Church of England, and a modern historian. Each source is valuable in its own way. Information is provided in each source about the religious policy of James II. Source 1 would have us believe that the King had no intention to interfere with the religious status quo. Source 2 suggests that the King was not candid in his address and that his objective is to advance the interests of the Catholic Church. Source 3 presents the issue in a wider context, reflecting Protestant sensitivities about any policy that would seek to increase Catholic rights.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will go into more detail demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the religious policy of James II. Answers at this level will discuss utility not just for the information it provides but also for the quality of the evidence – author, date and audience – and may use contextual knowledge to assess the value of the sources. All the authors are well placed to comment. However, the motive

and purpose of each source is different. James is seeking to reassure the religious establishment about his intentions, although arguably he is being disingenuous in doing so. Reresby expresses alarm, though in private, about the King's blatantly pro-Catholic policy. Ashley wants to communicate a balanced explanation of how James's religious policy was seen as a constitutional threat; he writes with hindsight, based on a study of a wide range of primary and secondary sources.

Level 4 ([12]–[14])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. James is arguably not being candid in Source 1. Source 2 provides a flavour of what the King is doing in practice, despite the reassurances offered in Source 1, and of the hostility it engenders. Source 3 puts that hostility in a wider context to argue that religious toleration was viewed as political and constitutional subterfuge.

AO2

[14]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

34

2 (a) This questions targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of the policies of Charles II and James II in relation to the creation of an absolutist monarchy. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may provide a more detailed account of royal policies though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. Answers may find some evidence to suggest that both kings had absolutist tendencies, but perhaps James more so than Charles. Charles started his reign working with Parliament until about 1668. Then, until 1672, he ignored Parliament and embarked on independent policies such as The Treaty of Dover and the Declaration of Indulgence. Under Danby, he tried to manage and control Parliament. During the Exclusion Crisis he confronted Parliament and in the last few years he came full circle and worked with those classes represented in Parliament with policies that they would have liked. James also showed inconsistency in first calling Parliament but then dissolving it, suspending its statutes and attempting to “pack” the next one. Answers will contain frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

At this level answers would be expected to have knowledge and understanding of the attitude of both monarchs to the idea or ideal of absolutism. Neither Charles nor James wished to be a constitutional monarch and, although the methods may have changed, the overall aim was the same: to attempt to rule independently of Parliament. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will have more detail. They will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility. Answers at this level may argue that James was more absolutist than his brother, and that both may have been influenced by the example of Louis XIV of France, Charles for example using French subsidies to rule without Parliament. James, however, went further than Charles in terms of an autocratic approach, witnessed in his arbitrary use of the suspending and dispensing powers, or in his arrest and imprisonment of the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other bishops for refusing to read the Declaration of Indulgence.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

(b) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of commercial developments with limited reference to evaluating their nature. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may only look at one aspect of the topic. For example, they may assert, with little substantiation, that English commerce to Europe expanded; or, that new Atlantic, African and Far Eastern trade emerged. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will take a more comprehensive view. For example, they may show that England's trade to Europe expanded and that added to this was a spectacular increase in trade to the Caribbean, North America, West Africa and the Far East. Not only did merchants trade in new geographical areas but the types of goods traded changed too. Before this period, England exported woollen goods and imported wine, grain and other foodstuffs. While wool remained an important export, England imported, and re-exported, tobacco, sugar and cotton and the emerging English colonies in North America and the Caribbean provided new market opportunities for English manufactured goods. England became a grain exporter and traded in slaves. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will demonstrate a very good understanding of the nature of the changes in England's commercial activity. Evidence of the change can be seen in London's decline in importance relative to the provincial ports of Liverpool, Bristol, Hull and Newcastle. The tonnage of merchant shipping doubled between 1660 and 1688, and new credit and insurance services developed. Reference will also be made to the Navigation Act of 1660, which laid the basis for the "mercantile system". Candidates may also note that there was a clear commercial motive behind both the Second and Third Dutch Wars and that the bulk of government revenue in this period was generated by customs and excise duties. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

26

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

- 1 (a) This question targets AO2: the candidate’s ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will typically paraphrase each source.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will explain more fully the detail in the sources and make some direct comparisons. Some of the following points may be made. The Earl of Buckinghamshire expresses concern about the threat of a French invasion, hence the need for the Volunteers, while Lord Harberton is concerned by the activities of the Volunteers themselves.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will make a fuller comparison and, using contextual knowledge, may provide some explanation of the differing views. The key to explaining the sources is the date. When the Earl of Buckinghamshire writes, there is the threat of a French invasion, and although he has misgivings about the creation in effect of a private army, in the circumstances he feels the government has no choice. By the time Source 2 is written, more than four years later, the situation has changed dramatically: there is no longer a security threat but this seems to have been replaced by a political threat to the establishment and indeed to law and order, as expressed by the former Irish MP, Lord Harberton.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers may use contextual knowledge to more fully explain the views expressed. In Source 1, Ireland has been left vulnerable to the threat of a French invasion by the dispatch of British troops to America to fight the rebels and the Lord Lieutenant reluctantly sanctions the use of Volunteer companies to fill the security gap. However, he is at the same time concerned that the Volunteers may have the potential to cause trouble, perhaps alluding to Presbyterian sympathy with the American rebels or ally with the Patriot opposition in the Irish Parliament. Source 2 would suggest that Buckinghamshire’s fears were well founded. Although the American war is over and there is no longer a threat from the French, the Volunteers have not disbanded but are holding a convention in Dublin. Candidates might note that in the period between the two sources, the Volunteers were active in support of the Patriots in the Irish Parliament in their successful campaigns for free trade (1779) and legislative independence (1782). By 1783, the political agenda of the Volunteers had become more radical, with discussion of parliamentary reform and Catholic emancipation.

AO2

[10]

- (b) This question targets AO2: the candidate’s ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers may rely on paraphrasing the sources or provide a narrative of the subject with little reference to the sources.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers may make some of the following points. Source 1 is in fact the only source to make mention of the defence role of the Volunteers, which reflects the date of the source, as this was when there were real fears that France, the ally of the American rebels, would exploit the fact that British troops had been sent to America, to launch an invasion. The Volunteers are therefore needed to protect Ireland. However, the other two sources make no reference to this role and instead focus on the political activity of the movement.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers make more detailed reference to the sources and use more contextual knowledge to interpret them and, at the top of this level, may note that the reservations of the Lord Lieutenant in Source 1 about the authorisation of the Volunteers have proved to be well founded as evidenced by the political activity described in Sources 2 and 3.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will interpret and evaluate the sources fully in relation to their historical context and in terms of the motivation, date and audience of the authors. Sources 1 and 2 are both by members of the political establishment who are sensitive to any threat to the political status quo, which is what the Volunteers eventually prove to be. In fact, the Volunteers' role as a defensive force is relatively short lived, as they quickly turn their attention to the political campaigns for free trade (1779), legislative independence (1782), both of which are successful, and then parliamentary reform (1783). Candidates might argue that Source 3 suggests that the Volunteer movement may have taken inspiration from the American Revolution to promote a radical political agenda.

AO2

[10]

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

Answers will paraphrase each source and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment that each source provides information from different viewpoints and at different times: first, the Lord Lieutenant whose priority at this time is the defence of the country; secondly, a member of the Protestant Ascendancy who is alarmed by the political activity of the Volunteers in 1783; and, thirdly, a secondary source from a modern historian. Information is provided in each source about the Volunteers: Source 1 notes their military necessity; Source 2 expresses alarm about their role as an extra-parliamentary pressure group; and Source 3 gives an insight into the radical political objectives of the movement, especially among its core elements in Ulster.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will go into more detail demonstrating the utility of the sources for a study of the strength of the rebels. Answers at this level will discuss utility not just for the information it provides but also for the quality of the evidence – author, date and audience – and may use contextual knowledge to assess the value of the sources. All the authors are well placed to comment. The author of Source 1, the Earl of Buckinghamshire, is responsible for the defence and security of Ireland and writes from an informed and concerned position. Lord Harberton is a former Irish MP, an eyewitness to the events described, and, as a member of the ruling Protestant Ascendancy, provides evidence of the alarm felt by the Volunteers' agitation for parliamentary reform. Beckett is a modern historian and expert on the period, who has hindsight and has had the opportunity to consult a wide range of primary and secondary sources. The first two sources are also private letters and therefore indicate the true feelings of both authors, while Beckett seeks to provide an objective and impartial account of the Volunteer movement.

Level 4 ([12]–[14])

Answers will use a wide range of criteria to assess utility, commenting on the significance of the information provided, authorship, motive, viewpoint, audience and date. Candidates might reasonably conclude that all the sources have value, Source 1 providing an insight into the circumstances that gave rise to the creation of the volunteers, Source 2 witnessing their assumption of a primarily political role, and Source 3 developing and providing an overview of some of the concerns raised by both Buckinghamshire and Harberton.

AO2

[14]

34

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of economic conditions in the period 1775–1789 with little attempt to assess whether or not this represented continuous success. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may only look at one aspect of the topic, e.g. focus on the rise of the cotton industry, the expansion of linen, or the impact of Foster's Corn Law of 1784 to argue that the period did witness continuous economic success. Answers will have frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will take a more detailed view. For example, while linen production expanded (exports increasing from 15 million yards in 1781 to 26 million yards in 1785), wool supplied the home market and cotton production was stimulated by direct trade with America, brewing made slow progress in this period due to the competition from imported British beer, and bad harvests between 1779 and 1783 produced widespread distress and food riots in some areas. Candidates may also note that the winning of Free Trade in 1779 did not bring with it immediate economic benefits, these only appearing with the ending of the war in America. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will be more detailed and comprehensive. For Ireland to have made significant progress as a manufacturing country – and attempts were made to establish new lines of production in the likes of soap, gloves, candles and crockery – would have required the imposition of a comprehensive set of protective tariffs, but the Irish Parliament was reluctant to take this step, fearing a trade war with Britain. The agricultural sector of the economy did make progress in this period, with Foster's Corn Law stimulating the growth of tillage and rise in grain exports, while pastoral farming benefitted from increasing exports of butter, pork and bacon. Nonetheless, these benefits were not shared by the lower sections of society, rents remaining high in places and Whiteboy activity resuming in Munster from the mid-1780s. Candidates will make a judgement based on the proposition posed in the question.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

(b) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will mainly offer a descriptive, often superficial, account of the 1798 Rebellion with limited reference to the impact of British military superiority in its failure. Answers will be characterised by defects in accuracy, organisation, a limited vocabulary, poor spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers may provide a more detailed account of the importance of British military superiority in the failure of the 1798 Rebellion, though answers will be characterised by narrative rather than analysis. Candidates may note that British forces had a distinct advantage over the United Irishmen in terms of their training and the equipment and arms at their disposal. Answers will contain frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation, use of vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

At this level, candidates would be expected to acknowledge that other factors apart from British military were responsible for the failure of the 1798 Rebellion. An important adjunct to the military power that Britain was able to bring to bear against the rebels was the presence of locally recruited forces in the form of the Yeomanry and the Militia. In addition, the success of the British informer network had undermined the leadership of the Rebellion, evidenced in the arrest of Lord Edward Fitzgerald and the Leinster executive of the United Irishmen in March 1798. Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility, though there may be occasional lapses.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will be characterised by accuracy, organisation, good vocabulary, spelling, grammar, punctuation and legibility. In addition to the points already outlined, candidates could also note that the failure of the Rebellion was as much due to shortcomings on the part of the United Irishmen as to British strength. The rising was not coordinated, for example the Antrim and Down risings occurred separately, allowing the British to deal with one insurgency before regrouping to deal with the other. Also critical was the failure of the French to arrive early enough to have a decisive impact. Arguably, the fundamental factor in the defeat of the Rebellion was the failure of the United Irishmen to in fact unite Irishmen. The sectarian nature of the rising in Wexford had an adverse impact on the Presbyterian rising in Ulster, while British forces were supplemented by local recruits, both Catholic (into the Militia) and Protestant (into the Yeomanry). Candidates will make a judgement based on the proposition posed in the question.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

Option 3

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

26

60

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

- 1 (a) This question targets AO2: the candidate’s ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will simply present a paraphrase of each source, and fail to engage with the question.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will explain and compare the sources with some limited and incomplete comparisons. Source 1 devotes much of the question to social reform, while Source 2 suggests that there was no coherent strategy to deal with social reform.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will directly and more fully compare the views outlined in each source. Disraeli in Source 1 declares that the question of social reform is of vital importance to the Conservative Party. Source 2 suggests disappointment that, once in government, Disraeli had no obvious plan for dealing with social issues. Source 1 elevates social reform comparable to that of maintaining the Empire, and in the context with which the Empire was regarded of the late 19th century, this was quite notable. This, perhaps, partly explains the sense of disappointment in Source 2, which clearly contrasts Disraeli’s speeches with his apparent lack of urgency. Source 1 describes social improvement as the “most important question” for a statesman, yet Cross notes how Disraeli relied upon the prompting – “various suggestions” – of colleagues.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will provide more explanations while making their comparisons, and will utilise some contextual knowledge. Disraeli’s speech, with its commitment to social reform, came at a time when he Conservatives were in opposition. Hence the criticism of the Liberals. Moreover, these comments at Crystal Palace came several weeks after Disraeli’s famous Manchester speech. His inference that the Conservatives could be trusted to look after the Empire as well as the welfare of the masses can be seen in the context of a political leader giving an ideological direction to the party members. Cross is driven by no such agenda. Written in 1903, he can afford a critical retrospective, though good answers may speculate about his motives in distancing himself from any shortcomings of a government in which he played a key role.

AO2

[10]

- (b) This question targets AO2: the candidate’s ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will will present a paraphrase of the sources, with little reference to the question.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will provide a more detailed but incomplete response. Source 1 suggests that the question of social reform would take a comparable priority to the upkeep of the Empire. Source 2 implies that Disraeli had no clear strategy for reforming the social ills which he had referred to in Source 1.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the sources. Source 1 does little to suggest either way the proposition of consistency. The source does imply that the Conservatives will initiate much-needed social reform. The amount of reforms outlined in Source 3 supports consistency insofar that Disraeli did attempt, in a significant way, to redress social grievances. However, Source 2 suggests that there was inconsistency because of the “difficulty” in outlining what reforms were needed, which contradicts the statement in Source 1 that health was “the most important question” and for some “a matter of life and death”. However, there is some consistency between the aspirations in Source 1 and the synopsis of Disraeli’s social reform record in Source 3, with the passing of 11 “major acts” in two years.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will employ some contextual knowledge to support the analysis. Source 1 came against the background of the Conservatives in opposition, and Disraeli’s speeches at Manchester and Crystal Palace were designed to give his party a sense of direction and a sense of purpose, rather than a programme. Good answers may remark on Disraeli’s scathing attack on the Liberals in Source 1. His comments on social reform had to strike a balance between inducing electoral support from the newly emerging enfranchised working class voter and drawing from the Liberals those men of property who were disdainful of social reform. This lack of a definite programme explains Cross’s disappointment in Source 2, as it reveals that in many ways Disraeli’s actions were his response to the ideas of others. Indeed, it is worth noting that the Disraeli cabinet of 1874 was the smallest between 1832 and 1916, with only 12 members. The fact that most cabinet colleagues came from the aristocratic class correlates with the analysis of Source 3 on the dearth of social reform in the second half of the government.

AO2

[10]

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate’s ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

For a level 4 mark, each source should be evaluated as to its value in relation to the question. There should be a reasoned conclusion given, regardless of verdict.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will paraphrase the content of each source and will make an assertion which is not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 indicates a commitment on Disraeli's part to introduce social reform, so the source is valuable in pointing the way to the kind of legislation which is referred to in Source 3. Source 2 is valuable because of its authorship: Cross, as Home Secretary, was one of only 12 cabinet members, so is well placed to give an "insider" view. Source 3 is valuable as it provides a broad survey of both the extent and limitations of the social reform programme.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source in relation to the question, reaching a credible conclusion. Source 1 outlines how Disraeli attempted to place the Conservatives at the forefront of the question of social reform, by placing the redress of social grievances on the same level as the security of the empire. Good answers may remark as to the significance of this "empire" comparison, bearing in mind the political climate and Disraeli's earlier speech in Manchester. The content is useful for indicating the kind of social evils which needed to be remedied namely, health and working conditions. Source 2 is valuable for providing an element of contrast to Source 1. Cross says that once in office a "lack of originality" over social reform was quickly apparent. Indeed, there was even a problem of "outlining" which social reforms should be legislated for. Source 3 is of particular value as it gives insightful comment about social reform. Disraeli's age can partly explain the sentiments in Source 2. Adelman explains how 11 reforms were introduced, and assesses their value. Moreover, the lack of domestic reform after 1876 is attributed to the composition of the Conservative Party, and the tensions liable to arise therein if the social programme was pursued.

Level 4 ([12]–[14])

Answers will interpret the sources in more detail, with additional comment on their value. Good answers may place Source 1 in its historical context: the leader of a party in opposition, seeking to undermine the Liberal government and win over the electorate. The disappointment of Cross in Source 2 can be explained by Disraeli's determination to avoid "harassing the country" with too much reform. Indeed, Disraeli's comments on the Artisans' Dwelling Act of 1875 of the virtues of "permissive legislation" endorses the sentiment in Source 3. Answers may examine the points raised by Adelman. The Licensing Act, by curtailing licensing hours, pleased nobody. The labour laws permitted workers to picket peacefully, and declared that breaches of contrast by employers and workers should be treated as offences under civil law.

AO2

[14]

34

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will present a brief narrative about Gladstone's foreign policy and make assertions that are not fully supported.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers will provide more details, with clear gaps in knowledge. For example, such answers may write about one of Gladstone's ministries.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will address the issues raised in a more detailed way, attempting a partial evaluation. Such answers may produce a detailed account of one ministry and a limited focus on another; or perhaps examine both ministries in an incomplete way.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Answers will be more detailed, examining the foreign policy of both ministries and assessing how successful Gladstone was in achieving his objectives.

1868–1874: Gladstone wished to conduct foreign policy in a different way from what he perceived to be the provocative and aggressive stance taken by his predecessor, Palmerston. Gladstone believed in the concert of Europe, and desired to settle international disputes by arbitration. He believed that British rule over the empire was a duty and responsibility, but said that when internal self-government was given to colonies, they should not have to rely on British military aid for their internal security. Answers should assess these objectives in the main episodes of this ministry. Britain helped with the peace arrangements following the **Franco-Prussian War** of 1870; the **Black Sea Clauses** were a success for the "Concert" ideal; international arbitration over the "**Alabama**" award portrayed Britain as weak in contrast to Palmerston; self-government was granted to **Canada** in 1872. Disraeli made much of the perceived "failure" of Gladstone's foreign policy in the 1874 election campaign, and answers should comment on how far this verdict is valid.

1880–1885: Gladstone was determined to provide a foreign policy alternative to what he termed “Beaconsfieldism”, which he described as interventionist and aggressive. In his Midlothian campaigns of 1879–1880 Gladstone committed himself to restoring the independence of the Transvaal and withdrawing from Cyprus, Asia Minor and Afghanistan. In 1881 the Transvaal was granted self-government, but the issue of “suzerainty” caused confusion and contributed to the Boer War of 1899. Gladstone failed to withdraw from Afghanistan and Cyprus; while the only successful example of the “concert” in this ministry came in 1880 with the Turkish handover of Thessaly to Greece. The death of Gordon at Khartoum in 1883 caused uproar in Britain and weighed against Gladstone in the general election of 1885.

Answers may reflect that in this ministry, Gladstone had more failures than successes.

AO1a [8]

AO1b [18]

(b) This question targets AO1a and AO1b.

- (i) AO1a:** the candidate’s ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) AO1b:** the candidate’s ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b

Asters will produce a narrative about the status of women and make assertions that are not fully supported. Defects in detail, accuracy, organisation and poor grammar will be present.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers will provide more details, perhaps identifying ways in which the status of women improved, worsened or remained unchanged.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will explain in greater detail examples of both progress and shortcomings for women. Such answers may refer to certain aspects of women’s status, e.g. marriage, education and employment, political participation.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

Candidates will provide more detailed and evaluative responses, examining the status of women in the period and coming to a reasoned conclusion with some conviction. Women did many paid jobs in industrial England during this period, mainly in the textile industry and in factories. However, a strong prejudice existed against *respectable* women doing paid work. The fastest growing occupational category for young women was that of domestic servant, with 1 woman in 8 so employed by 1872. Women were more vulnerable to unemployment during periods of domestic depression, since women were much less likely to be members of trade unions. Well over 90% of women married at some stage of their lives, and they benefited from the 1870 Married Women’s Property Act. In 1882 women were allowed to keep separate property that they had acquired before marriage. Minor changes in education helped women, since the prevailing view was that the middle classes and aristocracy could pay large sums to have their sons educated while girls had to make do with domestic accomplishments. The medical, legal and academic professions were male dominated. While women did not receive the vote until 1918, between 1869 and 1894, women were permitted to vote in an increasing range of local elections. They also sat as councillors. The 1869 Municipal Corporations Act enabled unmarried women to vote in municipal elections. In 1875 women could be elected as Poor Law Guardians, while the Local Government Act of 1888 permitted women to vote for new county and county borough councils.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

26

Option 4

60

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

- 1 (a) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate’s ability to interpret and evaluate source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will present a paraphrase of each source.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers will explain and compare the sources in a limited way. For example: the authors of the Covenant explain why Unionists oppose the Home Rule Bill. However, Carson accepts that Home Rule, in some form, is inevitable.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will directly and more fully compare and explain the views of the Covenant and Carson, providing additional analysis. Source 1 declares that a Home Rule parliament would undermine the Empire, as well as damage Ireland’s material wellbeing. Carson makes no reference to his apprehensions about Home Rule. Rather, he is reflecting on how best the Bill can accommodate the opposition of the Ulster Unionists whom he represents. The Covenant, a formal declaration of intent, is solemn in tone, and reflects the mood of Unionism in 1912. Carson is more direct and businesslike, outlining a strategy of compromise which private correspondence permits. While Source 1 strongly hints at a total rejection of Home Rule, even by force – “by all means possible” – Carson, the lawyer, is seeking the best deal for his clients.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will be more confident, and will utilise some contextual knowledge to enhance the comparisons between the two sources. Source 1 is published shortly after the Liberals introduced the Third Home Rule Bill in April 1912. The crisis is at an early stage, when all those opposed to the Bill are establishing their public stance. The Covenant could be interpreted a part of the “verbal menace” evident in 1912, in which Unionist and Conservative allies warned Asquith of the implications of pursuing Home Rule. Carson’s letter, virtually a year to the day of the Covenant, contains his private doubts and reflections which contrast with the unrestrained resolutions in Source 1. The crisis over Home Rule is now in its second year and, with time running out before Home Rule completes its full parliamentary course, he is taking stock. It is significant that he shares his view with Bonar Law, who had thrown the full might of the Conservative Party behind the Unionist campaign to resist the Bill. The word “compromise” accurately foretells the attitude of all the main parties to Home Rule in 1914.

AO2

[10]

- (b) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers will merely paraphrase the sources.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers may provide a more definite but incomplete response, e.g. that Ulster Unionists suffered a defeat because they compromised over the Home Rule Bill.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers will develop a more sustained assessment of the sources, linking the content to the issue of “defeat” in various ways. Candidates may argue that the firm resolve against the Bill in Source 1 appears to be diluted in Source 2, and that the UUC decision in Source 3 suggests a total failure. However, the word “defeat” may be interpreted in a less clear-cut fashion. Source 1 links Home Rule to potential damage for Ulster. Source 2 outlines a plan for saving most of Ulster from Home Rule, while Source 3 indicates that the government has endorsed Carson's wish to guarantee that the majority of Ulster Unionists will be permanently excluded from a Home Rule parliament.

Level 4 ([9]–[10])

Answers will use some contextual comment to enhance their analysis. For example, candidates may remark on the dates – September 1912, September 1913 and June 1916 – in order to place the sources in a historical context. Candidates may comment on the authors and/or potential audience. Source 1 appears at the commencement of the crisis, so it understandably articulates all the grievances, determination and potential methods of the Ulster Unionists. Source 2 appears in the middle of the crisis, when the need for compromise is more likely to materialise. Good candidates may comment that for Carson, the Dublin-born lawyer, exclusion in any form represented a defeat for his original aim of wrecking the entire Home Rule Bill. A contrast with the attitude of Sir James Craig would be well rewarded. Candidates may comment on the context in which the decisions in Source 3 were arrived at: the crisis of the First World War, the aftermath of the Easter Rising, and the belief that sacrifices were necessary to help the Empire – the latter mentioned in the previous two sources. Good candidates may draw attention to the fact that the Ulster Unionist delegates from Cavan, Monaghan and Donegal voted for six county exclusion.

AO2

[10]

- (c) **This question targets AO2:** the candidate's ability to interpret, evaluate and use source material in relation to historical context.

Indicative content:

For Levels 3 and 4, each source would have to be examined for the information it provides and in terms of the nature and quality of the evidence, with a reasoned conclusion reached, regardless of verdict.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Answers will merely paraphrase the content of each source and make an assertion which is not fully supported.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers will comment on the utility of the sources, using the content more fully. Source 1 is valuable because it reveals the reasons why Ulster Unionists opposed the Home Rule Bill. Source 2 is valuable because it conveys doubts about the prospect of preventing the implementation of the Bill, and shows a form of compromise. Source 3 indicates how the compromise was presented and received.

Level 3 ([8]–[11])

Answers will present a more sustained assessment of the value of each source in relation to its value, and reach a credible conclusion. Source 1 provides a range of motives behind the Unionists' campaign: economic, civil liberties, religious and imperial. The implied use of force is unmistakable. Source 2's value is increased by its author, content and audience. Carson had aimed to mobilise the Ulster Unionists to defeat the Bill: now he contemplates compromise. Bonar Law's language was quite menacing in the early months of the crisis: now the two main party leaders are in consultation about a tactical change. Source 3 is especially valuable for explaining the circumstances which prompted Ulster Unionists to accept six county Ulster exclusion.

Level 4 ([12]–[14])

Candidates will add some contextual knowledge in their assessment of the sources and their value. Good candidates may draw attention to the Covenant's aim of stopping Home Rule for *Ireland*, which is mentioned twice. Words like *citizenship* and *empire* are also repeated. The Empire is referred to in *all three sources*, revealing how significant the crisis was perceived to be. Candidates may draw on their knowledge of Carson and his colleague Sir James Craig when commenting on the value of Source 2. Top level responses will identify the deliberations described in Source 3 to the famous Lloyd George talks episode after the Easter Rising. The authorship of the source – the UUC – increases its value, as does its content in explaining the pressures which prevailed on Ulster Unionists to agree to a compromise which virtually abandoned fellow Unionists in the south and west of Ireland. *All three sources are of value, as they explain why Home Rule was opposed, how compromise was conceived, and why exclusion was endorsed.*

AO2

[14]

34

2 (a) This question targets:

- (i) **AO1a:** the candidate's ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) **AO1b:** the candidate's ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:**Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b**

Answers will provide a basic narrative on the period 1914–1918. Defects in accuracy, organisation and grammar will be evident.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers will have more detail, clarity and relevance. Frequent lapses in accuracy, organisation and grammar will appear.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will address the issues raised in the question in a more confident if incomplete manner, lacking the depth of detail and analysis required for a Level 4 mark. Such answers may concentrate on a narrow range of issues, such as the role of the Irish Party.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

These answers will be more detailed, providing a comprehensive account of the issues involved in the question, such as the mistakes of the Irish Party, the opportunism of Sinn Fein, the impact of the First World War and the role of British government policy on Irish politics between 1914 and 1918.

Candidates may choose to answer in this way:

Irish Party mistakes undoubtedly contributed to the success of Sinn Fein in the General Election of December 1918. Redmond accepted Lloyd George's verbal assurances that partition would be temporary rather than permanent, and the breakdown of these ill-fated talks undermined his credibility irreparably with many nationalists. Redmond refused a cabinet post when the wartime coalition government was formed in May 1915. Moreover, he spent too much of his time in London, and tended to be out of touch with political events in Ireland. His reaction to the Easter Rising was indicative of a statesman who was responding to political changes out of his control. Moreover, the Irish Party allowed its electoral machinery and party organisation to stagnate, thereby conceding momentum to the new and vibrant Sinn Fein challenge in the General Election.

The First World War assisted Sinn Fein in several ways: the postponement of Home Rule created a political vacuum which physical force nationalists exploited, while the government refused to acknowledge Redmond's gesture at Woodenbridge.

Government policy, especially during the period 1916–1918, undermined the Irish Party and contributed to Sinn Fein’s electoral success. The handling of the Rising antagonised all shades of nationalist opinion, e.g.: martial law, arrests of innocent people, re-arrests, deaths of Sheehy-Skeffington and Ashe, and the Lloyd George talks. The fortunes of Sinn Fein were additionally enhanced by the ill-conceived plans to introduce conscription in Ireland, and the German Plot. Dillon developed the theory that the government, in manufacturing Sinn Feiners, was deliberately setting out to destroy the Irish Party.

Top band responses will note that the fortunes of Sinn Fein were also affected by several other factors.

Irish Party misfortunes played their part. The prolongation of the War made Home Rule more elusive, while the damage to the *Freeman’s Journal* in 1916 weakened its capacity to defend its stance on many key issues.

Candidates at the top level may comment on the role played by Sinn Fein themselves in promoting their own political fortunes during this period, and may conclude that Sinn Fein carefully manipulated the fluid political scene in the months after the Rising. Such answers may refer to Sinn Fein’s public association with the 1916 rebels as they entered martyrdom, their exploitation of government policy, as well as their wooing of the Catholic Church whose hierarchy were dubious about what the Sinn Fein movement stood for. The Sinn Fein Convention of 1917 and the decision to contest by-elections, along with the capacity to take seats from their Irish Party rivals, created the political momentum which Sinn Fein needed in order to assert themselves in the General Election of December 1918.

AO1a [8]

AO1b [18]

(b) This question targets:

- (i) AO1a:** the candidate’s ability to recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.
- (ii) AO1b:** the candidate’s ability to present historical explanations showing understanding of appropriate concepts and arrive at substantiated judgements.

Indicative content:

Level 1 ([1]–[2]) AO1a, ([1]–[4]) AO1b

Answers will produce a basic account of the Anglo-Irish War, perhaps describing some of the main events.

Level 2 ([3]–[4]) AO1a, ([5]–[9]) AO1b

Answers will provide more detail, with a limited reference to the circumstances of the Truce.

Level 3 ([5]–[6]) AO1a, ([10]–[14]) AO1b

Answers will address the issues in the question in a more confident if incomplete manner, lacking the depth of detail and analysis required for a Level 4 mark.

Level 4 ([7]–[8]) AO1a, ([15]–[18]) AO1b

These answers will be more detailed, providing a comprehensive account of the issues raised by the question. Such answers will debate the extent of the military and political defeat which the British government experienced, and reflect on the pressures which compelled Republicans to accept the Truce offer of July 1921.

Candidates may choose to answer in this way:

Political pressures did impact on the decision of the British government to offer a truce in the summer of 1921. Over a period of eighteen months a body of opinion, reflecting intellectuals, churchmen, politicians at home and abroad, had privately and publicly condemned the actions of Crown forces. In particular, acts of perceived indiscipline by the Black and Tans, as well as the policy of reprisals, caused embarrassing publicity both domestically and worldwide for Britain. While the actions of Republicans were also criticised by the same sources, the balance of censure fell on the forces of the Crown, who were expected to adhere to a more rigorous code of conduct, subject to accountability.

Military considerations had a role to play in the truce offer. Candidates can debate the word “defeat” in several ways. It can be argued that Crown forces were not “defeated” in the sense of losing a decisive engagement. However, the guerrilla campaign waged by Republicans had taken its toll. Senior British military commanders had private doubts about the capacity of their men to continue the campaign into the winter of 1921. Top band candidates may comment on the *timing* of the truce. By mid-July, the government faced the real prospect of an escalation of the conflict following the declaration of the south and west of Ireland as a Crown Colony. It was this prospect of a greater military conflict, which offered no apparent expectation of termination, extending into the winter, which pushed the British military leaders towards a truce.

Top level answers should also reflect on the political and military perspectives which made accepting a truce offer so attractive. *While it took two sides to make a war, it certainly required the consent of both to agree to a truce. Candidates may remark on the inescapable logic that Republicans must have had comparable political and military problems or else no truce would have been endorsed.*

Political considerations impacted on the Republican side. A reasonable truce offer could scarcely be rejected without the loss of political sympathy. In this regard, the truce offer of July 1921 was remarkably generous, especially in the context of the earlier proposals drafted by the British cabinet in December 1920 and given to intermediaries in order to initiate truce talks. For example: while in December Republicans were required to hand over all arms as a precondition, no such obligation was evident six months later.

Military pressures also impacted on Republicans. Collins correctly assessed how low in arms and ammunition his men were. The Custom House raid had been a military disaster. His acceptance of the truce was based on the simple logic that there was little alternative. His comment to Hamar Greenwood that “you had us beaten in another three weeks” was no jest, but a serious indictment of Republican military strength by the summer of 1921.

AO1a

[8]

AO1b

[18]

Option 5

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

26

60

60