

## **Mark Schemes for the Units**

---

**January 2009**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

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

## **CONTENTS**

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

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

## **MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS**

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
AS/A2 History    Syllabus-Specific Marking Instructions	1
2580    Document Studies 871 – 1099	17
2581    Document Studies 1450 – 1693	23
2582    Document Studies 1774 – 1945	33
2583    English History 1042 – 1660	48
2584    English History 1780 – 1964	71
2585    European History 1046 – 1718	95
2586    European and World History 1789 – 1989	121
2587    Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	141
2588    Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	147
2589    Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	159
2590    Themes in History 1066 – 1796	180
2591    Themes in History 1763 – 1996	213
Grade Thresholds	243

# AS/A2 History Syllabus-Specific Marking Instructions

AS/A2 HISTORY

January 2009

## Unit 2580 SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

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

### 1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 3 GENERIC MARK BANDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **6 POSITIVE MARKING**

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

**Question-specific mark schemes alone indicate any omissions that will affect marks awarded or any ceilings to be applied.** Mark positively by rewarding what has been written. When things go wrong, it is usually because an undue severity creeps in when omissions and errors are looked for (marking negatively).

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

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

## **8 MARKING SCRIPTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Comments on scripts**

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

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

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

Always avoid:

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

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

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

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

Do **not** make:

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **10 OVERALL**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2580-2582

AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

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

### Question (a)

#### BAND/20: Comparison

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Question (b)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2583-2586:

### AS PERIOD STUDIES

#### NB

Examiners are reminded that

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

#### Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

### Units 2587-2589: HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Examiners are reminded that

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

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

## PASSAGES QUESTION

NB

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## ESSAY

### NB

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

## BANDS I-VII/45

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



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

The following question-specific content is indicative only. Candidates would not be expected to include all the possible points referred to here.

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

### UNITS 2590-2591: THEMES IN HISTORY

#### NB

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

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

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

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

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

- III (36–41) The answer demonstrates clearly an **attempt to synthesise some elements** to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **reasonable awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument supported** by appropriate factual material. The approach **mostly contains analysis or explanation but may lack balance** and there may be **some heavily descriptive/narrative passages and/or** the answer may be **somewhat lacking in appropriate supporting factual material**. The answer is mostly relevant. The writing is generally fluent and usually uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.
- IV (30–35) The answer demonstrates an **uneven attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is an **adequate awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly, but the structure of the argument is poor**. The approach **depends more on heavily descriptive or narrative** passages than on analysis or explanation (which may be limited to introductions and conclusions). Factual material, sometimes very full, is used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly the requirements of the question**. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (24–29) The answer demonstrates a **limited attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **limited awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer but the approach lacks analysis or explanation** and there is **little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question**. The structure of the answer shows **weaknesses in organisation** and the treatment of topics is **seriously unbalanced**. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (12–23) The answer demonstrates an **unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails to reflect the synoptic nature of the Module. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The **answer is not focused** on the requirements of the question and may be of **very limited relevance**. Any **argument** offered may be **fragmentary and incoherent**, and any **assertions** made may be **unsupported** by factual material. There may be serious irrelevance and/or serious weaknesses in knowledge. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0–11) The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails completely to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. There is **no attempt to answer the question**. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## 2580 Document Studies 871 – 1099

### Unit 2580 Document Studies 871-1099

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

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

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems faced by Alfred as King. [20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

Candidates need to compare the two Sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The introductions and attributions can be used to aid comparison.

In Source **A**, Asser, naturally favourable to Alfred, emphasises both the King's need to cajole, command and direct, amidst a context of setbacks, both political and military. In Source **B**, the King himself provides a translation, reflecting his perception of the need to improve learning and education, linked to good service. As in **A**, Alfred sets out some of the problems he faced and emphasises the value of literacy and so change. Both Sources emphasise the spiritual and religious, with **A** pointing up failings of subordinates and **B** failings born of a lack of learning and holy men, so reflecting Alfred's concerns and challenges. Comment can be made on tone of language in both, stressing the severity of problems faced; **A** pointing to a failure of thegns and others to fulfil royal orders, **B** pointing to the consequences of repeated Viking attacks.

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

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

**Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the success of Alfred's Kingship depended entirely on the force of his personality. [40]**

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

The proposition may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use all four Sources, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge.

All the Sources point to the personal nature and qualities of Alfred's Kingship. Sources **A**, **B** and **D** contain a sense of the force of personality, while **C** reflects on Alfred's impact and impression created as a King. Context needs to be borne in mind, including luck and changing circumstances. Sources **B** and **C** refer to religious values. Sources **C** and **D** point to military and political factors as well, with **D** providing a useful overview. Source **A** has some allusions to military needs as well, while Source **B** mentions military threats. In Source **A**, Alfred sets out to battle against various trials and tribulations, a part of his long haul as a King, meeting various challenges, in this case very much internal, while Source **B** reflects something of the external challenges and sets out the importance of didactic learning and instruction. Source **A** sees much value in clear instruction of subordinates and their respectful loyalty and obedience. Source **C** has praise for a great ruler, an all-rounder as king, involved in political activity (as in **A**) and military (hinted at in **B**). Source **D** points to the benefits of a lull in Viking attacks while Source **A** shows that Alfred had to rely on others, albeit having cajoled them into action. There is, then, the suggestion of other factors, reinforced by contextual knowledge (alliances and the Mercia Ealdormen, Welsh rulers, activities of regional Ealdormen and his son Prince Edward). Source **D** provides an overview of successes after 878-9, military and cultural, with religious changes seen as important. It makes overt, if brief, references to military reforms and campaigns, seen as a part of the breadth of good government. It can be linked to references in Sources **A**, **B** and **C**. 'Entirely' needs to be engaged and Sources and own knowledge used to assess and evaluate, arguing and counter-arguing as appropriate. Own knowledge can be used to support the above: for instance, the 'Alfredian Renaissance', efforts to improve the Church, the nature of government, military operations and their unevenness, even in 892-6, when, understandably, Alfred's physical powers were waning and he left much to others.

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

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

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the aims of the Normans for maintaining peace in England. [20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

Candidates need to compare the two Sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The introductions and attributions can be used to aid comparison.

The aims of peace and its foundations are prominent in both Sources. The tone and language of both Sources can be engaged with profit as can the provenances, with William of Poitiers being seen as more partial to William I and the writ as reflective of the King's concerns. In Source **A**, the regents are viewed as good and effective, in the face of unrest, while in **C** William directs and instructs the provision of good, effective justice, the righting of wrongs. In **A** Norman rule appears just and focused on peace, in **C** it is expressed in genuine concern for good order. In **A** the English are seen as potentially troublesome; peace is needed to control and contain them, while in **C** the focus is more upon the monastery, its head and lands, presumably a mix of Norman and English personnel, with perhaps the Norman paramount.

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

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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the success of William I's government depended entirely on the personal interventions of the King. [40]

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

The proposition may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use all four Sources, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge.

Source **C** is prominent in the spirit of personal intervention, Source **D** refers to the overall effects of William as a ruler, guiding, directing, adapting, changing; Sources **A** and **B** refer to the role of regents, in the place of an absent King. Source **D** provides a useful overview, suggesting a blend of accepted, old, Anglo-Saxon methods of rule and newer, imported Norman; Anglo-Saxon and Norman are welded, with achievements but also harsh rule, a feature also of Source **B**. Source **C** points to English methods of government and Sources **A** and **B** reflect the impact of Norman changes. Sources **A** and **B**, though depicting the regents in different ways, reflect the creation of posts to maintain government in the absence of the King; problems had been created by the fusion of England and Normandy. Source **C** shows the use of a favoured Anglo-Saxon device, the writ, to demonstrate the forceful authority of the King. Sources **A** and **B** reflect something of the new as do parts of **D**, while **C** and parts of **D** reflect elements of the old. Own knowledge can be adduced to support these Sources: the role and place of regents, including William's wife and queen and Lanfranc; the blending of Anglo-Saxon institutions and methods (treasury, writing office, hundreds and shires, the writ) with Norman developments (the enhanced status of the sheriff, a proper secretariat, a more powerful Treasury, the changed status and powers of Earls, the uses of Latin); the necessities of developing efficient government and rule (including law and order issues) in England with its ruler absent so often (especially later in the reign). Source **D** has value in its depiction of a number of these features. Sources **A** and **B** point up the importance of firm control, albeit **B** is critical in tone, while **C** emphasises firm justice. 'Entirely' needs good engagement: argument and counter-argument.

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

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

**Compare these Sources as evidence for how the hardships were faced by those on the Crusade. [20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

Candidates need to compare the two Sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The introductions and attributions can be used to aid comparison.

Sources **A** and **B** can be welded together to address a range of hardships and how they were dealt with. In **A**, climate, attacks by enemies, a lack of equipment, the problems of a 'mixture of languages' are all reviewed, while in **B** possible desertions, the internal divisions (Bohemond is exemplified), illness and again problems of equipment and horses, are also covered. In both, there is a religious dimension, both implicit and explicit. Both Sources suggest the ability and determination of the crusaders to overcome their problems. Both emphasise the threats from the Turks, seen as formidable ('dreaded the ceaseless attacks' in **B**, 'terribly wasted and depopulated' in **A**). The provenances are similar, perhaps encouraging a certain similarity of views, in part the product of presence on the Crusade and experiences engendered.

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



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

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the success of the First Crusade depended mainly on the unity of the Crusaders. [40]

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

The proposition may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use all four Sources, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge.

Unity of purpose is reflected, at different levels, in all four Sources, especially in Source **C** and, in part, in **A**. Other factors and issues are adduced in Sources **B**, **C** and especially **D**. **B** and **C** stress religious commitment and determination, with **C** praising the triumph over adversity. **D** mixes Crusader endeavours and Turkish weaknesses, stressing – like **C** – the handicaps the Crusaders faced in their operations. **D** does provide the useful overview, linking to other Sources. The Sources reflect on the achievements of the crusaders, overcoming many problems (Sources **A**, **B** and **C**), including internal divisions (Sources **B** and **D**). Military success was founded upon the leadership of such as Count Raymond (**B**) and religious endeavour and comradeship (**A**, **B** and **C**). Source **D** points up the importance of the context: their opponents were seriously divided and so weakened. Own knowledge can be used to support the Sources: the diverse make-up of the Crusade, with a great range of peoples and classes; the needs of strong noble leadership; the ability to adapt military tactics to meet climate and opponents; expressions of religious fervour; the prevailing divisions of opponents. ‘Mainly’ needs good engagement, based around argument and counter-argument.

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

## 2581 Document Studies 1450 – 1693

### The Wars of the Roses 1450-85: Noble Feuds in the early 1450s

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

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the conduct and motives of Somerset from 1452 to 1455. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources.

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

Clearly there is more detail in Source C than Source A, but they agree about the basic facts. Somerset was close to the King and opposed to the Duke of York. The difference lies in the spin they put upon these facts. Source A regards Somerset as the King's only good advisor and as trying to rid the kingdom of faction. Source C describes him as stirring the King against York and motivated by malice. Discussion of the provenance of the two Sources provides clues to explain these differing views of his conduct. Source C is a Yorkist Source written soon after Edward IV's accession, while Source A was written in early Tudor times, after the overthrow of the Yorkist monarchy. It might be argued that Source A, written by an Italian some 50 years after the events described, is likely to be more objective; but his view does seem surprisingly favourable to Somerset, perhaps reflecting the fact that the first Tudor king was of Lancastrian descent.

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

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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the feud between York and Somerset was the main cause of the outbreak of civil strife in 1455. [40]

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

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

Sources **A** and **C** support the assertion. Source **C** explicitly states that there was 'a deadly quarrel' between them in 1455, while Source **A** refers to York being 'certain that Somerset would oppose him'. Both Sources, however, go further and attempt to apportion blame for this feud. Source **A** speaks favourably of Somerset and so blames York, while **C** regards York as the wronged party. The provenance of these Sources can be used to explain their standpoints: Vergil, as mentioned in the introduction to Source **A**, was employed by the Tudors, heirs to the Lancastrian claim, while we are told that Source **C** was written from a Yorkist viewpoint. Candidates could also use own knowledge to assess these two views of the feud, e.g. by reference to York's resentment of his replacement by Somerset in Normandy in 1446 (many will know of this even though it is outside the set period) or to the arrest and imprisonment of Somerset by York during Henry's incapacity in 1453-4. Source **B** supports Source **A** in placing the blame on York. This is not surprising: it is a Lancastrian tract written to support the attainder of York in 1459, expressed in fairly extreme language, and clearly biased. But the point it makes is not unfair: what right had York to take the law into his own hands? Source **D** offers a different explanation for the outbreak of civil strife, one that is widely regarded as the true explanation: the weakness of Henry VI as King. Own knowledge could be used to develop this, particularly the point in the last sentence about the influence of favourites – e.g. Suffolk and, especially, Somerset. Which takes the argument back to Sources **A** and **C** and the feud between Somerset and York and poses the question, Should the blame for the growth of this feud and the resulting civil strife be placed not on York or Somerset but on the King? Or perhaps on structural problems such as bastard feudalism?

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

**The German Reformation 1517-30: The Appeal of Lutheranism****2(a) Study Sources A & B**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for Luther's attack on the Roman Catholic Church.** [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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

Sources **A** and **B** share a common authorship, Martin Luther. In both he discusses financial exploitation - indulgences in **A**, church taxes in **B**. In both he is indignant at the Church misleading the simple German folk. He attacks the splendour of Rome in both – the Papal indulgence for building St Peter's in **A**, the unwieldy papal bureaucracy in **B**. In **A** Luther attacks Papal indulgences and criticises the Archbishop who is allowing them to be sold in his lands, whereas **B** attacks the general extortion of Germany by the Papacy and Roman Curia. In **A** Luther bases his attack on spiritual damage and lost souls, whereas in **B** he concentrates on the humiliating economic and social impact of papal taxation. The tone of **A** is subservient: 'dear Father', 'your Electoral Highness'; whereas in **B** he uses emotive and provocative language: 'swarm of rats'.

Reasons for the differences might include the changed context: in 1517, Luther was a lone voice and the dispute was local; whereas in 1520 Luther had been exposed as a heretic, and was an internationally notorious figure, thanks to the printing press. He was about to be formally excommunicated. The audience of **A** is one church official, whereas in **B** it is primarily the secular powers, whose protection is his only means of escaping death, though he also addresses the whole German 'nation'. He is anxious to harness his cause to wider anger against church taxes and tap national feeling. Luther's own anti-papal views have hardened by 1520, he is by then in real danger and needs breadth of support.

Candidates are not required to use contextual knowledge in their answers, but may refer relevantly to Albert's need to pay his personal debts to the Fuggers and to the political division of Germany into 300+ states, some ruled by the Church directly.

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

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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that financial issues were the main reason for the appeal of Lutheranism between 1517 and 1520.

[40]

Focus: Judgement in context of the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, including any limitation as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Sources **A** and **C** tend more towards spiritual issues, while **B** and **D** focus on financial issues. Within the set of Sources are financial, economic, religious, nationalist, propaganda and personal reasons for the appeal of Lutheranism. Three Sources refer to financial issues, which are perhaps implied by von Hutten's reference to 'Church frauds' in **C**. The **main** aim of Source **C** is to rally support for the subsequent Knights' War to gain economic and social status. **D** suggests that Aleander may be able to bribe the Germans to co-operate with the Church, supporting the evidence of corruption in **A** and **B**, while the envoy himself is seeking money for his own expenses. At face value, **B** supports the claim that financial issues were crucial, though Luther's purpose, the appeal for princely protection, makes him underplay his spiritual motives. Spiritual and religious reasons also appear in the Sources as a set. Source **A** mentions extortion through sale of indulgences, but its **main** concern is spiritual. Written on the same day as the posting of the 95 Theses, **A** provides the basis for Luther's broader attack on papal corruption. Source **A** raises the issue of papal perversion of the true path to salvation, but, as a private letter, will not be read by the public. **C** refers to Christian truth. Both **A** and **B** refer to the piety of the simple folk, whose support Luther has rallied by 1521 in **D**, with important help from the printing presses which have published the propaganda pictures mentioned. National feeling is an important reason in **B**, **C** and **D**: the 'German Nation', targeted by Luther in **B**, is in 'full revolt' in **D**. Personal reasons also play their part: Luther's and von Hutten's need for protection in a time of excommunication, which links to the attribution of **C**. Knowledge of Ulrich von Hutten's personal, social and political reasons for supporting Luther may be known and used. **C** also appeals to those seeking freedom (the Freedom of a Christian Man was also published in 1520). Own knowledge might include discussion of the appeal of the 'priesthood of all believers' to those seeking liberty. The reaction of the Church, as in **D**, and hints of the violence to come may also explain the appeal of Lutheranism in this period.

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

**Mid- Tudor Crisis 1540-58****3(a) Study Sources B and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the importance of former Church property in 1554. [20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to make real comparisons between the contents of the Sources and to evaluate such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for - - '. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation. Reference to both Sources is vital for a successful answer.

Both Sources recognise the importance of the issue at a time when reconciliation with Rome was being pursued. Both recognise the potential resistance to any return of property. Again both see the issue as a key to progress in returning the English Church to Papal obedience and both refer to the role of Cardinal Pole. Candidates should notice that both Sources emanate from foreign observers (but possibly have slightly different concerns) and both report to Charles V. The chronology of the Sources could be important; Pole was not in the country in August 1554 but was in November. There are some differences between the sources in that in **C** there is an implication that there might have been a movement in favour of the restoration of Church property and that there is a suggestion that Pole was behind it. In mentioning the actions of the Council, **C** provides evidence for 'official' opposition to the return of Church property which **B** does not.

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

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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the religious policies of Mary's reign were based mainly upon reconciliation. [40]

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

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge, evaluating their strengths and weaknesses and any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is to be expected. Careful reading of the question is required since 'the religious policies of Mary's reign' go a little beyond 'Mary's religious policies'. Sources **A** and **B** go a long way towards supporting the proposition. **A** has useful phrases concerning conciliation and lack of compulsion. In the early part of the reign, particularly, the influence of Charles V was considerable and his interests lay in a stable England. Source **B** reflects this softly-softly approach. Nevertheless both **A** and **B** seem to look forward to a further stage of the religious settlement which could be less conciliatory. Candidates can be expected to pick up on key phrases. Candidates might also argue that although Mary had successfully married Philip of Spain in July 1554 there was still some nervousness concerning Wyatt's rebellion in January. Source **C** also lends some support to the existence of a conciliatory policy but, here, it is based on the one issue of Church property and was driven by necessity rather than principle (Mary had initially hoped to restore Church property wholesale). Source **D** presents an entirely different picture of religious persecution. The execution of Taylor took place on 9 February 1555 by which time Parliament had met (November 1554-January 1555). Papal authority had been successfully restored and, although the ownership of Church lands had been assured, the heresy laws had been revived. Contextually, candidates might argue the relatively mild nature of religious persecution in England when compared to some other parts of Europe.

Some candidates may interpret 'reconciliation' as 'reconciliation with Rome' or 'reconciliation of the country to the old faith'. This is allowable provided that it does not form the main focus of the argument.

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

**The English Civil War 1637-49****4(a) Study Sources B and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for Charles I's religious policies. [20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to make real comparisons between the contents of the two Sources and to evaluate such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources as 'evidence for- - '. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation. Reference to both Sources is vital for a successful answer.

Taken together the Sources demonstrate some clear indications of Charles I's religious policies. Candidates may make some reference to Charles' earlier religious policies but this should not be at the expense of comparing the Sources. Source **B**, the Nineteen Propositions, reflects how Parliament sees Charles's policies for stricter measures against Jesuits and recusants; reform of Church government and liturgy; the abandonment of 'innovations and superstitions'. Candidates may suggest that the proposition concerning the marriage of the King's children was aimed to prevent marriage alliances with Catholic powers and may invite them to argue how far Charles intended to follow such a policy. Source **C** (the King's Declaration from Nottingham) seem to accept up to a point, Parliament's demands over religion 'to oppose Popery and superstition' and 'to advance the true Protestant religion'. However, at least here, the King offers no concessions on, for example, Church government and candidates might argue that the King's interpretations of 'the true Protestant religion' was very different to Parliament's. Moreover, candidates might doubt the King's overall sincerity in expressing his religious policies at a time when he is appearing to achieve a last-minute compromise and settlement, having already raised his standard.

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



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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the outbreak of the Civil War was the result mainly of Charles I's uncompromising attitude. [40]

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

Successful answers will need to make use of all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge, evaluating their strengths and weaknesses and any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is to be expected. Although candidates may draw upon wider knowledge to point out the longer-term causes of Civil War the predominant focus must be upon the last phase, that is to say the period from the summoning of the Short Parliament in April 1640 to the outbreak of civil war in August 1642 and especially upon the period covered by the Sources (January-August 1642). There is very helpful material in Sources **A** and **D** to support the proposition presented in the question. **A** demonstrates a hard line against the 'five members' and candidates might well question the justice and validity of the charges made. In **D**, Kenyon draws attention to the King's 'politics of confrontation' and his firm belief in upholding the Divine Right of Kings. Source **B** provides opportunities to present a counter argument. In the Nineteen Propositions, Parliament strikes at the root of the royal prerogative (matters to do with the royal family, dynastic policy, the government of the Church and the control of military resources). These were requirements that the King could not accept and candidates might argue that Parliament was deliberately driving the King into a corner. Source **C**, it could be argued, gives evidence of a willingness of the King to compromise on some important issues but candidates may draw attention to the lateness and possibly desperation of this more conciliatory attitude. In this respect, **C** should be set alongside **D** which is helpful on the context of the King's newly found moderation and also raises the question of the King's sincerity. Candidates may be expected to draw upon own knowledge in further evaluating the balance of blame and responsibility and good answers will identify issues and events which relate to the matters covered by the Sources. It would be particularly appropriate to mention such matters as Parliament's impeachment of Laud and Stafford, the Root and Branch bill, the Triennial Act, the Grand Remonstrance and the Militia Ordinance and the King's responses. Other relevant issues might be the Irish Rebellion and responses to it, the King's decision to leave London and raise armed forces in June 1642.

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

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

**Louis XIV's France 1661-1693****5(a) Study Sources B and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for Louis XIV's style of kingship. [20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to make real comparisons between the content of the two Sources and to evaluate such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for- -'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation. Reference to both Sources is vital for a successful answer.

The two Sources present a different picture of Louis XIV's style of kingship. Source **B** is, of course, written by Louis himself after almost twenty years of personal rule with his authority well established and great success already behind him. Since **C** is written by a well-known critic of the 'Versailles system' and of Louis himself, although his personal loyalty to the King was stressed elsewhere in the Memoirs. Saint-Simon's account is able to put the whole reign into perspective. Louis is concerned to present some of the dilemmas of personal monarchy, largely that of balancing public duty and private inclinations. He makes it clear, however, that the interests of the State must come first, although the concept of 'l'etat c'est moi' is made clear. Louis admits to mistakes but to an extent avoids responsibility by putting blame on the 'advice of others'. Saint-Simon is concerned to point out some of the dangers of Louis' style of kingship and points up the King's vanity rather than, perhaps, his sense of public duty, and his susceptibility to flattery from many sides. There seems to be at least one touching point between the Sources in that Saint-Simon also draws attention to the influence of ministers. Saint-Simon introduces one issue not referred to in **B**; the King's alleged aversion to the nobility and candidates may use contextual knowledge to comment upon this.

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

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

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the extent to which absolutism in France was strengthened between 1661 and 1693. [40]**

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

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

There are elements of support for the proposition that absolutism was strengthened in the period 1661-93 in all four Sources. Equally, evidence can be found in all the Sources, or an argument developed, for a different conclusion. Of course, the balance across the Sources is different. It could be argued from Source **A** that the development of absolutism benefited from the personal control established by Louis in 1661 especially if such personal monarchy was in the hands of a conscientious and able King. There are signs in Source **B** that the King did exhibit a conscientious approach. From own knowledge, candidates could argue that a monarchy run by the King himself was more likely to be effective than one under an unpopular Cardinal. Source **A** certainly demonstrates the King's conscientiousness but it could be argued that such attention to detail detracted from the effective exercise of absolutism. Source **B** certainly demonstrates the King's sense of duty and the inference might be that this made the monarchy more effective. The reference to 'the advice of others' should remind candidates of the ability of ministers chosen by Louis and their achievements in extending absolutism and making it more effective. Examples may be expected. Source **C** criticises the King for his vanity, his being open to flattery, his high opinion of himself and his desire for glory. This may be held to detract from absolutism being strengthened but although wars might have been 'long and ruinous' it still might be argued that absolutism was strengthened by being able to direct ambitious wars and foreign policy. It might be further argued that Louis' 'aversion to noble birth' weakened the nobility who, in the past, had been obstacles to absolutism. Source **D** presents a guarded view, and distinguishes between appearances and reality. The matter of the nobility, as raised in **C**, has echoes in **D**. Source **D** recognises the King's ability to 'command the largest armies and revenues in Europe' but balances this against the persistence of local powers and particularism.

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

## 2582 Document Studies 1774 – 1945

### Origins of the French Revolution

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

**Compare these sources as evidence for the causes of unrest in Paris in July 1789.**

**[20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

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

The clear link is the dismissal of Necker mentioned by both **C** and **D**. **D** says that ‘the whole of Paris’ took up arms; **C** says that there was huge enthusiasm for the suggestion that Paris take up arms among the crowds of the Palais Royal. **C** confirms that the people were shocked and horrified by the dismissal of the reforming minister. **D** also makes mention of bread shortage which **C** does not. Both sources refer to the threats from troops – **D** says that they were stationed round Paris and Versailles and **C** shows them in action against the crowds in central Paris. **D** gives more detail about the situation of Necker; **C** shows more of the process by which radicals used the dismissal to stir the crowds. The sources are different but both are by people who were close to the events – as Necker’s daughter Germaine de Staël would have known the situation prior to his dismissal. As an active participant in mob unrest, Desmoulins would know the impact of Necker’s dismissal. **C** is written much closer to the events and is a letter. **D** is a memoir written long after the events of 1789 – but the writer is hardly likely to forget momentous events in her father’s life. Both in a sense have a vested interest – Necker’s daughter might want to inflate his reputation and importance; Desmoulins might wish to give a heroic image of himself as the avenger of Necker’s betrayal. Necker was more of a symbol than anything else and the wider context may explain discontent more – the failures of the Third Estate, the bad economic situation in Paris, the end of censorship referred to in **A** and the emergence of radical ideas. The fear of a counter revolution is the key issue rather than Necker himself, perhaps.

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

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

**Using all these sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that it was the King who was mainly to blame for the revolutionary situation which had developed in France in the period August 1788 to July 1789.** [40]

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

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

The issue here is whether the King by failing to get the Estates General going on a basis acceptable to the Third Estate of voting by head and by delaying calling the Séance Royale was to blame or whether it was the Deputies themselves, the dangerous context of high prices and bread shortages, the expectations aroused by the Cahiers and the emergence of radical agitators that led to the revolutionary violence of July. The King added to insecurity by deploying forces without having the decisiveness to use them – perhaps the worst combination. On the other hand, he was responding to the demands of his subjects and acting in an enlightened way. Some may point to the long term problems which the King had failed to serve before 1789 but the main focus should be on the sources which deal with 1789.

Source **B** offers a defence which candidates may agree or disagree with. Obviously he is trying to persuade the Third Estate at a difficult time, after the Tennis Court Oath, but it was a remarkable thing to allow a national debate and to summon the Estates General even if the dispute over the voting did sour matters. The threat in the last sentences may be picked up and commented on – was it wise if the King had no intention of backing it up! The dismissal of Necker and the stationing of troops seemed to be indicative of a tough line ( Sources **C** and **D** ) which never led anywhere and stirred up feelings already aroused by Source **B**.

The alternative view emerges in Source **A** – the expansion of radical ideas in Paris. The fruits of enlightenment debate together with a relaxation of censorship and the expansion of book publishing in the last half of the C18 were matters rather beyond the King. **A** more politically aware Paris populace together with the economic crisis referred to in **D** produced a revolutionary situation. The long term issues – feudal rights, financial problems, social distress and the failure of the King to deal with the so called aristocratic revolution may be referred to in order to explain the violence of feeling against the nobility and clergy. Unemployment, high prices and shortages of food were important in providing the discontent which orators like Desmoulins – himself reflecting the influence of ideas and social frustrations – had on the people.

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

**The Condition of England 1832 – 53****2(a) Study Sources B and D**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the management of the Poor Laws.**

**[20]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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

Similarities: there is a clear agreement on local rates set by the overseer for two local Poor Law authorities working under the New Poor Law of 1834. Chadwick in **B** cites 7.5p whilst Cutler in **D** cites the Assistant Commissioners claiming 11p for Aston. This is in contrast to much higher rates under the Old Poor Law, where Chadwick mentions 25p and Cutler 27.5p. Both might suggest more economy in the management of the Poor Law post 1836, especially as Chadwick cites winter rates which might be expected to be higher.

Differences: Chadwick in **B** also mentions the efficient management of the workhouses in his tone using words like 'regular', 'strict' etc. Cutler in **D** does not pursue this but rhetorically refers to it by raising the question of how Aston's overseers could set such a low rate. He suggests that the use of figures is selective. In his view Aston was subjecting its poor to unfair economies under the new workhouse regime. Birmingham, as an industrial area, continues to provide outdoor relief. Cutler also uses the national figures for 1836 to demonstrate that Chadwick has been selective in his choice of examples. The national average suggests a rate higher than those given for pre -1834 parishes (37.5p). He deduces Poor Law management has not attained its 'boasted economy'.

Clearly much depends on what figures are used. Both **B** and **D** are selective, although Cutler's use of national figures to contextualise local ones might suggest it provides the better evidence.

Both are propagandists for their respective positions, Chadwick in 1837 concerned to demonstrate that the ideas behind the New Poor Law are working and going into print to prove it. His appeal is to literate rate payers. In contrast Cutler is an opponent, his audience a Town council that has yet to implement the New Law. Clearly it was considered an effective piece of Anti Poor Law opposition, being printed in a collection of anti workhouse contributions. It is an effective refutation of some of Chadwick's points made in 1837. Better candidates might note that Chadwick had also been highly selective in the evidence he collected for the famous Poor Law Report that provided the foundations for change.

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

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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that saving money was the most important factor in explaining changes in the Poor Law in the 1830s. [40]

Focus: Judgement in context of the set of Sources and own knowledge.

The question asserts that **saving money** and economy was the driving force behind a change in the Poor Law. A possible grouping to support this is **B**, **C** and **D**. Cutler in **D** certainly thought this was the case (and considers it to have either failed or been achieved at a high social cost). Chadwick in **B** is pleased that economies are made, although as evidence one would expect the Secretary to the New Poor Law Commissioners and the main advocate of the New Law to argue this. The Banbury Guardians in **C** also refer to the historic need to save money, commenting on the 'burdens' on the rich prior to 1834 and the implied generosity of 'doles' handed out regardless of merit or civility. Own knowledge of the Poor Law Report could be used to extend this or question it (its selectivity), as could information on the operation of the Old Law, particularly the Speenhamland system. The Poor Law rates had risen in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century; there had been much complaint locally and in Parliament. The Whigs were seeking to cut taxes and rates. **However** to argue that **moral issues** were of more importance there is an alternative grouping, **A**, **B** and **C**. Rokesby in Source **A** makes no mention of saving money. His argument is about the problems of the 'moral character of the poor', although he may be providing the Commissioners with what they want to hear after the event (1837). He cites pre 1834 arguments about the demoralisation of the poor, their laziness and 'misbehaviour' caused by surliness and a belief that the Parish owed them a living. His moral arguments can also be detected in Chadwick (**B**) and the Banbury Guardians (**C**). Chadwick confirms Rokesby's view that the poor have a changed attitude to work and that the workhouse was intended to deter inappropriate moral attitudes and to encourage 'sober' living etc. The Guardian Newssheet in **C** makes much of 'pauperism' as a moral state and the degradation involved prior to 1834. This can be confirmed with references to the Poor Law Report, the provision of the New Law, the works of Malthus, Bentham, Chadwick and the new economists all of whom commented on how the Old Poor Law acted as an obstacle to a free labour market and was a drain on national wealth. This will take candidates' answers into other areas referred to in the Sources – that the poor were encouraged by the Old Law to have children to obtain more relief ('family size' and 'idle children' in **C**; Bastardy rates in '**A**'), i.e. that the Old Poor Law was, in itself, a cause of poverty. It is perfectly possible to argue for the primacy of 'moral arguments' relating to behaviour, to economic ones on a free labour market or financial ones ('saving money'). The source evidence can and should be disputed. Three Sources (**A**, **B** and **C**) are strongly anti the Old Poor Law and concerned to promote the new one. They are from a rural perspective. Nonetheless, given their concern over the Old Law they provide balanced arguments against it, especially **B** and **C**, although '**A**' is more concerned with looking at the impact of the rate on the poor rather than the ratepayer. Source **D** could be considered untypical but it is concerned to stress a betrayal of responsibility for the poor and to question whether the 'boasted saving of money' is genuine.

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

## Italian Unification 1848 – 70

## 3(a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for the attitudes of Britain and Austria towards Italy in the late 1850s.

[20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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

Some candidates may place greater emphasis on the similarities or the differences depending on their interpretation of the content of the sources. Candidates can be expected to stress the differences between the attitudes of the two powers. They differ on the roles each has to play in Italy. Britain expresses concern about the power and influence of Austria in Italy and indicates that Austria's position should be challenged. **Source A** is more implicit in this respect as Clarendon hesitates to accept Austria's wishes whereas **Source B** clearly argues that Austria should be checked. On the other hand Austria clearly wishes to maintain her power in Italy. In **Source A** their fear that the 'order of Europe' would be unsettled are implicitly matched by the comments in **Source B** about the restoration of Austrian power. Britain clearly feels she should be involved in Italian affairs. **Source A** emphasises the obligation of Britain to reciprocate Piedmont's support for the 'Crimean Alliance' whilst **Source B** considers it to be the moral responsibility of a great power to help shape events. By contrast, Austria thinks differently. In **Source A** the ambassador criticises English support for Piedmont's attendance at the Paris conference. Also, the British and Austrians differ on the right of Italians to decide their own future. In **Source A** the author considers it proper for Cavour to discuss the issues of concern to Italians in contrast to the Austrian ambassador who clearly wanted Piedmont to be excluded from decision-making. The whole tone of **Source B**, and specifically the final sentence, reinforces the British view on self-determination in contrast to the second sentence which implies the Austrians claimed the right to 'decide the future destiny' of Italy.

Comments on the provenance should also be provided for the higher bands. The position of both authors reflects the concerns of Britain to maintain the balance of power in Europe and the peace of the continent. Both extracts are intended as confidential expressions of opinions on state policy. Written just after the Crimean War had finished British hostility to Austria, evident in **Source A**, may be explained by her late entry into the Crimean War compared to Piedmont's willingness to engage at an earlier stage and to commit troops to battle at Tchernaya in 1855. Nonetheless, **Source A** is merely a statement about a conversation intended to inform the recipient of what passed between Clarendon and the ambassador which might explain its measured tone. It also accurately reflects Austria's views at the time when she enjoyed hegemony in the north and centre of Italy, the most obvious threat to that being Piedmont. **Source B**, on the other hand, is intended to persuade the monarch of the future direction of British policy and is more robust in its advocacy, perhaps a reflection, also, of the style typical of the author. However, it is also accurate in its depiction of Austria's stubborn refusal to concede power in Italy despite, and because of, the recent war in the north. Indeed, **Source B** is written after Villafranca from which Britain was excluded and as such helps explain the concerns expressed in **Source B** that Britain should be involved in Italian affairs.



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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that of all the foreign powers Britain played the most important role in Italian affairs in the period from 1856 to 1861. [40]

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

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

Some sources might be interpreted in more than one way. On balance, and taken at face value, **Sources A** and **D** are more likely to be seen as supportive of the view whereas **Sources B** and **C** might be used to counter the view expressed in the question. Candidates who pair these sources in this way can present a sound response. However, there is scope for a variety of structures to answer this question and the more sophisticated responses may use the sources in a less rigid way.

At face value **Source A** might be interpreted as a clear statement of support for Piedmont. Not only does the author rebut the demands of the Austrians but he is prepared to recognise Piedmont as an equal and also to honour her reputation. The promise to 'never abandon our friend' suggests more than limited support for the Italian cause. Reference might be made to the fact that Cavour did attend the conference and the Italian question was addressed there. However, candidates might stress the power of Austria implicit in the ambassador's hostility to any concession to Piedmont which might be substantiated by linkage to the outcome of the Paris conference from which limited gains were made by Cavour including the failure of the British to commit themselves to future action on behalf of the Italian cause.

**Source D** reinforces the point that Britain took a leading role in recognising Italy diplomatically. Italy is acknowledged as an equal by Britain in the gesture of the John Bull and Britannia's acceptance of the hand of Italy. Britain's lead in this respect is emphasised by the way other heads of state (Prussia, Russia, Austria and the Papacy) to the right shun Italy and how even Napoleon III is restrained by the force of French public opinion. Overall, the impression is that Britain's recognition of Italy prevented her complete isolation. Candidates should be able to apply knowledge to put the cartoon in context. Britain was keen to secure Italian support as a counterweight to both France and Austria in the region. Austria (extreme right) was particularly miffed as recent events in Italy confined her to Venetia only and the Papacy was similarly reduced to the Roman littoral a fact that helps explain the attitude of France who still stationed troops there. The kings of Russia and Prussia were alarmed by the success of nationalist and liberal forces represented by the creation of Italy. Some candidates might question the veracity of the source which suggests Britain was the major player in shaping events in Italy when, in fact, their role had been limited.

**Source C** is rather ambivalent but could be used to support the statement. It suggests Britain played the most important role of all the foreign powers as far as the landing at Marsala is concerned if only because no other power was directly involved. Garibaldi concedes that the presence of the English ships did buy time for the landing and delayed the Neapolitans in opening fire. Given the vital importance of a successful disembarkation it could be argued that Britain's role in this event was important. With knowledge this point could be reinforced. Garibaldi's force was very small ('the Thousand') so earlier action by the Neapolitans could have been decisive. Analogies to the way Britain influenced the

crossing from Messina to Naples later in the campaign might be made to indicate the importance of the English ships at Marsala.

However, in **Source C** Garibaldi indicates only limited support by Britain for he refutes the notion that the English directly assisted his landing at Marsala a view substantiated by the fact that the presence of English ships did not prevent the Neapolitans from opening fire. The impression given by Garibaldi is that the ships were there by chance rather than deliberate orders.

If **Source C** suggests Britain played a peripheral role only this could be developed further using **Source B**. **Source B** merely presents the options the British had to respond to events in the Duchies and suggests some uncertainty over policy: even though Palmerston states England must play a part he does not specify how. The thrust of this passage is that Britain should play a major role but, in fact, she does not. Rather, Palmerston acknowledges the leading role of France and Austria at least until the date in question, 1859. The implication of the second sentence is that France and Austria have previously decided the politics of Italy as does the later reference to 'Austrian domination and supremacy'. Candidates should be able to elaborate with their own knowledge by explaining how Austria enjoyed hegemony in the North and Centre of Italy before 1859 and reference to the war of 1859 and subsequent revolutions in the Duchies would show how France had played a leading role in changing the political landscape. In addition, candidates with knowledge of events will stress the degree of support in England for the Italian cause not only in liberal circles but also from Victoria. Also, that England backed the plebiscites held in the Central Duchies and their annexation to Piedmont which helped secure Napoleon's acquiescence in these developments.

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

**The Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61****4(a) Study Sources A and B**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the aims of the South in pressing for the Kansas-Nebraska Act to be passed. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources.

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

The Sources agree that the aim was to make it possible for Southerners to take their property, i.e. slaves, with them outside the slave states. Source **A**, however, merely refers to taking them to the territories, while Source **B** claims that this will lead to a demand to take them into the Free States, i.e. the North. Some credit should be given for recognising the similarity, even if weaker answers fail to make the distinction between territories and States. They differ in their commentary on the significance of this. Source **A** argues that the aim was to remove congressional authority over the issue of slavery in the territories, while Source **B** claims that the ultimate aim was to gain acceptance for slavery in the North. This would be achieved in stages: first, Southerners would be allowed to take slaves with them when travelling in the North, then they would be allowed to keep them when remaining in the North and finally slavery would become part of Northern society. This difference of interpretation is not surprising in view of the fact that Source **A** comes from the South and **B** from the North. The tone of the two Sources could be compared: **A** is almost triumphalist, while **B** is alarmist. The language reflects these characteristics: 'rejoice', 'great advantages' in **A**, 'fling off the mask' in **B**. Candidates may also note that both Sources are newspaper accounts.

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

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

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the passing of the Kansas-Nebraska Act did the Southern cause more harm than good. [40]

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

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

Sources **C** and **D** clearly support this view. **C** sees the Kansas-Nebraska Act as part of a pattern of developments which show that the South did not act 'prudently'. The effect was to 'force' the North 'to rise in our might and drive them from power'. Source **D** also sees the Act as provoking outrage in the North and specifically as leading to the creation of the Republican Party – an exclusively Northern party devoted to resisting the expansion of slavery. Own knowledge can be used to extend this: this was Lincoln's party, which won the 1860 election. Source **B** shows why the Act caused such a hostile reaction in the North. It expressed both Northern fury and Northern fears and thus can be regarded both as supporting evidence for the views expressed in Sources **C** and **D** and as support for the view in Source **A** that the Act was good for the South. Source **A** claims the Act gives 'great advantages' to the South in allowing slavery in the territories and removing congressional control over the issue, and Source **B** fears that the Act might lead to further advances for the Southern cause. Own knowledge might be used to suggest that, even on the issue of slavery in the territories, these two Sources were too optimistic (**A**) or pessimistic (**B**), since the attempt to introduce slavery into Kansas led to several years of strife ('bleeding Kansas' – referred to in Source **C**). Moreover, Sources **A** and **B** were written immediately after the passing of the Act, and may therefore show short-term gains for the South, which were outweighed by the long-term effects shown by Sources **C** and **D**. Sources **A** and **B** are valuable as expressions of sectional views at the time of the passing of the Act. It might be thought that the value of Source **C**, though it attempts to place the Kansas-Nebraska Act in context, is limited by the fact that it comes from a speech by a Northerner on the eve of the civil war. The longer-term perspective provided by the modern historian (Source **D**), however, suggests that Congressman Alley's view was not far short of the mark. Examiners should note that, since the basic grouping for this question is **A/B** and **C/D**, a sequential approach, appropriately handled, could produce a successful answer.

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

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

**The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93****5(a) Study Sources A and B**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the motives of Parnell and the Land League in 1880 and 1881. [20]**

Focus: comparison of two Sources

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

In **B** Parnell is seen as pursuing political ends and ignoring the reforms made by the government. The inference is that Home Rule is more important than help given to the Irish people. **A** sees Parnell being frustrated by British inaction towards the Irish suffering. In **A** we see a man moved by the evictions and the distress, in **B** we see only bitter hatred and unable to recognize the government's attempt to offer 'good laws and good government'. The common element is hatred – bitter in **A** and also bitter in **B** – in both private and public. So they agree that there are strong feelings behind Parnell's campaign but the selflessness of **A** is not reflected in the more critical **B**.

In terms of provenance, **B** is a letter to a colleague and not a public document. **A** refers to private feelings – at home with Katherine in Eltham, but the source is intended for public consumption and unlike **A** is written some time after the events it refers to. Gladstone is writing out of frustration at Parnell's lack of support, initially for what he saw as a major piece of legislation, and also at concern about the agrarian violence unleashed by the Land League. Katherine had no such animosity – she is recalling – perhaps even embellishing the genuine concern of her former lover for the Irish people.

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

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

**Using all these sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that there was little justification for British policy towards Ireland in the period from 1880 to 1882**

**[40]**

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

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

The issue here is whether Gladstone by pursuing the Land Act and the 3 'F' s and being willing in the end to negotiate with Parnell was still pursuing his mission, or whether he was led into unwise coercion by his dislike of Parnell's obstruction in the Commons and his association with rural violence. **B** and **C** offer some justifications from Gladstone – in essence the League is ignoring his fine Land legislation and is moved only by a desire for power. Parnell in **C** has been challenging civilized values and threatening the Rule of Law and property. The counter view emerges in **A** with British apathy to evictions – something that Gladstone did not tackle and in **D** with the failure to grapple with peasant proprietorship (a solution eventually associated more with the Conservatives).

**A** refers to distress and **D** to its consequences: the levels of agrarian crime, the breaking of the consensus of English politics about terrorism and crime, with even the conservative opposition being critical.

Candidates might support these arguments with knowledge of the land legislation, the extent of depression and evictions, the furore about abuses of power by the authorities, Parnell's deliberate exploitation of the problems to promote Home Rule, the Kilmainham treaty; the uneasy relationship between the activities of the League like the No Rent campaign and Parnell's concern for property as landlord himself. Indeed Gladstone was wrong about Parnell wanting to go on with the agitation and he was glad to be taken off to prison to escape association with rural radicalism. Gladstone's statesmanship can be defended and his rhetoric about the resources of civilization was not typical; he was open to new ideas as was shown by his later conversion to Home Rule and his willingness to deal with Parnell.

In terms of provenance, all the Sources come from active participants with a distinct view – Gladstone was frustrated by the situation; Katherine O'Shea was writing after Parnell's fall and was aware of the continuing problems in Ireland and wanted to hallow his memory. O'Connor was a committed Home Ruler and even when looking back, his political views come over very clearly about the situation in the 1880s.

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

**England in a New Century 1900-18****6(a) Study Sources C and D**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for opposition to the National Insurance Act of 1911.** [20]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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

Both sources oppose the 1911 Act, but for directly opposite reasons. **Source C (Lansbury)** criticises the contributory elements of the Bill. It suggests that working men can't afford the payments, and will revolt against the plan. Lansbury would prefer the Government to spend money ensuring an improvement in wages and living standards, instead of introducing National Insurance. He believes this legislation will do nothing to tackle the basic causes of poverty. **Source D (a doctor)** opposes this Bill as being a slide towards socialism. Obviously, it views welfare legislation as encouraging dependency among the working classes. The writer fears the collapse of society, and resents the Government giving help to the poor at the expense of more worthy citizens. In terms of **provenance**, each is typical of the period. **Lansbury** is a socialist, and an important left wing member of the Labour party. His criticisms of the Liberal reforms very much echo those of people like Beatrice Webb, Keir Hardie etc. **The writer in the British Medical Journal** is right wing, middle class and conservative. He is expressing the hostility of the doctors to the health provisions in Lloyd George's Bill. Putting it simply, many doctors feared more work, more Government control and less money.

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

- 6(b) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that between 1906 and 1914 the best solutions to poverty were offered by the Liberal Governments.

[40]

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

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

**Sources A and B** support the assertion. Lloyd George (**Source A**), Chancellor of the Exchequer in the reforming Liberal Government, is a leading New Liberal. He clearly puts the growing argument for state intervention, a move away from Old Liberalism. Candidates might refer to other Liberal reformers, like Churchill, or support their comments by reference to the welfare reforms brought in at this time (school meals, school medical inspections, old age pensions, labour exchanges and National Insurance itself). Herbert Samuel (**Source B**) represents the intellectual support for the new policies. Since the time of the Boer War (or even earlier) writers like Samuel (Hobson, Hobhouse etc) had been putting the case for state intervention. The three reasons Samuel gives for the eventual triumph of greater state intervention might be supported by own knowledge references to the various investigations into the causes of poverty (e.g. Rowntree in 1901; the Royal Commission on the Poor Law 1905-09, and so on).

However, both **Sources C and D** do not think that the Liberals have chosen the best solution to poverty. **Source D** clearly represents the still well-supported view of conservative opinion, which was totally against any increase in state intervention. Such intervention would sap national strength, and be very expensive. Many doctors were opposed to the health provisions of the 1911 Act, seeing a threat to their vested interests. **Source C**, however, would like the Government to be much more radical. Lansbury is obviously not convinced by Lloyd George's nine pence for four pence argument where the working man is concerned. He criticises both elements in the 1911 Bill (Health and Unemployment). Candidates might refer to the Webbs' Minority Report on the Poor Law which pushed for a completely new (welfare state) approach. Candidates might also be aware that the Webbs saw the 1911 National Insurance Act as a disappointing compromise. They accused the Liberals of bringing in the Act in order to 'spike the guns' of the socialist Labour party.

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



**Nazi Germany 1933-45****7(a) Study Sources A and C****Compare these Sources as evidence for Hitler's popularity.****[20]**Focus: Comparison of two Sources

Source **A** is an SPD agent reporting to his superiors in exile whereas **C**, also from the SPD, is giving a specific report on a conversation with an individual. Source **A** therefore makes more general observations. Thus although there is some general similarity in the provenance, the specific nature of the sources is different. Candidates should know who the SPD were and that they were banned political opponents of the Nazis. Some basic comments might therefore be made about political bias in both sources but good candidates can point out the honesty [bearing in mind the provenance] of both sources.

The content of **A** focuses on the image of a decisive and strong Fuhrer making tough decisions 'cleaning up the brown trash' The impression here is of a Hitler standing above the party bosses etc. In **C** different reasons for Hitler's popularity are given-specifically anti-Bolshevism and Hitler's appeal to Nationalist instincts. Both sources suggest the unpopularity of various party leaders [**A**] and Goebbels [**C**]. There are similarities in the last line of both sources.

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

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

**Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Hitler's rule was based on a large measure of consent between 1933 and 1939. [40]**

**A** and **C** directly support the idea that Hitler's rule was based on consent and parts of **D** also point this way. **B** provides a contrast, by suggesting Hitler had no great appeal with the German people. **D** raises the dimension of terror as an alternative basis for Hitler's rule.

**A** and **C** both highlight the centrality of Hitler's personal popularity as a factor in ensuring consent. Even when other Nazis became unpopular, the appeal of Hitler remained decisive. Own knowledge could be used to develop this theme e.g. with reference to the Führer Cult. These sources also provide other explanations for widespread consent, such as the restoration of law and order and the fear of Bolshevism as the only alternative. Both comment on how the workers (who might be expected to lean towards the left wing parties) have also fallen under Hitler's influence. The fact that these sources both come from an SPD source, which is unlikely to be weighted in favour of the Nazi regime, add to their credibility. Their dates (1934 and 1936) provide evidence over some, although not all, of the relevant period. **D** (historians' broad overview of the period) contributes a wider range of factors which generated a broad basis of support (desire for leadership, solving unemployment, restoration of Germany's international reputation, racial policies, youth policies). All these areas provide scope for own knowledge to be used by way of exemplification and explanation.

**B**'s evidence contrasts with **A** and **C** in questioning the extent of Hitler's hold over the people. However, it does not go so far as to suggest an active lack of consent – rather, indifference. Its typicality might be questioned (using own knowledge of the usual effectiveness of Hitler's speeches and Goebbels' use of radio as a means of propaganda), with the early date and the Berlin setting as possible reasons for this untypical response. On the other hand, the source could be used as a springboard for candidates to use own knowledge to challenge the views in **A** and **C**, by questioning the extent of active support for the regime and highlighting evidence for dissent and opposition.

**D**'s reference to the use of terror, the SS and the Gestapo provides a clear alternative explanation to consent as the basis of Nazi rule. Own knowledge can be used to develop this theme. Own knowledge might further be used to put forward other reasons for Hitler's rule, such as the weakness and division of opponents, economic recovery, national pride etc.

No set conclusion is expected but candidates should effectively combine contextual knowledge with evaluation of sources explaining the extent to which consent was a major factor in the establishment of Hitler's rule down to 1939.

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

## 2583 English History 1042 – 1660

### England 1042-1100

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

- (a) **Assess the extent of Norman influence upon England during the reign of Edward the Confessor.** [45]

Focus: Analysis of a significant aspect of late Anglo-Saxon England.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The succession issue is relevant but the question does ask 'during the reign' and the essay should examine the links between the King and Normandy. Candidates should be aware of a variety of influences in both the state and the church and answers in the top bands will need to assess these influences. Candidates may consider the impact of Edward's time in Normandy, which encouraged his willingness to see Norman influence in England. He admired Norman and other continental practices and customs. The appointment of Robert of Jumieges as Bishop of London saw growing Norman influence in the Church. Some answers might explore the issue of the introduction of castles and feudal tendencies, both of which are matters of historical debate.

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

- 1(b) **To what extent was the English Church in need of reform during the reign of Edward the Confessor?** [45]

Focus: Analysis of the condition of a major institution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Answers at the higher levels will consider 'How far'. Candidates should consider the strengths and weaknesses of the church during the period. It is not expected that candidates will spend equal time on each characteristic and may spend longer on whichever is seen as stronger. Historiography is not an assessment criterion at AS but credit can be given to those candidates who make accurate reference to the debate on post conquest propaganda. Much of the dubious reputation of the Anglo-Saxon Church derives from Norman chroniclers who had an interest in criticising it. Candidates may consider issues such as Stigand's reputation and the physical size of the churches, which were smaller and less ambitious than the buildings that were constructed or reconstructed after the Conquest. The issue of the Church's isolation has been exaggerated, but it was out of touch with some of the developments on the continent. The monasteries were reasonably healthy. There was a lack of organisation, but on the other hand the Church could claim the loyalty and embodied the beliefs of the large majority of the population.

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

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

- (a) **'The most important reason Harold Godwinson was unable to maintain his hold on the English throne was weakness of his claim.'** How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: Analysis of the reasons for Harold's failure to claim the English throne.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The focus of the question is the claim of Harold to the throne and this should be weighed up against other factors. Harold had become head of the Godwin family in 1053 but the period to 1066 showed his problems in maintaining his primacy among the nobility. His position in England was never completely secure. Answers may compare the claim of Harold with that of William and the importance of his recognition by the Pope. There were other claimants such as Harald Hardrada and Tostig, the claim of Edgar Aethling was not a serious problem. The near simultaneous challenges from William, Harald and Tostig prevented Harold from securing his position on the throne. As the topic begins in 1064 there may be some reference to Harold's visit to Normandy involving major issues about his claim to the throne. It might also be noted that Harold had difficulties from the beginning when his claim was contested by Tostig. The late nomination by Edward the Confessor did little to strengthen his position. Candidates may consider other factors such as the leadership of William, his well disciplined army and this can be contrasted against Harold's failure to win the full support of the Anglo Saxon earls, his preoccupations with problems in the north and his possible over-hasty march to meet the Norman invasion. It is possible that some may argue that Harold was unlucky or unwise in the final campaign, but his claim reflected deeper problems. Answers should avoid unnecessary narrative of the battle, but it must be remembered that the claim to the English throne was settled on the battlefield.

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

- 2(b) How serious was the opposition to William in England after the Battle of Hastings? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a problem faced by William I.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The question specifies that candidates should consider the period after the Battle of Hastings. Candidates might refer to opposition to William immediately after Hastings, but it hardly amounted to a rebellion. William had the advantage that his main rivals were dead and that other important Anglo Saxon nobles from Mercia and Northumberland promised allegiance. Some answers may simply describe the rebellions that William faced with little assessment of their danger or threat and they will not reach the higher levels. Candidates may consider the resistance in Northumbria, Mercia and Wessex, particularly from Waltheof, Edwin and Morcar, there might also be reference to Hereward the Wake. Candidates may argue that given the resources available to William and his determined methods that the resistance could be easily repressed. The rebels had limited support and resources and their resistance was uncoordinated. Many of the risings were localised and arose from local grievances rather than dissatisfaction with William's rule. Candidates might refer to the problem of Exeter, which was more serious, but order was restored after a siege. In 1069 there was trouble for William in the north with intervention from Scotland and Scandinavia. Although this was more dangerous, William enjoyed a clear military advantage and used ruthless devastation to put down the rebellion. The challenge of Hereward the Wake was brief and not too serious a problem.

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

**3 Norman England 1066-1100**

- (a) How far did the Norman Conquest affect land tenure and military organisation in England? [45]**

Focus: Analysis of the impact of the Norman Conquest on the organisation of English society.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The topic begins in 1066 and candidates are not expected to demonstrate how feudal England was in late Anglo Saxon England beyond an awareness of the general situation. Candidates may consider how far the Conquest affected social relationships, obedience and protection, the role of the nobility and peasantry in this process and the issue of knight service. The question involves a complex topic and examiners should note the requirements of an AS answer. Feudal tenure will play an important role in most answers as it was based on land and military service. The King held most of the land with tenants-in-chief, secular barons and great churchmen, holding their land directly in return for the provision of knights. The pattern was replicated among the lower orders of society.

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

- 3(b) How serious were the problems created by William I's absences from England? Explain your answer.**

**[45]**

Focus: Assessment of a major problem of government after the Conquest.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The question arises from a Key Issue in the specification and links to the content about William absences from England that required arrangement for firm government and also justified methods to crush dissent, the divisions of his territory and rivalry among his sons, Robert and William Rufus. Candidates may discuss the opportunity that his absences gave for rebellion, for example in the north. An important issue that might be considered was the need to establish an efficient administration that could work in his absence. His absences also encourage his increased reliance on the Normans. There is no need for candidates to provide much detail about the absences except that they reflected the King's different priorities, but brief references to Normandy or to the wars with Anjou and Maine can be given credit. Some might make a connection between the key issue and the development of the succession quarrel.

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

**4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042-1100****(a) How wealthy was England on the eve of the Norman Conquest? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the economic condition of late Anglo-Saxon England.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Historiography is not an AS assessment criterion and candidates are not expected to show knowledge and understanding of the historical debate on this matter. Answers that do not refer to historical interpretations can be awarded the highest mark. England was an attractive prize for William of Normandy and Harold Hardrada of Norway. Candidates might discuss the efficient tax system that pointed to prosperity and an ordered economy. Internal and external trade might be examined. There were market towns that had developed from earlier burhs and merchants. London's role may also be examined. Regional differences may also be considered, the most wealthy regions were in the south and south-east, including East Anglia.

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

**4(b) Assess the impact of the Norman Conquest on English towns and trade. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of urban change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The development of town was encouraged by the conquest. Some towns benefited because they became more important centres of administration and/or trade. The best example of this is London, William I confirmed its customs. Some towns developed because they were near castles. The south tended to benefit more than the north. Markets developed and there were some professional merchants and craftsmen. As trade expanded, so did towns. They became more important to administration and castles were often linked to towns as military and administrative centres. The destruction of the North led to the decline of some towns although York remained eminent in that region. New town did develop under Norman patronage.

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

**England 1450-1509****5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450-1470****(a) How weak was the monarchy in the period from 1450 to 1461? [45]**

Focus: Examination of an important political institution in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Answers should note the period in the question as being 1450-1461. It is likely that many answers will focus on the personal failings of Henry VI and argue that the monarchy was weak and was exploited by overmighty subjects as was shown by the outbreak of civil war. However, monarchy was the highest institution and the office was surrounded by ceremony and formality. Offices such as Chancery and Exchequer could be used to enhance kingship. The king was the head of a more complex judicial system. However, the powers did depend upon the personality of the king. During this period, there was a discrepancy between 'the powers of the monarchy' and the practice of monarchy by Henry VI. As a result theories of loyalty were able to take second place against the ambition of nobles. Royal Councils, supposedly subordinate to the crown, could become centres of intrigue against the king. Some answers may consider the development of parliament and whether it weakened monarchy.

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

**5(b) Assess the reasons why the Yorkists were able to win the crown by 1461. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a key political development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates in the higher bands should be able to refer to the strengths of the Yorkists and the weakness of their enemies. Answers may consider the inability of Henry VI to control the nobility in spite of the efforts of Margaret of Anjou. Henry was also unable to lead his forces effectively. The Yorkists appealed more to the commonalty whilst the court was unpopular. Richard of York was an able military commander, for example at Northampton. Although his death was a blow to the Yorkists, his son, Edward proved able. Examiners should note the difference between appropriate supporting material and unexplained narrative accounts of the major engagements such as the second battle of St. Albans and Towton; they should be used only to explain the reason for Yorkist success. The Yorkists benefited because their enemies were led by an indecisive king and the Queen, Margaret of Anjou, was widely unpopular. The Yorkists included experienced soldiers who had seen service in France.

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



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

- (a) How successful was Edward IV in ruling England in the period from 1471 to his death in 1483? [45]**

Focus: Analysis of a major problem of government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates may suggest that Edward was unsuccessful as he did not leave an undisputed succession, but it is likely that this will be balanced against other areas of success. The areas of success may include issues such as the nobility, the reassertion of royal power from 1471 and economic and diplomatic issues. Answers may consider Edward's ability to crush the Lancastrian threat and his ability to strengthen his position through his friendship with Charles the Bold of Burgundy and his treaty with Louis XI of France. Edward was able to gain the Neville lands, adding to his resources. He was able to secure the royal finances and it is likely that this will play a large role in many answers, but there were still some problems with the nobility (Clarence), but generally he was able to re-establish control.

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

- 6(b) Assess the reasons why there was so much opposition to the rule of Richard III. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of an important historical phenomenon.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Richard was widely admired at his accession, with a good reputation as a soldier and administrator. The fate of the Princes in the Tower created opposition but Richard did defeat the rebellion of Buckingham. The alleged illegality of Richard's accession will give the opportunity for candidates to discuss fully events of 1483, but it is unlikely that answers that consider only the illegal seizure will achieve a high band. Some answers might claim that Richard did not seize the throne illegally and this can form the basis of an effective answer. Some candidates will identify the sources of opposition; it was mostly from the factious nobility rather than the populace. The death of his son was a blow; it encouraged the opposition because of the threat to his ability to establish his dynasty. He tried to win over Parliament and curbed forced loans but other financial exactions, necessary to strengthen his position, made him unpopular. Although he enjoyed support in the north and Ireland, this counted little against the conspiracies of dangerous nobles. Richard's plan to marry Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV, after the suspicious death of his wife, Anne Neville, made him unpopular. Some powerful nobles such as Buckingham and Northumberland opposed him either for real or imagined slights. The Lancastrians remained implacable and found a champion in Henry Tudor. Candidates who focus on the usurpation should not be penalised.

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

**7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485-1509****(a) To what extent was Henry VII a 'modern ruler'?****[45]**

Focus: Assessment of a description of Henry VII's monarchy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Answers should focus on the nature of Henry's kingship, but it must be remembered that any discussion of 'medieval' and 'modern' must be in the context of the period 1485-1509 as candidates are not expected to show knowledge or understanding of earlier or later periods, although valid wider references will gain credit. Some answers may argue that Henry was a medieval king, he claimed the throne by inheritance, stressed continuity through court ceremonial and tended not to inaugurate new institutions. Henry relied to a large extent on traditional methods, but he also used middle class men as advisers, rather than the nobility. The nobility as a class became less important in central government, although they remained influential in the provinces. His Council was not modernised in its functions. Institutions such as parliament did not change. The concept of kingship did not change; Henry enforced his traditional powers. In arguing that he was a modern king candidates might argue that he took more personal control, improved the bureaucracy and gave England a greater degree of stability than had been known for a long time. However, his success in crushing opposition and the effective organisation of government signified a more modern approach. Henry VII was not an innovator, certainly not a radical. He was interested in government and had the personality to enforce his policies. In this he resembled the best ideals and practices of medieval monarchs. However, he did strengthen royal courts and weaken the nobility in ways that could be described as modern. Some might claim that the Council Learned in Law was different. The reorganisation of existing courts represented more change than continuity. Local administration saw the roles of existing sheriffs and JPs transformed.

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

**7(b) How serious were the threats to the throne of Henry VII? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a challenge to the Tudor monarchy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates are not expected to show knowledge of the period before 1485 but should understand the background to the Yorkist threat. Although Henry VII won a decisive victory at Bosworth his claim by inheritance was not particularly strong and the Yorkists still presented a danger. However, some may argue that after years of civil war many wanted peace and would support a strong king. The major threat came from Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck. These had support from various groups in Europe and Ireland but had limited appeal in England. Candidates should discuss how serious to Henry these plots were. In themselves Simnel and Warbeck presented little danger but they provided a focus for the plots of others in England and overseas, such as Margaret of Burgundy. Ireland was sympathetic to the Yorkists. Some candidates might also discuss the issue of Lovell and Suffolk. The King also took a number of steps to weaken the Yorkist challenge, for example he married Elizabeth of York, but this was only a partial solution. The King took a number of steps to limit the danger of Yorkist plots. The Earl of Warwick, son of Clarence, was imprisoned until the conspiracies of others provided an excuse for his execution. He handled the nobility partly by using them to govern the country and by using strong measures against those who might become too strong, thus weakening possible support. Some answers might also consider the strengths of Henry as he was capable personally and a strong king was perhaps the best guarantee against rebellion and civil war. Henry was able to defeat the threats by firm action when military and diplomatic methods were necessary.

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

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

- (a) How far did economic changes benefit the middle and lower orders in the period from 1450 to 1509? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of an economic development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The question is based on the second Key Issue in the Study Topic. The rural middle classes- lesser knights and gentry-tended to gain by their ownership of land but change should not be exaggerated. Urban middle classes gained through the expansion of trade and commerce. Some became very wealthy. However, the extent of the change was again limited. Overall the position of the middle classes was confirmed rather than transformed. For the lower order there were periods of good harvests but the pattern was uneven. However more land was available to former landless families. Peasants gained more freedom from onerous feudal duties and dues. The wool and cloth trades did well during most of this period. Enclosure affected some peasants but others were able to enlarge their flocks. Cloth towns grew and their increased wealth probably benefited the urban poor. But other towns declined. This is a topic about which historians disagree about the balance of gains and losses and winners/losers. However, historiography is not an assessment criterion at AS.

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

- 8(b) How serious were the problems facing the Church in England in the late-medieval period? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a key institution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Answers might consider the popular support for the Church, its role in the state or the cultural and intellectual developments taking place in order to argue that the Church in the late medieval period was in a good condition. By the late fifteenth century, the Church had repulsed the threat of Lollardy, which had gone underground, where it still existed. There was a growth in Mariology and church services were well attended. An English mystical tradition was well established. Pilgrimages remained popular. Although there were secular writers, religious books were popular. The clergy provided respected ministers and advisers. The period did witness the continued building and extension of churches and other quasi-religious buildings, for example university colleges. However, the Church and particularly papal authority were coming under more pressure from the state even before the Reformation. Whilst individual clergy attracted criticism and the tendencies of some groups brought them into disrepute the situation as a whole seemed healthy. Candidates may take their answers to the eve of the Reformation, but this is not to be expected as the topic ends in 1509.

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

**England 1509-1558****9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509-1529**

- (a) How successful was Wolsey's domestic administration of England in the period from 1515 to 1529? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Wolsey succeeded in bringing most areas of administration under his control. He controlled the royal seals and the rest of the council did not play an active part. Possibly his greatest weakness was in finance and his methods were unpopular and sometimes unsuccessful, as with the Amicable Grant. Perhaps his greatest achievement was in judicial affairs, with Wolsey an effective Chancellor and there may be comments about Star Chamber. It will be relevant to discuss the Church, but care should be taken to ensure the focus is on administration rather than doctrine. The divorce, if it is mentioned, should be considered in the same way.

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

- 9(b) Faction was the most important reason for Wolsey's fall from power in 1529. How far do you agree with this view? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of an important historical event.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Many answers will focus on the crucial issue of the divorce, but at Band III and above there must be consideration of the named factor, even if other issues are also evaluated. In considering the role of the divorce candidates may explain why the divorce was so important to Henry and also consider the role Wolsey played in the negotiations. Candidates may link the issue of the divorce to the hostility of those who were envious of his pre-eminence. His dependence upon Henry was a fragile prop and his failing over something so crucial to the King may play a significant role in many answers. Candidates may also consider the issue of faction, earlier failings on the question of taxation with the Amicable Grant and its impact upon Henry's other priority, the invasion of France. Some answers may explain how Wolsey had alienated the nobility with earlier policies on enclosure etc. and how they exploited the divorce question. Answers may also point out that Wolsey was unpopular with other groups such as common lawyers because of his tendency to draw cases into his own courts. It is also probable that Anne Boleyn disliked him and she may have influenced Henry.

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

**10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529-1558****(a) How far reaching were the reforms of Thomas Cromwell? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a historical view.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Historiography is not an AS level assessment criterion and the highest band can be awarded to answers that do not mention the Elton debate. However, accurate use of the debate should be rewarded. Candidates are not expected to show knowledge or understanding of previous or later developments. It is likely that answers will make reference to the Privy Council, use of Parliament and the unification of the country. The question does not exclude consideration of changes in the church and candidates may comment on the importance of the Royal Supremacy. The basic issue is about the extent to which Cromwell changed a household system of government to a more bureaucratic system. The Privy Council and institutions and courts such as the Exchequer became more active under Cromwell's prompting, however much one would qualify the idea of a Tudor/Cromwellian revolution. A few answers might consider the greater unification of the realm through a strengthening of the Council of Wales and the Marches and the Council of the North. Control of Ireland was also extended.

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

**10(b) To what extent did factional disputes affect the stability of the throne in the period from 1529 to 1553? [45]**

Focus: An assessment of the impact of court factions.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The discussion, particularly in the higher bands, should show some ability to discuss developments throughout the period, although it will be unreasonable to expect comprehensive treatment. Candidates need to show an understanding of the nature of factions. The specification mentions the Boleyn, Seymour and Howard families. The crown was supreme, but its powers were not unlimited. Even Henry VIII could not ignore faction and Edward's age was obviously a reason for the importance of faction in his reign. Faction had a role to play in the varieties of religious change and there may be some consideration of the developments in the last years of Henry VIII's reign where a powerful king may have been losing his grip. The Seymour faction benefited from its link to Jane Seymour, mother of Edward VI. Edward Seymour allied himself to the more Protestant groups at court, including Cranmer, but his influence varied in the last years of Henry's reign. The Seymours gained power in the early years of Edward's reign and then lost it. The Howards proved more lasting in their influence. Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, survived as a leading figure in the reign of Henry, supporting the religious changes, but more conservative than Cranmer or Cromwell. He narrowly survived Henry's wrath in the final weeks. The reign of Edward saw Norfolk and the Howard's take a back seat, but they were restored under Mary.

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

**11 Church and State 1529-1558**

- (a) **'The main problem facing the church in England in 1529 was the legacy of Thomas Wolsey.' How far do you agree with this view?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of the problems facing the church at a specified time.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates are not expected to have specific knowledge of the views of historians; this will not prevent answers reaching any band as historiography is not an assessment criterion at AS. However, answers that make use of the views of historians to support their argument should be given credit. Answers should weigh up the problems that Wolsey personified, such as wealth, absenteeism, pluralism and nepotism, as well as his failure to carry out reforms, against other problems that faced the church on the eve of the Reformation. Candidates may consider other issues such as heresy, anti-papalism, the attacks of intellectuals, tithe payments, ordination rates, the ability of the church to meet the spiritual needs of the population and the attitude of the King to the catholic church. There is a great deal that could be included and it is not expected that candidates will cover all the areas.

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

- 11(b) How far were the monasteries dissolved for religious reasons?** [45]

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for a major event.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates are not expected to have specific knowledge of the views of historians; this will not prevent answers reaching any band as historiography is not an assessment criterion at AS. However, answers that make use of the views of historians to support their argument should be given credit. There are a variety of reasons that candidates might consider including the condition of the monasteries, their wealth and Henry's need for money for defence against a foreign catholic crusade, Henry's desire for power and complete mastery within his kingdom, monastic support for the Pope. This might be linked to the earlier examples of the Franciscans and Carthusians, the declining role of monasteries in everyday life, the fear that monasteries might act as centres of rebellion and resistance and this might be linked to the Pilgrimage of Grace and the example on the continent in Scandinavia and Germany.

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



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

- (a) How far was enclosure the main cause of price inflation in the period from 1509 to 1558? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the causes of a major economic development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Contemporaries blamed enclosure for the problem, but this is to probably exaggerate its impact. Enclosure had an impact in some regions, but not all. It also provided a convenient scapegoat as the wealthy could be blamed due to their greed. Governments did not understand the causes and enclosure was a visible explanation. Candidates are likely to consider the issue of population rise, which despite periodic crises due to plague or bad harvests, did rise. The birth rate rose and expectations of longer life spans increased. This put pressure on resources, for example land and employment. The greater speed of rise in agricultural goods, rather than industrial, suggests population rise was crucial. War had an impact because of its effects, but affected the crown and nobility who bore the brunt of the expenses, more than the lower orders. However, the tendency of successive governments to engage in debasement had a general effect on inflation. Some answers might consider the influx of foreign silver or bullion, but this was limited in this period.

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

- 12(b) How effective were Tudor governments in tackling the social and economic problems they faced in the period from 1509 to 1558? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the development of government policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Examiners should not expect every government in the period to be mentioned, but they should also beware of answers that fix on one government and make out a good case, but ignore the others. In Henry VIII's reign, a group showed more awareness of the problems. Thomas More and Cromwell might be linked with the Commonwealth Men who became more significant in the 1540s. Growing poverty and especially the effects of enclosures spurred some to demand reforms and limitations on damaging practices. Cromwell was responsible for a Poor Law Act (1536) and anti-enclosure legislation (1539). JPs were made more responsible for controlling vagrants. Somerset also tried to curb enclosures and reference might be made to the Hales Commission. It might be argued that he attempted to do more than any other governor in this period, but his failure was greater, as seen in Kett's rebellion. Somerset's social policies became a weapon amongst his enemies to bring him down. Mary did not do much to directly alleviate social problems although her economic policies promised to help in the long run. Some candidates might point out that the scale of the problem was a major limiting factor for governments that were not used to such issues.

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

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

- (a) How serious a threat were the Puritans to Elizabeth I's religious settlement? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of the significance of a major religious development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The question requires candidates to offer some definition of 'Puritanism', and in the higher bands there might be a realisation of the varied Puritan group. Candidates should be aware that puritans were anti-papal, emphasised Biblical teaching and individualism; there was also a degree of nationalism that was difficult for the queen to counter. Candidates may consider the aims of the different groups and how much support they had when assessing their seriousness. It is likely that answers will consider the threat in parliament. Elizabeth's response is relevant as her methods give an indication of how seriously she viewed the threat. However, candidates might suggest that they were not a threat as they were basically very loyal to her rule and saw her as the best defence against Catholicism. They did want to achieve a more protestant settlement than Elizabeth probably wanted, although there is debate about this, and they continued to try and make changes to the settlement.

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

- 13(b) Assess the strength of the Church of England on the death of Elizabeth I in 1603. [45]**

Focus: An assessment of the strength of a key institution at a specified time.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. At the death of Elizabeth Anglicanism was unchallenged as the established church. Whitgift enforced discipline and was an active archbishop whilst Hooker's Laws provided strong intellectual justification. Candidates may also assess the state of Catholicism and Puritanism in this context. However, whatever approach is taken, better answers will focus on the end of Elizabeth's reign. The Queen gave her full support to the Church and could rely on church leaders who were generally able. Most of the population conformed and were apparently happy. The Queen's policies were sufficiently broad to be accepted by most people, including the important social groups. Catholicism was in decline partly because of the effectiveness of official policy, partly because of the divisions between its exponents and partly because of the lack of priests who could minister to believers. Puritanism was not as active as it had been earlier and the damage caused by the Marprelate Tracts could be mentioned as could government legislation. The damage to both Catholicism and Puritanism in the 1590s meant that the Church of England faced very little challenge. Some answers might look ahead to the early years of the Stuart King's, but this is not a requirement and its omission should not be penalised.

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

**14 Foreign Affairs 1547-1587**

- (a) Assess the reasons why England's relations with Spain deteriorated in the period from 1568 to 1585. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Examiners should note that this unit is on English History. Candidates are expected to know only enough about Spanish policy to make sense of the English perspective. The question is designed to encourage candidates to think about factors that show some English responsibility for the worsening relations and the outbreak of war. Candidates may consider issues such as English incursions into the Caribbean and Drake's circumnavigation which led to worsening relations. Candidates might consider English policies towards the Dutch Revolt. Some answers might refer to the treatment of English Catholics, but Philip did not give much attention to this issue. The wider aspect of England's status as a Protestant country was a greater priority. The specification begins with the arrival of Mary Queen of Scots and her importance may play a role in the deterioration.

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

- 14(b) To what extent was the removal of French forces from Scotland in 1560 the most important reason for the improvement in Anglo-French relations in the period from 1560 to 1584? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of an important development in foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The question is based on the fourth Key Issue and associated content in the specification. 'What part did relations with France play in Elizabeth's foreign policy between 1562 and 1584? The Le Havre expedition, the effects of the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion, the importance of the Dutch Revolt for Anglo-French relations, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, marriage negotiations with Alencon and Anjou. It is likely that many candidates will argue that relations with France improved considerably during the period. Elizabeth inherited a war with France but by the end of the period specified marriage negotiations had taken place, although their seriousness might be questioned. Some answers will link the improvement to the changing situation in Scotland as French involvement there became reduced. Other answers might consider the deteriorating relations with Spain and the concern of both nations about the situation in the Netherlands and also Spanish involvement in the French Wars of Religion.

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

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

- (a) How efficient was the government of Elizabethan England?  
Explain your answer.**

**[45]**

Focus: An assessment of Elizabethan government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. This is a very large topic and examiners will not expect all areas to be covered, but what matters will be the quality of analysis. It is likely that many answers will focus on central government, but some might also consider local government. Candidates might consider the financial problems faced by government and argue that it was very successful until 1588 and reasonably successful overall. Others might claim that government allowed financial problems to worsen because they were reluctant to raise taxes. Some answers might consider the issue of faction and argue that its presence weakened government. However, others might argue that by keeping a balance Elizabeth ensured stability. At times factions co-operated against the Queen and this may have made government less successful. Some answers might look at the 1590s and suggest that the lack of unrest, despite the serious economic problems is testimony to the success of government. Candidates might also consider the relationship with parliament to argue either that government was or was not successful.

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

- 15(b) How far did the popularity of Elizabeth's government decline in the period after 1588?**

**[45]**

Focus:

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. By the end of her reign Elizabeth was isolated at court and in her government because her associates had either died or retired. Many were waiting for the new monarch. Nevertheless she still maintained a grip on affairs and her weakness and determination should not be forgotten. In parliament there appeared to be opposition as the royal prerogative was questioned. The last parliament showed a willingness of MPs to criticise her over a policy of monopolies that pointed directly at the crown. On the other hand the Golden Speech demonstrated her continued ability to defuse opposition. It was really after the 1601 parliament that she failed physically. The queen herself might have lost popularity but the prestige of monarchy remained high. The problems of the last years must be set alongside the achievements, including religious peace, a stable ministry led by Robert Cecil and a peace forced on Ireland. The lack of support for either the Oxfordshire Rising or Essex's revolt might be used to show that there was little support for opposition. Elizabeth was reluctant to raise taxes in this period which would have been unpopular and necessitate the agreement of parliament, other means of raising money were restricted and therefore measures she could take were limited. However, the lack of real tax increases, despite the cost of war may have helped maintain her popularity.

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

**16 Social and Economic Issues 1547-1603****(a) Assess the effects of rising prices in the second half of the sixteenth century. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a major economic development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The most serious rises were on food prices, which rose at a much greater rate than industrial goods. This had an impact on those relying on wages and increased the problem of poverty. The issue of poverty may be examined in some detail, but answers need to link it to the rise in prices. Inflation created pressures to increase income and landowners sought to increase rents whilst tenants correspondingly suffered. Landowners who were less efficient found that their prosperity declined. Some courtiers and nobles invested in new ventures to try and offset the problems. The crown was badly hit by inflation; income from revenues fell behind the increase in costs. Labourers had no means to increase their income. Townspeople were affected according to their sources of income. Merchants and trades people were not as badly affected but the poor found their conditions worsening.

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

**16(b) How far did agriculture change in the second half of the sixteenth century? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of changes in an important aspect of the economy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The period saw a number of changes in agriculture; at the lower end candidates will describe these changes, whilst at the higher levels candidates will address their significance. Various books were written about agricultural methods. Attempts were made to introduce some new crops in the south east (hops). Enclosures meant changes in rural areas and sheep farming became more specialised. Some farmers concentrated more on cattle to provide meat for the growing markets in large towns. Yet there were many regional differences. The changes were limited to the more prosperous areas and the gap between richer and poorer areas probably increased.

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

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

- (a) **‘The relationship between James I and his parliaments is best described as one of co-operation rather than conflict.’ How far do you agree?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of an historical judgement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Many answers are likely to disagree with the view and argue that conflict was the main feature. However, for answers in the higher bands both sides should be considered. Answers may claim that James was tactless in his approach to Parliament and its position in government. Until his last years James insisted upon his rights and appeared to deny Parliaments a significant role. It is likely that many candidates will use James’ upholding of Divine Right to argue that there was conflict. Candidates might examine areas of policy that appeared to be unpopular. They might consider the criticisms made of royal favourites. Some answers might suggest that conflict was inevitable as Parliament did not appreciate the problems, particularly financial and that the policies proposed by critics, such as intervention in the Thirty Years War, might have created more problems.

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

- 17(b) Assess the reasons why religious divisions developed within England during the period from 1603 to 1629.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of religious developments in a specific period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Although it is difficult to dispute the claim that divisions did increase during the period, it was not consistent. There were differences in 1603, although they were moderated in the first instance because of varied expectations of James I. Some might refer to the diverse views of Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics which made division more likely. There were hopes of conciliation between the King and orthodox Anglicans and Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference, but Bancroft’s Canons led to the ejection of puritan clergy. The Gunpowder Plot, although the work of a minority, increased antipathy to Catholic in general. Puritans were alienated by the Book of Sports (1618). Foreign policy and marriage negotiations for Charles caused further disquiet. Religious divisions probably became worse under Charles. His religious views favoured Arminianism and even seemed close to Catholicism with his marriage to Henrietta Maria. Laws against Catholics were not harshly enforced and this caused disquiet. The influence of Laud was resented.

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

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

- (a) How far could Charles I's personal rule be considered a success? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Most answers are likely to suggest that Personal Rule was a failure because Charles was forced to end it. However, during the period there were measures that were successful. Candidates might discuss the issue of Ship Money, which was initially very successful. Charles was able to raise sufficient funds for a pacific foreign policy. The issue of religion may feature and candidates are likely to argue that this was less successful as the religious reforms and the introduction of the Prayer Book in Scotland resulted in Charles having to abandon personal rule. Answers may consider the opposition that Personal Rule created and conclude that this made it less successful. However, the sudden ending of Personal Rule was largely unexpected and this might lead some to argue that it had been largely successful until the end.

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

- 18(b) How important were financial reasons in determining the outcome of the First Civil War? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of a specified factor in an important historical problem.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates can examine a range of factors and at the higher levels should compare the importance of finance with other factors. The army was better financed because of the reforms of Pym and the introduction of the Excise; on the other hand the King lacked the ability to raise regular levies. Charles was cut off mostly from the normal sources of government income, which went to parliament. His supporters tended to be in the poorer areas of the country, compared with parliament's prosperous bases in London, the south east and East Anglia. The King had to rely on loans. Answers are also likely to look at the importance of the New Model Army. It helped to overcome the shortcomings that had limited the effectiveness of war against Charles I, the parliamentary armies had been reluctant to move from their home bases. There was no national strategy. Leaders were uncertain about the aims of the war. The New Model Army gave parliament an army that was firmly led by capable commanders. The importance of the Self Denying Ordinance may be examined. Candidates might examine the role of leadership. Candidates may discuss Charles' growing difficulties in recruiting soldiers, geographical factors and strategic issues. The importance of London might be addressed.

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

**19 The Interregnum 1649-1660****(a) How successful was the foreign policy of Oliver Cromwell? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates may consider his attempt to build a Protestant alliance with the United Provinces and the negotiations with Sweden. Relations with France and Spain might be considered but Ireland is not foreign policy. Candidates might consider his aims and then weigh up his achievements against these. However, some might argue that this is difficult as his aims were not always clear. For example, the decision to ally with France against Spain was not an obvious one at the time whilst his attempt to win over the Dutch showed Cromwell's inability to discern the real international situation. Candidates might also point out that aims could change and this makes assessment difficult. For example, the capture of Jamaica was not an intended policy but the result of failure elsewhere in the Caribbean.

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

**19(b) 'The actions of Monck were the most important reason for the restoration of Charles II in 1660.' How far do you agree? [45]**

Focus: Analysis of an important historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Examiners should take care when assessing answers that rely on arguments based on inevitability. It may well be that there was no alternative from 1658 and answers that show this clearly should not be undervalued. Candidates can explain a variety of points that reveal the disparate groups involved. These factors included the increasingly weak hold on government by Richard Cromwell and then republican groups from within the army and the Rump. Some royalists tried to seize power (Booth's Rising in Cheshire) but Charles II wisely decided to wait for the regime to collapse. Monck decided that there was no alternative to a restored monarchy. The appeal of the royalists is very relevant. Charles II had widespread support but could not return to power as long as the republican army effectively controlled security in England. It was the work of Monck that was important in overcoming this obstacle.

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



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

- (a) **‘The period from 1603 to 1660 was one of economic prosperity in England’. How far do you agree with this view?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of economic conditions.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. The relevant key issue in the Specification is ‘How far was this a period of economic expansion?’ and the related Content includes ‘Trends in population and prices, the development of internal and external trade, industry (especially coal, iron, textiles and shipbuilding), agriculture, the expansion of overseas colonies. Even the best answers are unlikely to discuss all these issues, but examiners will look for a reasonable range. There are other aspects that might be considered, for example the effects of civil war and the consequent hardships to royalists in the 1650s or the impact of taxation in the 1630s.

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

- 20(b) Assess the reasons why women and the poor were the main victims of the persecutions for witchcraft.** [45]

Focus: Assessment of a social development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Women and the poor were perhaps the most disadvantaged in seventeenth century society; they were among the most vulnerable. Women were seen in the early modern era as ‘weaker’ and thus more susceptible to diabolical influences. The witch craze reflected widespread belief in supernatural explanations for disasters, but equally may have reflected and been a physical manifestation of deep tensions within society, whether social, economic, religious and/or political. Women and the poor could thus very easily be scapegoats, especially in a society that had no other marginal groups or outsiders to focus on. These groups were the least able to defend themselves and were therefore an easy target when inexplicable events occurred. Candidates might also consider the religious basis of the persecutions. At a higher level, candidates might make reference to local studies, but examiners should be aware that research has been highly localised and should expect that many examples will be drawn from Essex.

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

## 2584 English History 1780 – 1964

### England 1780 - 1846

#### 1 The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783 – 1830

- (a) How successfully did Pitt deal with the challenge of the French Revolution to 1801? Explain your argument. [45]

Focus: An evaluation of Pitt's handling of the French Revolution

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to understand the threat posed by the revolution to an urban and industrialising society with a traditional set of views— the fear of revolutionaries and radicals, the rapid spread of their message, their organisation and methods (combinations, corresponding societies, riots, machine smashing, meetings to focus on parliamentary reform. etc.) and their targeting of obvious issues like corruption, waste, the King and Regent. Most are likely to argue that Pitt dealt successfully with this in the 1790s – putting Radicals on trial in 1793, suspending Habeas Corpus, creating a new party of Order in 1794 when the Whigs split, the Treasonable Practices Act and the Seditious Meetings Act of 1795 targeting their methods of communication. Newspapers were regulated via taxes (to enable the theoretical maintenance of 'freedom'). Radical Societies were formally banned. Revolutionary inspired ideas were driven underground and organisations were infiltrated by spies whilst loyalist Associations were fostered and financed. This, using Church and King mobs, did much to counter the challenge of the French revolution, as did the confidence that Britain had already had her revolution and 'liberty' in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. However candidates could point to periodic radical revival and the persistence of ideas of parliamentary reform amongst the masses as part of a long standing libertarian tradition. Danger in 1795, the naval mutinies of 1797 and the Wolfe Tone Irish rising of 1799, together with the Foxite Whig pro- revolution stance could also be used to challenge the extent of success enjoyed by Pitt.

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

- 1(b) How successful were the reforms of the Tory governments in the period from 1822 to 1830? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: An evaluation of the reforms of the Tory government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to consider the reforms from a government standpoint, assessing their relative success in deflecting serious constitutional change, especially in the prevention of Parliamentary Reform and particularly in dealing with the problems of a rapidly changing society. Liverpool was a cautious Pittite reformer as was Peel, Huskisson and Canning, but Wellington was not. Better candidates will be aware of the constraints on reform – the governments remained Tory, hostile to religious, constitutional and general reform. Such a view prevented Catholic Emancipation before 1829, although candidates could argue that its eventual achievement solved O'Connell's Irish agitation by stopping it and removing an annual Bill that had caused controversy. It did not lead to an overthrow of the Protestant Ascendancy or even to many Catholics gaining office. From the government's point of view it was a success, the only political penalty being the permanent loss of the Ultras. Of greater impact was the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, allowing Dissenter equal political if not religious equality. This bolstered the stand of property and religion against revolution and helped the Pittite Tories keep Dissenter support. Many may argue that the most successful of the reforms were either the economic ones of Robinson and Huskisson (tariff adjustments, some on Corn in 1822 and 1828, which some have seen as anticipating free trade, a useful area for evaluating relative success) or the administrative and legal reform of Peel. The latter has also been seen in varying lights – as sensible rationalisation and inspection with a more humane approach to the offences carrying the death penalty or as hard but rational approaches to prison reform (Bentham's models) and the need to obtain harsher penalties from jurors reluctant to convict on over-savage ones. Another useful test case could be the Repeal of the Combination Acts in 1824. Of similar use would be the reaction to dealing with constituency redistribution (East Retford). Better candidates could certainly point to the limits of reform, not least on questions of education, factories and towns.

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

**2 War and Peace 1793 – 1841**

- (a) How important was Britain's naval strategy to eventual victory in the conflict with France from 1793 to 1815? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: An assessment of the importance of naval strategy in defeating France by 1815.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to place the importance of naval strategy into the context of other factors in the French Wars. Points on the importance of naval strategy may stress the 1790s and early 1800s, with better candidates aware of the changing balance of factors which pointed away from the Navy after 1805. Up to 1805 a 'Bluewater' strategy was followed, in partnership with alliance diplomacy and subsidy. Candidates could point to West Indian occupation, Quiberon Bay, victories over the Spanish, Dutch and French (Aboukir Bay) and Danes (the destruction of the Armed Neutrality). It can be argued that victory at Trafalgar in 1805, followed by penetration of the Continental System, pushed Napoleon into overreaction in the Peninsular War and in Russia. Naval strategy aided Britain's prosecution of the Peninsular War. However candidates could challenge a decisive role for the Navy. Quiberon Bay in 1795 and the Walcheren expedition of 1809 were failures. Britain might gain naval supremacy but this would not allow her to dictate events in Europe. Candidates could well argue that for this to happen diplomatic, financial and military muscle needed to be applied and was, via the Peninsular, after 1808 and through continued and more effective coalition diplomacy thereafter. Similarly a case could be made for the importance of Napoleon's mistakes, the role of the Russian campaigns and above all Britain's relative economic and financial power in relation to the conflict.

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

**2(b) How far did Canning's foreign policy differ from that of Palmerston in the period from 1822 to 1841? [45]**

Focus: A comparison of Canning and Palmerston's foreign policy from 1822 to 1841.

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

Candidates will be expected to focus on both difference and similarity and it is perfectly possible to conclude that the similarities outweighed the differences. Sometimes differences are not as sharp as they may seem. Palmerston had been a minor liberal Tory before becoming Whig, a very similar root to Canning. Both were controversial members of their governments, mistrusted by the establishment, their monarchs and contemporary rulers. Both, perhaps because of this, played up other power bases, the Commons and the Press, striking popular attitudes and acquiring reputations for oratory. Areas of debate will involve their attitudes to alliances and the Concert of Europe where Canning was more concerned to disassociate Britain from acting as an adjunct to the Eastern Powers in 1822, whilst Palmerston was faced with Eastern triumph in 1830 and had to work to establish a Western Quadruple Alliance (1834) to achieve a balance of power that Canning had less need of. Both also differed in their attitudes to Spain and Portugal, Canning an opponent because of Latin America and trade, Palmerston more supportive because of the need for a balance against the Eastern powers. Both however were not averse to courting poor relations with both France and Spain. Palmerston especially came into conflict with France over the Belgium Question and the near East (Mehmet Ali in 1839). The Greek and emerging Eastern Questions provides candidates with much for comparison. Both wanted to prevent a weakening of the Ottomans, although Canning was prepared to see 'surgery' via Greek independence and to work with Russia on this, whilst Palmerston, perhaps of necessity, gave more unquestioning support for the Ottomans. Palmerston seemed more prepared to risk war with the great powers, although both he and Canning courted poor relations with the US (Canning's high profile involvement in Latin America in opposition to the Monroe Doctrine and Palmerston's insistence on 'right of search' and recognition of an independent Texas in 1836). Candidates can certainly question the extent of their differences, citing such issues as trade.

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

**3 The Age of Peel 1829 – 1846**

- (a) How successful was Peel as party leader in the period 1834 to 1846? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an evaluation of Peel as party leader.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to be aware of the problems facing Peel as party leader in the period – the need to restore the party after the disastrous electoral result of 1832, to attract property and moderates to the cause, to exploit Whig division and mistakes, to establish clear policies and to maintain party confidence and morale whilst in office (1834 / 35 and 1841 – 46). Peel's record in these areas was mixed. Up to 1841, successful areas could be stressed using the electoral results of the period, culminating in the first time a sitting government lost an election (1841). The pursuit of more 'conservative' policies in the Tamworth Manifesto (1834) could be seen as visionary and successful. He exploited Whig divisions very effectively after the Lichfield House Compact, keeping them in power 1839 – 41 partly with a view to ensuring greater 'success' in 1841. As PM Peel established clear policies on the Depression and finance and took a popularly hard line on Ireland before 1845. However this could be qualified given Peel's moves against old Toryism. He offended many by supporting the new Poor Law, appeared little interested in organisation and the work of Bonham in the 1830s, arguably deceiving the Tories in 1841 over continued Corn Law protection and spent much of his premiership in conflict with them over Factory Reform, the Sugar Duties, Maynooth and, ultimately, the Corn Laws. He seemed prepared to destroy his party by 1845 – 46 and resigned refusing to lead after repeal was achieved. Candidates could usefully pursue his notion of Pittite executive government which relied on patronage and the monarch rather than the active pursuit of party support. He expected obedience rather than working to achieve it by consensus and compromise. Candidates could thus question the extent of his success as a party leader.

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

- 3(b) How far would you agree that Peel mishandled Corn Law policy in the period 1841 to 1846? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an evaluation of Peel's Corn Law policy 1841-6

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

Corn Law policy has been seen as a triumph for Peel, a successful guiding of country and party away from protection towards a Free Trade that would cheapen prices and stimulate competition. It could be argued that Peel handed the issue well, given the difficulty of Tory protectionism in his own party. He realised that the Whigs, 'fishing for a budget' in 1841, were flirting with lower agricultural protection and defended the Corn Laws with great success in the 1841 election. Nonetheless, faced with the great Victorian Depression and the arguments of the Anti Corn Law League he moved, as part of his budgetary policy, towards lower protection in 1842 and succeeded. Accompanied by other Free Trade measures it could be argued that he was laying the ground for repeal very successfully. Similarly it could be pointed out that Peel waited until the League was in decline before announcing his conversion to Repeal in 1845. He did not want to be seen to be dictated to by them. He then persuaded the Cabinet and drove, with Whig support, repeal through, convinced by consular reports that Europe was moving into grain deficit and Britain would have to institutionalise her supplies on a European and global scale. That agriculture did not collapse was to his credit and he was later known for the blessings of high farming and cheaper bread. However candidates could point to the cost – the destruction of the Conservative party, thirty years in the political wilderness or even the need to address a modified law at all given that prices in the unprotected 1850s were very similar to the protected 1840s. By appearing to defend the laws in 1841 Peel laid himself open to the charge of betrayal. Certainly in private he agreed with most of the Anti Corn Law League's points. The decision to announce conversion in 1845 could be considered unwise. His Cabinet uniformly condemned it, with some resignations. It may have been better to wait until the next election (1848?) and then fight on repeal, although he may have been influenced here by the timing of the Irish Famine. It could be that he calculated on a minority and temporary Whig government to achieve repeal (Russell's Edinburgh letter) but it was naïve to expect the Whigs to do his dirty work and then depart. He made little effort to woo the bulk of the Tories on the issues, relying instead on cross voting. Did he intend a personal sacrifice? There is a strong case for 'mishandling'.

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

**4 The Economy and Industrialisation 1780 – 1846**

- (a) How important were transport developments in causing industrial growth during the period from 1780 to 1846? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: An evaluation of the role of transport in industrialisation

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

Candidates will need to compare transport developments with other factors causing industrial growth such as 'demand', trade, urbanisation, capital and mechanisation. This is a wide ranging question so detailed or complete coverage is not expected, provided there is some comparison with other factors. A key difficulty is to decide whether any factor is a cause or an effect and to be aware of geographical and chronological change. It could be argued that roads and canals were mere responses to growing trade and demand, particularly the N.W. transport focus (Liverpool to Manchester, where textile mechanisation and the global operation of that industry certainly led to crucial transport innovation (Bridgewater and the Leeds – Liverpool canal and then the Liverpool – Manchester railway in the late 1820s). Nonetheless Canal mania in the 1790s led to company growth given the scale of capital development required. The railways in the 1830s and 1840s led to crucial boosts to iron, engineering and coal, both here and abroad. The carrying trade was also boosted throughout the period, leading to shipbuilding and the growing dominance of British merchant shipping. Clearly technical development, social change and employment patterns were markedly affected by transport, particularly the railways. The 1840s 'mania' laid the foundations for industrial recovery and dominance. Before 1830 however it is possible to argue that transport was less important than trade, both domestically and overseas. Population increase and urbanisation provided ready markets for coal, textiles and iron. Overseas, in the Americas and India and China, Britain was dominant, the point of re-export for all their goods. Trade enabled capital, markets and raw materials to come together to fund industrial growth. These, plus capital formation, could be argued to be more important than transport, which is simply another 'cost' rather than a qualitative leap (mechanisation or the application of power).

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



- 4(b) How extensive was rural change in the period 1780 to 1846.  
Explain your answer.**

**[45]**

Focus: an assessment of the extent of rural change 1780 - 1846

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

Candidates will need to be aware of geographical difference as well as the areas of potential change – from employment prospects, reorganisation, the experiences of poverty and how to deal with it, types of employment (from arable to pastoral, seasonal and under employment etc.). Enclosure is a good measure of the extent of rural change having been underway for centuries. Its extent and impact in this period is a matter for debate. Enclosure in general was usually voluntary, albeit dominated by the wealthier landlords. In the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and up to 1820 about 4,000 ‘forced’ Parliamentary enclosures occurred, mainly in the Midlands and East Anglia. In the latter rising population and lack of employment elsewhere increased poverty through structural imbalance (lower wages and widespread underemployment). By the 1820s the ‘final’ areas were being enclosed and this led to the Captain Swing Riots, the last large scale Agricultural labourer’s Revolt. There were fewer problems in the North where alternative employment was available and farming traditionally more pastoral. In the South traditional artisan industries, domestically based, (the South West, Wiltshire and Gloucestershire, East Anglia) collapsed. The lot of the rural labourer thus changed for the worse in the South during the period and changes to the Poor Law also affected this (beneficently so in the Speenhamland period, 1795 – 1834) harshly so post the new Poor Law of 1834. The mechanisation of agriculture (threshing machines) was also reasonably extensive, further reducing employment opportunities. Thus casual labour became much more common. War and its aftermath also affected rural change between 1793 and 1815. Bread prices rose, although so too did employment opportunities as agriculture expanded. Post 1815 however there was contraction and agricultural depression. The rural worker had become a temporary hired labourer in large parts of the South by 1830. Grievances were real, although the experience was not common, even in the South.

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

**Britain 1846 – 1906****5 Whigs and Liberals 1846 – 1874**

- (a) 'Commitment to reform was the most important reason why Whigs and Liberals dominated politics during the period from 1846 to 1874.'

How far do you agree?

[45]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for Whig – Liberal dominance

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

Candidates need to consider a reform commitment and why it might be electorally attractive weighing this against other factors. These may include an increasingly urban electoral system, the extent of talent on the Whig, Liberal, Peelite side (Russell, Aberdeen, Palmerston and Gladstone), the conservative split after 1846, (a particularly important factor given its longevity) and the near monopoly on populist foreign issues that Whig – Liberals enjoyed. Candidates could also consider the manner in which they managed to attract both traditional, propertied and radical views in a relatively stable coalition. Mention could also be made of the economic stability of the Mid Victorian period with genuinely radical issues (Chartism and Ireland) all but disappearing. Each of these could be considered to be more important than a commitment to reform, although candidates will need to discuss the relative importance of reform. Here mention may be made of free – trade, laissez-faire and administrative reform (and where they touched Nonconformist issues there was a growing electoral impact). In the hands of Gladstone such reforms were clearly popular with an urban middle class electorate. However candidates could point out that much reform was slow and limited, despite the Crimean War's exposure of the aristocratic State's incompetence and Conservative supported Free trade and laissez-faire from 1852. Perhaps very limited reform was the key for a propertied electorate. Repeal of the Paper Duties in 1861 was certainly electorally popular and helped cement good relationships with a pro 'liberal' new popular press. Parliamentary Reform is a useful qualifier here. Although toyed with by Russell as early as 1852 it was proposed first by the Conservatives in 1859 and passed by them in 1867, although it could be argued that Gladstone and the Liberals took the credit in 1868.

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

- 5(b) How important was Gladstone in the development of Liberalism during the period to 1874? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an assessment of Gladstone's relative importance in the development of liberalism to 1874.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Gladstone will need to be compared in relation to other factors in the development of Liberalism – the role of the Whigs and their constitutional emphasis, the radicals, the Nonconformists with their sense of religious and civic equality, the Peelites sense of administrative duty, the role of the Celtic Fringe and of the Liberal intelligentsia led by J.S.Mill. Candidates assessing Gladstone's relative importance could stress his abilities as an administrator and leader, first of all of the Peelites and then, after 1866, of the liberals. It could be argued that many of their distinctive policies were also his – the stress on peace, retrenchment and reform (Gladstone as both Chancellor and PM). He was an electoral asset from 1859 and a key advocate for liberalism (a crusade). Against this, candidates could note his Peelite conservatism before 1859, his early aloofness from government until 1853 and especially 1855 – 59 when he was distinctly unpopular and out of government. Many mistrusted him, from Radicals to Whigs, especially his tendency to raise embarrassing moral questions at the expense of the party (for example on foreign policy). These, like his opposition to Parliamentary Reform before the 1850s, cast doubt over his commitment to liberalism. Palmerston's version was very different. As PM, Gladstone often took little interest in key liberal issues like education, temperance or army reform. Candidates could stress the importance of other factors in the development of Liberalism based around the view that it could have easily done without Gladstone. Leadership for a large part of the period lay with others (Whigs like Palmerston and Russell, Peelites like Aberdeen). Radicals provided much energy and pursued their causes regardless of Gladstone. Key liberal elements were sustained by them, from skilled artisan to Nonconformists. Free Trade and Laissez – Faire were not Gladstonian monopolies, existing before he embraced them and championed by most heavyweights of the day. Liberalism did not have to be Gladstonian.

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

**6 The Conservatives 1846 – 1880**

- (a) How weak was the Conservative Party during the period from 1846 to 1866? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an assessment of relative weakness of the Conservatives 1846 – 1866

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

A case could be made for both weakness and relative strength. A focus on weakness to 1866 would be likely to stress leadership – uncertainty and experimentation (tripartite in the Commons after 1846), followed by Stanley's stately and grandee dispassion that was frequently at odds with a mistrusted and socially inferior Disraeli, who had to be frequently reprimanded for his tactics in opposition. Stanley (Derby) instinctively preferred to support liberal governments on great issues, forsaking the opportunity to play 'politics'. Another serious weakness was the failure to woo the Peelites back to the party in the 1850s, although not for the want of trying (did Disraeli deliberately obstruct their return, especially that of Gladstone?). Distinctive policies were also lacking, the one exception being Parliamentary Reform. This prevented exploitation of the mistakes of the Crimean War. The suspicion of Protectionism also lingered long. Similarly there was little headway made with party organisation or with trying to gain more support in the urban areas or the Celtic Fringe. The latter especially was a weak point. Their opponents were strong throughout the period and monopolised new electoral concerns like free trade, finance and foreign policy. However one can challenge the extent of their weakness. All three governments of the period were distinctive and fell only because of their minority status. Derby's 2<sup>nd</sup> ministry in 1858 saw promising legislation and proposals that would have stolen Gladstone's thunder if longer surviving (the Paper Duties and Parliamentary Reform). His 3<sup>rd</sup> ministry was a reform triumph, finally rehabilitating Disraeli whose strategies had succeeded. Electorally the Conservatives retained much strength. The political system was still weighted towards land, 72 MPs were regained in 1852 and by the 1859 election they had 306 MPs to the Liberal 325. Derby was a safe pair of hands and Disraeli was clearly unequalled in the Commons in terms of rhetoric, save for Gladstone. By 1866 even party machinery was being overhauled. With Palmerston's death there were to be opportunities and the party was, arguably, never as weak as it may seem in hindsight.

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

**6(b) How far were Disraeli's foreign and imperial policies in Britain's interests in the period 1874 to 1880? [45]**

Focus: an evaluation of Disraeli's foreign and imperial policies to 1880.

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

Candidates will need to be aware of the controversy surrounding Disraeli's overseas policies in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ministry. Gladstone accused Disraeli of being firstly indifferent to Turkish barbarism (the Bulgarian Atrocities), thus implying Britain's interests were to uphold the Concert of Europe, international law and Christian civilisation, and secondly to running unnecessary risks of war with Russia in the Eastern Question. On the Empire Gladstone and others detected aggression and expansionism aimed at native peoples struggling to be free (the Hill tribes of Afghanistan and the Zulu and Boer peoples in Southern Africa). The accusation was that Disraeli preferred wasteful romantic gestures (Victoria as Empress of India, the sudden purchase of the Suez Canal shares and the posturing at Berlin in 1878 with his rhetorical 'Peace in our Time' claim). It was argued that this ran counter to British interests - the avoidance of war, the maintenance of a balance of power and a Pax Britannica, the lowering of costs and the avoidance of unnecessary responsibility. However it is perfectly possible to defend Disraeli against such charges. He felt that Gladstone had neglected vital British interests and was determined to reassert a British presence, not least by defying the Dreikaiserbund, although the effect of this was to embolden the Turks in their resistance to international pressure for reform. He may have made a political mistake over the Bulgarian Atrocities, but he was determined to prevent a Russian victory and especially to unpick the San Stefano Treaty. The settlement at Berlin was clearly in British interests (the break-up of the 'Big', potentially pro Russian, 'Bulgaria') although one can question the policy of unquestioning support for Turkey. Nonetheless he won a victory without recourse to the war expected by Gladstone. On the imperial front the Royal Titles Act clearly ensured Victoria's prominent monarchical role, whilst the acquisition of the Suez Canal was clearly in British interests (trade with the East, a vital imperial artery threatened by France and Russia etc). More doubtful were events in Southern Africa. Before the discovery of minerals there seemed little point in acquiring the Boer States or Zulu territory. Federal schemes might have been sensible but Disraeli has been criticised for letting men on the spot like Bartle Frere too much leeway. Similarly in India, Lytton was an ill advised choice and his Afghan policy proved disastrous. There were better ways of containing Russian influence there.

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

**7 Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846 – 1902**

- (a) How successful was Britain in upholding the balance of power during the period 1846 to 1902? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an evaluation of Britain's attempts to uphold the balance of power 1846 – 1902.

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

Candidates should be aware of the importance of the balance of power in this period. No government, even Salisbury's, thought it could dispense with it as the means of most effectively pacifying Europe, preserving trade and preventing the need for British continental military intervention. 'Splendid Isolation' in the 1890s was more a newspaper construct and one that Salisbury feared rather than celebrated. The period saw major challenges to it – its old 'Vienna' form was destroyed by the Crimean War in 1853 – 4, whilst Italian (1860 -1) and German (1866-70) unification saw an unstable situation emerge, particularly in relation to German ambitions and attitudes. It could be argued that Britain succeeded in maintaining a balance, curbing Russia in the Crimea (Peace of Paris 1856) and again at Berlin over the Eastern Question in 1878. France too was curbed by Ironclads, trade treaties (Chevalier – Cobden 1863) and imperially (Fashoda 1898). Britain resisted the emerging alliances of the 1870s and 1890s, despite some German wooing by interested parties, as she had earlier sought to prevent the Eastern Powers dictating to the Ottomans (Dreikaiserbund) in 1875 -76. However Britain's international position deteriorated after 1870 and her success can be questioned, or attributed more to chance (the recalcitrance, for example, of the new Bulgaria in relation to its expected sponsor, Russia). Britain was powerless to prevent the military alliances of 1879 and 1894. She was lucky that France was weakened and could challenge only in Africa and Asia. In this period Germany and Austria and Hungary seemed content to draw breath. Rival fleets were under construction only at the very end of the period. Russia remained a problem (the great game in Afghanistan and Tibet) but was now secure in Europe behind a German / Austrian barrier. The Balkans were relatively quiescent in the 1890s. Most tension was caused in Africa, the Middle East and Asia. A balance of sorts had been achieved, especially if Britain remained aloof from the new power blocs in Europe. The Boer War suggested that she could successfully do this.

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

- (b) **How popular was imperialism in Britain during the period from 1880 to 1902?**  
**Explain your answer.**

**[45]**

Focus: an evaluation of the popularity of imperialism in Britain.

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

Better candidates should provide a balanced account assessing the issue of 'how popular' and whether it remained so throughout the period in question. In 1880 Gladstone won an election based on a campaign that condemned Disraeli's imperial expansion. The provincial liberal press backed him on this. In contrast the Khaki election in 1900, at the end of the period, appeared to endorse Chamberlain's imperialism. By then those who opposed imperialism were an intellectual or older Cobdenite minority. The Liberal Imperialists were gaining ground in a party traditionally suspicious of Empire, just as Chamberlain's supporters did within a much more receptive Conservative Party. When Gladstone bombarded Alexandria he was popular, when he conceded to the Boers in the Convention of Pretoria or was reluctant to back Gordon at Khartoum, he was unpopular. The rise of the lower middle class and the predominance of Salisbury's conservatives would suggest imperialism was popular with those who could vote. A new mass circulation press was supportive and elementary education via the post 1870 Board Schools used the Empire to instruct ('wider still and wider'). Advertising and new products promoted imperial themes. New comics fed on imperial heroes and Seeley lectured on the 'Expansion of England'. Imperial incidents could be blown out of proportion, as at Fashoda in 1898. Nonconformists had opposed the Empire's expansion but issues such as the persistence of slavery and the role of missionaries could grip moral Victorians, as could their appetite for exploration and the cataloguing of its findings in new large scale urban museums (the V. and A, the Natural History Museum, the Pitt Rivers in Oxford). It was celebrated in the Diamond Jubilee of 1897 and in the hysteria of 1900. The popularisation of Social Darwinism, with its racial imperatives, could also be usefully referred to. Candidates can tie in social and economic developments with the Empire. However they could also usefully point to areas of resistance. The new Socialist movement, the Trade Unions (suspicious of cheap labour and capitalist rapacity) and many middle class people ('pro – Boers') were also doubtful, especially of the costs. Slum Toryism might have been more susceptible to imperialism, although this is difficult to prove, but by the end of the Boer War in 1902 the popularity of Imperialism was dented.

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

**8 Trade Unions and Labour 1867 – 1906**

- (a) Why was the Labour Representation Committee more successful after 1900 than the Independent Labour Party had been before 1900? [45]**

Focus: a comparison of the reasons for success or lack of it for labour's political parties.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to establish a relatively balanced account, comparing both the ILP before and the LRC after 1900. Before 1900 it is likely that candidates will refer to the narrowness of the ILP in its West Yorkshire textile base with outlying links to Lancashire and Scotland, to the hold of traditional liberalism on the skilled working and middle classes, to the weakness of socialism amongst the working class (the ILP consisted of socialist groups like the SDF, Labour Clubs and Fabians), to the problems of finding and supporting working candidates, to the lack of trade union support, to Tory electoral victory and to the circumstances of the 1895 electoral wipe out. Hardie's energies after defeat recognised this by seeking a broader labour base for a new labour party. After 1900 the LRC could draw upon a widening Trade Union base, a much weaker Liberal party, a sense of grievance created by the legal and employer onslaught on wages, laws and rights, to a careful avoidance of specific socialism (the SDF left) and above all to the Taff Vale case which swung Unions and finance in the direction of the LRC. As evidence of the LRC's success they were able to negotiate the electoral pact with the liberals, securing the first significant electoral breakthrough in 1906 (24 MPs). Better candidates however could point to the limitations of both the ILP and the LRC. Before 1906 neither did especially well and many unions (the Miners) remained with the Liberals despite issues like Chinese Slavery. The 1903 Electoral Pact could be seen as reinventing lib-labism and losing the independence of the ILP, its 'raison d'être', which in the 1890s had secured 35,000 members. Comparison could also be made of the leadership of Hardie and MacDonald.

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



- 8(b) How successful were the Conservatives and Liberals in dealing with organised labour in the period 1867 – 1906? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: assessment of the success of the political practice in dealing with organised labour.

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

Candidates will need to deal with both the unions and the various political groups, especially the LRC, post 1900. Before the late 1890s neither party felt it particularly necessary to consider the Unions or parties as important political factors, especially in the late 1870s, 1880s and for part of the 1890s. At the start of the period both were reasonably keen to recognise the New Model Unions as respectable Victorian institutions. The Liberals and especially Gladstone had idealised the upper working class as moral and respectable and been prepared to extend the vote to them. Disraeli had followed such a policy in the Second Reform Act, penetrating further into the working class vote than Gladstone was happy with. Both were keen to recognise and encourage the self help aspect of Unions in their legislation of the 1870s, Disraeli going further by condoning peaceful picketing as a strike weapon. Despite this candidates are likely to argue that the Liberals were the more successful in gaining the political support of the Unions, most of whom were Lib - Labs throughout the period. After 1880 Chamberlain was one of the few politicians who wished to woo the Unions and the Upper working class (the 'unauthorised programme') but neither party showed any interest in the New Unionism. It was too easily condemned. Both supported the employer backlashes over the Match Girls in 1888 / 9 and in the disputes of the 1890s. There seemed no political cost as independent labour politics remained weak in its emergent period of the late 1880s and 1890s. The turning point came with the LRC in 1900. Both parties were indifferent to the implications of Taff Vale and the need to change the law. Chamberlain's 'social reform' strategy of combining imperialism with Tariff based economic solutions (to tax foreign importers to finance reform) proved unsuccessful, a victim of free trade instincts, the small loaf and the debacle over the Boer War. His Tariff Reform campaign of post 1903 proved disastrous and helped Liberalism re-establish its relations with the working class. Liberalism was more responsive, reviving the cheap food and Free Trade option so attractive to 19<sup>th</sup> century workers. There was the promise of a New Liberalism. They moved to absorb the LRC into liberalism via the Electoral Pact of 1903, partly designed to stop the 'independent' aspect so beloved of Keir Hardie and labour activists. The 1906 Liberal victory was a testament to both their success and their awareness of Union issues, legal, moral (Chinese Slavery) and social (Lloyd George's New Liberalism). The Conservatives, whilst the franchise remained that of 1884, were a party of the middle and upper classes, despite various attempts, from Lord Randolph Churchill onwards, to woo conservative workers (usually via Empire). They had less to gain and much to lose from association with the Unions or the Socialist parties. Thus the liberals tended to be more successful in articulating and identifying with the values of organised labour or at least its 'respectable' part.

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

**Britain 1899 – 1964****9 Liberals and Labour 1899 – 1918**

- (a) **‘Liberal strengths rather than Conservative weaknesses explain their electoral victory in 1906.’ How far do you agree?** [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the reasons for liberal victory in 1906.

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

There is an argument that the Liberals under Campbell Bannerman won 1906 under the flag of the New Liberalism of Lloyd George and Churchill. As a strategy it revived liberalism and presented an effective answer to the Condition of England issues both in terms of finance (direct taxation) and focus (safety nets to remove most of the institutional poor from the workhouses). However it could be argued that signs of the New Liberalism were rare. The effectiveness of the liberals was to be traditional and safe – a ‘no’ to food taxes, repeal of the Conservative Education and Licensing Acts to woo traditional liberal groups like the Nonconformists and a repeal of Taff Vale to appease the Unions. Their effectiveness was to appeal to the strength of 19<sup>th</sup> century liberalism, minus Ireland, (alienated or neglected in recent years). Particularly successful was Herbert Gladstone’s 1903 Electoral Pact with the LRC to avoid damaging tripartite constituency contests which had the added advantage of making labour more dependent on the liberals. It effectively avoided splitting the progressive vote and undermined working class support for Labour. Nonetheless candidates should be able to balance their argument by focussing on conservative mistakes. It was this that gave the liberals their new found unity, especially the rally to defend Free Trade. Conservative party organisation declined (27 liberals were unopposed in 1906, in marked contrast to 1900) with 100 Conservatives retiring. The loss of working class support in Lancashire and London was because of a Conservative failure to reverse Taff Vale, Chinese Slavery and the ‘small load’ provided by Tariff Reform (by far the biggest issue in 1906). Middle Class voters were alienated by Conservative Tariff divisions. Candidates may well therefore conclude that the election was lost by Balfour’s attempt to solve problems controversially. There was a much increased turn-out for the 1906 Election, (of 25%) and it is likely this was a reaction against Conservatism rather than a response to a newly effective Liberalism.

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

- 9b) How important a role did Lloyd George play in the creation of the Liberal welfare reforms during the period 1906 to 1914? Explain your answer. [45]

Focus: an evaluation of the role of Lloyd George in creating the liberal welfare reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might argue for Lloyd George's pre-eminence in the Welfare Reforms. By 1906 he was shuffling off his 'aggressive Welshness' and anti Anglicanism, arguably provincial, and associating more with the progressive ideas fostered by C P Scott and the Manchester Guardian, becoming a key advocate of them for political reasons - to pre-empt the labour Party. As President of the Board of Trade 1905 – 8 he played little role in the early Educational and Children's legislation on diet, health and family law, making his mark over a Merchant Shipping Act and the prevention of strikes. His 'new liberal' role became more prominent as Chancellor of the Exchequer, from 1908 onwards. At the Exchequer, OAPs in 1908, the People's Budget 1909 and the National Insurance Acts of 1911 bore his imprint. He was certainly the most effective political operator and here his role was crucial, slaying many old and new dragons (House of Lords, the English landed aristocracy) at the same time. He piloted pensions and insurance legislation through Parliament. However candidates could question his motives. They were certainly political and personal (ambition). His social concern has been questioned. Candidates will need to put his role into perspective as the welfare reforms were not his creation and nor was the climate within which they occurred. Liberal thinkers like J A Hobson, L T Hobhouse and T H Green laid the foundations for giving the state a more prominent role, while Booth and Rowntree provided an analytical framework and exposed the evils. It could be argued that Churchill played a more prominent role on issues like labour Exchanges. There was also the element of the piecemeal. School Meals were introduced by a Labour MP with government backing. Indeed the influences of labour in the early years were more important (the Workmen's Compensation act of 1906). At Education the role of Sir Robert Morant, a gifted administrator was considerable. Asquith himself drew up the Pension legislation in 1908, whilst much of the work on the 1911 Insurance Acts had been that of the young liberal civil servant William Beveridge. Thus other politicians, parties, civil servants, unions (the Miners especially) and individuals were just as important as Lloyd George who, post 1911, seemed to revert to more traditional causes (Disestablishment, land legislation etc.). Candidates could also examine the changed climates, (the Report on the Poor Laws, debates on national efficiency and democracy, the rise of labour) provided these do not divert too much from a focus on specific reform and the factors involved in their creation.

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

**10 Inter – War Domestic Problems 1918 – 1939**

- (a) How successfully did Lloyd George deal with the domestic problems facing the government of 1918 – 1922? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an evaluation of Lloyd George's handling of domestic problems 1918 - 22

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

Candidates will need to provide some criteria for success – the solution to a problem, the short and long term effect, achievement in the face of long standing opposition, the maintenance of a fragile coalition government, the need to satisfy the Conservatives, the post war economic and social problems etc. The agenda had been set by the expectations of the war – employment, homes fit for heroes, education for all, democracy (the 1918 Reform Act) etc. It could be argued that Lloyd George was successful in balancing these with the post war problems that emerged, political and economic. There were education and housing Acts, whilst he successfully juggled the problems of a semi-nationalised Coal Industry via the Sankey Commission. He was very successful in handling post-war industrial disputes whilst in Ireland he first resisted Sinn Fein's rebellion and then reversed his policy, negotiating a settlement for Ireland that would last for most of the century. Universal Manhood Suffrage and a compromise on the female vote was achieved. He was certainly successful in balancing a mistrustful Conservative Party until 1921 / 22, convincing them that they needed him to ward off the labour menace. He was less successful in keeping liberals in the Coalition. Candidates can just as easily question the extent of success. Fisher was outraged that his plans for secondary education for all in the 1918 Act were sacrificed to the economies of the Geddes Axe. Above all Addison at housing found his extensive Council House building programme cut in a similar manner. There were few moves to extend insurance or health measures beyond that of 1911. The Old Poor Law remained. In Ireland Lloyd George's Treaty satisfied no one. Partition was unwelcome to all – Sinn Fein and Ulster Unionists alike. The Black and Tans were clearly a mistake, whilst the careless drawing of the boundaries for Northern Ireland left a large Catholic minority at the mercy of the Protestant majority. Industrially Lloyd George de-nationalised and failed to secure industrial re-organisation. In the Coal industry he bequeathed many problems for successive governments. Whilst candidates might point to his ingenuity in persuading opponents to accept temporary solutions to a variety of problems, in the end he was to be defeated by them.

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

**10(b) 'Political problems were far more serious than economic problems in undermining the Labour governments of 1924 and 1929 – 31.' How far do you agree? [45]**

Focus: an assessment of the relative importance of the problems that undermined the first two Labour governments

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates are likely to agree that political problems were more important in 1924, but that the opposite was the case in 1929 – 31. Doubts over labour's ability to run the economy and finances were prevalent on both occasions but the Chancellor, Snowden, acted in an impeccably traditional manner on both occasions. There was no major economic or financial crisis in 1924 but in 1931 the Depression threatened Sterling and to save the Pound and the City, Snowden and MacDonald were prepared to argue for cuts at the expense of the labour rank and file. To ensure confidence they were prepared to head a National Coalition. Economic problems and the political questions they posed had ended a Labour government. Yet arguably political problems lay behind this and better candidates could point to the stark political choices facing the 1931 government. Political problems were certainly of much greater importance in ending the 1924 government and candidates could well stress that, politically, both governments were minorities, dependent on liberal support to defend Free trade. Some might point out that the decision over 'cuts' in 1931 was just as much a political decision as an economic one. However, in 1924 it was a series of mishandled political issues that led to its fall – the undermining of all previous attempts to appear moderate by negotiating treaties and a loan with the Soviets, the mishandling of the Campbell Case and, during the election, becoming the victim of secret service smear tactics using the Zinoviev letter. In 1931, for those arguing for the importance of political issues, the failure to resolve the relationship with the Trade Unions was very serious. Those, like Henderson, who owed their position to the Unions, would not accept the level of cuts proposed and no one told the labour government that going 'off gold' was anything other than disastrous. 1931 was as much a political split between the wings of the party as they were disputes over economic policy.

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

**11 Foreign Policy 1939 – 1963**

- (a) How successful was Britain in maintaining its imperial influence during the period from 1945 to 1960? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an evaluation of Britain's imperial influence to 1960

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

Candidates could point to the fact that few in government during the period accepted decolonisation. The motives were always, in the post-war world, to preserve the Empire and maintain imperial influences through new structures, economic and political. Candidates will need to focus on how successful these were or whether the loss of Empire and decolonisation continued remorsefully throughout the period. Candidates can examine various areas (South Asia, South East Asia, Africa, the Dominions) or look thematically at political, economic and military influences. Most candidates will stress failure to maintain influence citing the withdrawal from India, the reluctance over its Partition, withdrawal from the Middle East in the 1950s culminating in Macmillan's 1959 decision to abandon the African Empire. However most politicians and civil servants did not see it in this way. They believed it was possible to develop a new type of relationship by managing change carefully. The model was to be the emerging 1930s Commonwealth, the 'Dominion' model. This could demonstrate flexibility (the London Declaration in 1949 allowed India to stay in the Commonwealth despite becoming a Republic). Running alongside such political association was a determination, once India had gone, to develop other areas as sources of economic and political power. In Africa and Malaysia between 1945 and 1959 Britain pursued a series of economic schemes, including a Sterling Area (a form of protection against the US and a means of earning dollars). The Colonial Development Corporation in 1948, the Groundnut Scheme and a Middle Eastern presence (the Anglo – Iranian Oil company was nationalised in 1951) are all examples of this, but all except the last proved failures, not least through US pressure and colonial discontent at the distortion of local economies. The presence of white settlers, an echo of the old Dominions and part of the policy of self government, was also to provide a variety of problems for Britain in Southern Africa later. The Commonwealth and its associated schemes never developed into the profitable British trading areas hoped for. As a balance to US power Britain's imperial influence lacked the economic clout and was vulnerable to US pressure for a free trade world. Militarily there was more success, partly because of the Cold War. In Malaysia and the Middle East Britain successfully retained her imperial influence, maintaining large bases at Aden and Singapore and co-operating with the US in restoring the Shah to power in Iran in 1953. There was also some success in fostering moderate colonial elites to whom power could be devolved (as in India). Candidates can point to a very mixed picture.

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

**11(b) How far did British attitudes to Europe change during the period from 1945 to 1963?  
Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: an evaluation of British attitudes to Europe 1945 – 63.

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

Candidates may well argue that little changed until the end of the period (1957 onwards, but most likely 1961). In 1945 Russia was clearly Britain's major opponent in Europe and Britain was very involved, as an occupying power, in Germany and as the main Mediterranean power. Britain assumed she would dominate and resisted or ignored attempts at European co-operation, fearing a challenge to her national sovereignty and failing to see that her economic interests might be challenged by this. Britain had a global and imperial outlook on such issues (Africa) and looked to America as the key competitor. In Europe she saw the US as the means of bolstering her power in areas like Greece rather than Europe itself becoming a Third Force. Better candidates could point on Britain's side to some equivocation over defence (a Third Force Europe). Bevin took it seriously, insisting a Customs Union be considered in 1947. He thought Commonwealth resources could find a European market and he signed military treaties at Dunkirk and Brussels in 1947 and 1948 but little was achieved beyond this. By 1947 it was clear Britain's economy was too weak to act as a European motor and the US stepped in. Both the Treasury and the Board of Trade opposed European involvement, seeing it as a threat to free trade, Britain's global interests and as too weak an area to provide any answer to Britain's problems. This was to change in the 1950s as Europe recovered economically. Britain saw herself as bridging the European / American gap, another excuse to stand aloof from European co-operation. In defence NATO in 1949 demonstrated the achievement of such a bridge. At best Britain saw moves to European co-operation or unity as being guided by Britain militarily. Morrison and Eden continued to stress NATO and the US, considering the Pleven and the EDC plan only to secure West German rearmament. Some have argued that Eden tried to sabotage the EDC, others that he wished to work with it. Britain gained what they wanted when the EDC failed and the 1955 Western European Union was put in place without supranational control of the troops. It also ensured the completion of West German recovery that Britain had worked for, suiting the British policy of mediating between the US and Europe. However, economically Britain continued to remain aloof in the 1950s, failing to participate in talks to set up the EEC (1951 Coal and Steel, 1957 the Treaty of Rome). Only after 1957 did Britain slowly realise their importance, hence Macmillan's change in 1961 with the decision to apply for membership. Whereas on defence Britain took the initiative with the WEU, economically she failed to be part of the post 1955 talks. Thus candidates can argue for consistency in Britain's European policy throughout or for change at the end of the period in economic policy, or at least a change in methods to retain British influence.

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

**12 Post War Britain 1945 – 1964**

- (a) 'Labour's social reforms of 1945 – 51 owed everything to wartime changes and reports.' How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: an assessment of the causes of labour's social reforms 1945 – 51.

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

Candidates need to examine how far everything was owed to the war. There was public expectation of a fair society and more equality given the wartime stress on equal sacrifice. State interference had been massive and accepted (the reaction came later). There had been much practical involvement in key social areas like food, housing, health and children. The inadequacy of pre war welfare provision was heightened by the war, especially hospital coverage, and planning was accepted. Much could be made of Beveridge's 1942 Report's commitment to universal entitlement, although better candidates will stress the concerns of many to water it down. The 1944 White Papers and Woolton's Joint Party Cabinet Reconstruction Committee could also be cited as vital wartime influences, whilst the war experience had already abolished the Means Test in 1941 and introduced family allowances to tackle low incomes and a universal earnings contribution. The principle of welfare as a right rather than as a reward for appropriate behaviour was clearly already established by 1945. Arguably the post-war labour governments merely put this into practice and built on war-time planning, as represented by Butler and Beveridge. However candidates could challenge this view. It could be argued that labour was immensely buoyed up by sweeping electoral victory in 1945 and made a deliberate decision to focus on social reform rather than building up industrial recovery. The Socialist element was clearly 'new', although most of the wartime experiences accepted it through need. Such an element was added to the often liberal inspired reforms and plans of the wartime era. Labour ministers were quite conservative and, in education, happy to abandon a comprehensive view of secondary education for a potentially class bound tripartite one. Yet, in the NHS and in Housing, Bevan, in practice, pursued a very radical scheme, with success, (prefabs and squatting). It owed little to wartime practice. Thus the election, individuals, socialist pressure etc could all demonstrate that not everything was owed to the war.

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



**12(b) How far do Conservative mistakes explain their loss of the 1964 general election?  
Explain your answer.**

**[45]**

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for the result of the 1964 general election.

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

The focus needs to be on whether Conservative mistakes lost them the 1964 election or whether Labour won it. Electoral statistics suggest the parties were evenly divided so candidates can argue either way. Those who emphasise Conservative mistakes will stress the ineffective campaign run by the new, but traditionally aristocratic, Conservative leader, Sir Alec Douglas-Home in comparison to the apparently more technocratic and 'in touch' Harold Wilson. The Conservatives had been in power for 13 years and the economy was no longer the asset it had once been. Now sluggish, the Chancellor, Selwyn Lloyd, had imposed unpopular deflationary policies in 1961. Macmillan's 'winds of change' and rapid decolonisation (including the outrages of British rule in Kenya), together with immigration, all dented the Conservative's image in the eyes of the middle classes, as exemplified in the 1962 Orpington by-election. On top of that there was the Profumo scandal in 1963, whilst the 'New Approach' in economics was undermined by De Gaulle's veto of Britain's EEC entry in the same year. Macmillan's attempt to produce a fresh government, the 'Night of the Long Knives', had backfired and instead left a legacy of ministerial distrust, far from the image he had hoped to create. The Conservatives were unlikely to win many working class votes given the heavily based class policies of the time. Given this it was remarkable that the Conservatives managed to muster so many votes but candidates can question the extent of Conservative mistakes. There had been attempts at new policies, new ministers and new leaders and many of the 'mistakes' lay in the past (1963). Immigration and Empire were unlikely to help Labour. Yet Labour's ideological division appeared less strong (Gaitskell v. Bevan), they appeared more technocratic ('the white heat of technology') and Wilson was well organised ('scientific managerialism'). This all helped Labour seem relevant and up-to-date in comparison. The social democracy of Gaitskell (now dead) and Crossland appealed to large parts of the electorate, especially on education. The mid 20<sup>th</sup> century swing of the pendulum may also have played a role.

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

## 2585 European History 1046 – 1718

### Europe 1046-1250

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

##### (a) Assess the reasons for the conflict between Gregory VII and Henry IV. [45]

Focus: evaluation of causal factors explaining conflict

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

Answers need a good sense of 'Assess ...' and to provide a range of reasons, preferably prioritising such. This will be a feature of the top Bands. The sense of conflict needs to be conveyed and reference to events (e.g. Canossa) will be necessary. The candidates may range across some long-term causes dating back to 1046 and, more so, to short-term, above all associated with Gregory VII. That said, a sense of perspective is important and the answer needs to focus upon the Gregory VII-Henry IV disputes, with limited references to longer-term causes. Likely areas for consideration: a reform-minded Papacy, determined to overcome previous weaknesses, linked to a desire (even urge) to assert and further its (sense of) powers; Henry IV's minority and the gains made there by the Papacy; Henry's desire to re-assert his authority; Gregory's apparent agenda and the threats there to traditional German Imperial monarchy, especially over control of the church; the respective ideas of each as to their authority and claims to rights, centred, of course, upon lay investiture and its symbolism. There will be reward for those who handle the ideological dimension (e.g. the bases to the respective claims made, the tensions of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*) but candidates can score equally well by developing the context and the personal element, undoubtedly embedded in the conflict. Gregory's principal ideas were: paramount nature of *justitia*, sovereignty and so supremacy of Pope over Christian society, including bishops and kings; the necessity for 'suitability' of office holders in ordered society; illegitimacy of lay control over clerics. These ideas had powerful implications, not least political, above all in the attack on lay investiture and the idea of deposition of a ruler. There was a political context to events.

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

**1(b) Assess the reasons for the appeal of monasticism in the period from 1046 to 1122.**

**[45]**

Focus: Comparative evaluation of religious movements

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates are likeliest to compare the Cluniacs and the Cistercians, though reference to other orders (e.g. the Carthusians) would be welcome. Direct and careful, close comparison will be a feature of **Bands I and II** while a more sequential approach or simple description will be a feature of the **Bands III to V**. Appeal both within the structure and outlook of the Church and, wider, within lay society, above all amongst the elites, should be considered. The religious-spiritual context was important: the Benedictine Rule, prayers, good works, ways to salvation, traditions of patronage, family connections, benefactions, the appeal of monastic life to the younger members of families. The sense in which 'new' monasticism had a stronger appeal over what was seen increasingly as a contaminated and over-comfortable 'old' monasticism is important, and contrasts can be made between the approaches of 'old' and 'new' to such issues as community sense, location (remoteness), asceticism and austerity, lay involvement, the uses of lands, true and pure Benedictinism, the links to episcopal and papal authority and power (to identify only several aspects). Some knowledge of the Orders and their functioning will be necessary. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good, persistent focus upon 'Assess ...' and the needs of the question. There will be sound knowledge and understanding, linked to reasoned judgement as to range of reasons; answers in those Bands will have a sense of range as well as development. There will be a clear sense of both assessment and prioritisation in these higher Bands.

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

**2 France and the Empire 1152-1250**

- (a) How successful were Frederick Barbarossa's policies in Germany? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success

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

Candidates need to focus well upon 'How successful ...' and will need to establish some criteria by which to adjudicate upon success and the degrees of success, long- or short-term. No set conclusion is expected. They must focus upon Germany with references to Italy kept to a bare minimum and likely to be linked to the effects of Frederick Barbarossa's frequent absences on campaign. Candidates are likely to examine areas such as: the impact of frequent absences upon the conduct of government in an era of personal rulership; the state of the royal domain lands; the conduct of government and administration; his use of his own Hohenstaufen lands; the independence of the nobles and its extent; the struggle with Henry the Lion and the eventual outcome in the breaking of Welf power; the lack of unity within the German lands; their extension by military action; unrest levels (e.g. the revolt of Mainz); the relationship with the German church, strained by disputes with the Papacy; provision for the succession. It is possible to argue that Frederick attempted to re-shape German politics with a focus upon settling conflicts with Bavaria and Saxony and upon reasserting royal claims without necessarily regaining territories. The crown accepted feudal tenure of lands wrested from its control, though nominal and residual rights remained. It is possible to argue that, in his later years, when focused much more on Germany, Frederick was successful and left a strong legacy.

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

**2(b) Assess the reasons why Frederick II clashed so often with the Papacy.**

Focus: Evaluation of causation of major politico-religious event

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

Candidates are required to consider and evaluate a range of reasons, even though exhaustive coverage is not expected even for the top Bands. Focus upon 'so often' is important and will be a determinant of the top Bands. Much evaluation centres upon a mixture of ideological, territorial, political and personality issues. The temperament and visions of Frederick himself as well as of the Popes, above all Gregory IX, were important. There was a major clash of interests in Italy: Frederick's position in the Regno and his aim to extend his power in Lombardy; the Papacy's landed and political interests in Central Italy; the capacity of the North Italian towns to manipulate any Imperial-Papal conflict to their advantage. The effects of this contest in Italy upon Frederick's position in Germany and his relations with the German Church could be assessed, if briefly, especially in the 1240's. Other issues of note included the broader background of inherited Empire-Papacy conflict and rival ideological positions on Church-State relations and powers and, perhaps more specifically, Papal unease over Frederick's unique approach to crusading activity. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good, persistent focus upon 'Assess the reasons ...' and the needs of the question. A sense of prioritisation will be evident in these higher Bands.

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

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

- (a) **‘Religious zeal was the main motive of those who went on the First Crusade’. How far do you agree with this view?** [45]

Focus: Assessment of causation of major historical event

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

This is an evaluative question and the focus is upon a balanced coverage wherein the role of religious zeal is set against a range of other factors. The question is about the launching of the Crusade rather than its course and candidates need to make brief mention to the latter if at all. Responses that deal solely with religious zeal alone or with the Papacy, no matter their quality, will **not rise above a good Band III** mark; to go higher they will need to assess other factors in evaluating motives. Narratives or descriptions of the background to and/or start of the Crusade will **not move beyond Band IV** unless there is some linkage to analysis of motives. Many candidates may argue for the central importance of the Papacy, citing Urban II's enormous personal commitment, energy and drive, his preaching and the responses elicited. Such can be allied to (e.g.) prevailing religious zeal, ideas of the armed pilgrimage, penance, remission of sins, salvation routes, plenary indulgences. Without doubt, his personal leadership inspired many, not least knights and ordinary people. Candidates do need to provide a wider perspective to ‘religious zeal’. Other factors can be adduced, however. These include a desire to stop fighting in Europe and to export violence; possibly a desire to ease over-crowding of lands and to meet land hunger; actions to prevent Turks seizing Christian lands and killing Christians and destroying churches (this would link to ‘liberation’ of the Holy Land); possible fears of Turkish advances into the European heartland; care for fellow Christians in suffering and appealing for help; succour for the Byzantine Emperor and the possible benefits to the on-going tensions between the Churches of the West and the East (a desire to reunite the two under Papal leadership). No set answer is expected; the quality of argument is what matters.

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

**3(b) Assess the reasons why the Crusader States were able to survive in the period 1100-43.**

**[45]**

Focus: Assessment of causation in the development of the Crusader States

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The best answers will focus well upon evaluation and upon a set of reasons, possibly trying to prioritise those. Mention of the problems faced by the States will be acceptable but the emphasis must be upon survival factors. Attention to the dates given and identification of some of the States can be expected. The dates are bounded by the formation of the first of the States and by the fall of Edessa to Zengi in 1144. Although the States were vulnerable geographically and the settlers faced problems of climate and numerical inferiority, this period saw both survival and some growth. The States were aided by competent leadership, skilful tactics and the obvious disunity of their enemies. Candidates might consider leadership, the deployment of forces, the creation of defensive positions based upon castles, the avoidance of pitched battles, diplomatic and military skills to keep their enemies divided and simple good fortune. Their relationship with the Byzantine Empire was uneven for much of the time but a fierce determination allied to religious zeal and sheer survival instincts preserved their position. A strong focus upon 'Assess ...' is expected. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good persistent focus upon the question stem and the needs of the question. There will be a sense of prioritisation of factors.

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

**4 Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century**

- (a) Assess the reasons why internal and international trade developed in the twelfth century. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of causation of economic changes

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Trade, both internal and international, did expand across the period in respect of developing existing routes and links, opening up new and greater volume. Within countries, a degree of greater peace and stability, greater royal protection of merchants and the growth of an active merchant class, were all factors. Internationally, routes were opened up further, above all by sea but some overland with some technical advances in ship design as in the facilities to support merchant activity. A rising population, more towns and general urban growth, expanding markets and fairs, the stimulus of royal and aristocratic interest and need, all helped; so, too, expanding agricultural activity, growing industrial centres (cloth, etc.), stronger currency viability all contributed. Local or regional examples of trading activity and trade routes would be useful: Italy, France, the Low Countries, the Baltic are all possible arenas; overland, river and sea routes could be cited. Answers in the higher Bands will have a strong focus on 'Assess ...' and convey a sense of prioritisation of factors.

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

- 4(b) How far was there a renaissance in learning in twelfth-century Europe? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of character, extent and nature of major historical event

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may argue about the validity of the term 'Renaissance', though most may accept its usage. A broad time span (c. 1050-1250) is possible, though the focus in illustrative content should be primarily on the 12<sup>th</sup> century. Some contextual sense is to be expected, e.g. growth in government and law; the need for well-trained and literate administrators/officials for kings, nobles, merchants; the Investiture Contest and its effects on scholarship and the search for the means to buttress arguments; developments in canon law; contacts with the Muslim world; a greater sense of critical enquiry. 'Learning' may produce a focus upon literary areas, but references to arts and culture and architecture are also acceptable. Revived scientific interests, a strong interest in classical learning, maturing humanism, the roles of masters and teachers may be mentioned, as also activities from a wide field of Northern Europe (especially Paris) and Southern Europe (Bologna, Montpellier, Salerno). Answers in the higher Bands will have a strong focus upon 'How far ...', allied to a good sense of argument.

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

**5 The Italian Renaissance 1450-1530**

- (a) Assess the importance of economic factors in the development of the Renaissance in Italy from 1450 to 1530. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates are likely to focus on Florence, Rome and Venice. Much of the wealth came from trade – cloth and wool in Florence, a virtual monopoly of trade in the near East for Venice, whilst the wealth of Rome was based on that of the Papacy. Mention is also likely of the banking industry in Florence and the Medici family in particular. Candidates need to establish strong links between economic factors and Renaissance developments. Such a link is likely to mention patronage and candidates should give examples of how individuals such as the Medici and groups such as the guilds helped the development. Economic issues may also be set against others such as cultural – the background of classical Rome and humanism, and the political importance of the city state, not least the part it played in encouraging competition in the arts to promote individual city states.

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

- 5(b) Assess the importance of classical examples as influences on artists and architects of the Italian Renaissance from 1450 to 1530. [45]**

Focus:

Some examples are required of Renaissance artists and architects use of classical models e.g. work of Brunelleschi, Bramante and Palladio based on a study of classical buildings of Rome such as the Pantheon. Artists such as Botticelli and Titian using classical subject matter. However, candidates should go further and look at developments peculiar to the time, building on or adapting the classical approach e.g. Brunelleschi's dome at Florence, development of new techniques such as perspective chiaroscuro and oil painting and the use of religious subject matter. Answers should be well-supported with examples but must be more than just a list, reaching a conclusion in line with the question.

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



**6 Spain 1469-1520**

- (a) How successful were Ferdinand and Isabella in dealing with problems caused by the nobility? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates are likely to suggest that Ferdinand and Isabella were reasonably successful considering the relative stability of their reign after the Civil War – though they could refer to the Comuneros as evidence of longer term problems. Issues could include success in the civil war at the Battle of Toro, subsequent balanced treatment of nobles e.g. the resumption of land acquired before 1464 but confirmation of exemption from taxation, diversions

in Granada, peripatetic kingship enabling them to deal first-hand with problems such as the revolt of the Duke of Lemos in Galicia, improved systems of law and order through use of corregidores and the Hermandad and use of other groups such as letrados as a counterweight to the nobility. There should be a strong link between problems and solutions to assess extent of success.

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

- 6(b) How important was religion in influencing the policies of Ferdinand and Isabella? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates are likely to conclude that religion was very important but should draw some distinctions between Ferdinand and the more pious Isabella e.g. treatment of the Moriscos. Mention should be made of the end of convivencia and the attempt to establish limpieza de sangre. Answers should make reference to specifically religious issues such as church reform, Conversos and the Inquisition, though even her might suggest that other factors are involved such as political control. Other issues which might be interpreted as religious issues such as Granada and policies against the Moriscos and Turks should be seen as having a variety of motives – economic, political as well as religious. Some balance should be achieved – the question is not just about religion. Policies where religion plays no part e.g. administration reforms - not necessary.

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

**7 The Ottoman Empire 1451-1529**

- (a) To what extent was military strength the main factor in the expansion of the Ottoman Empire from 1451 to 1529? [45]

Focus:

There should be a strong focus on military issues such as the Janissaries - their recruitment, training and activities as a highly disciplined and elite body e.g. at the battle of Chaldiran. However their revolts e.g. forcing Selim to retreat from Tabriz might also be considered on the down side.

The Timar system providing feudal sipahis as cavalry making up the bulk of the army should also be discussed. Together with the Janissaries they provided forces whenever required – contrasting strongly with regimes elsewhere. Detailed consideration should be given to these issues even if they are eventually rejected as the main factor.

Links could be made with other issues such as system of government and/or set against other factors such as the economy, religion, qualities of individual rulers etc. Whatever conclusion is reached, there should be significant discussion of military strength.

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

- 7(b) How far were Suleiman the Magnificent's qualities as a leader the main factor in his success to 1529? [45]

Focus:

Candidates may refer to the personal qualities of Suleiman reflected in his titles of 'magnificent' and 'lawgiver' i.e. a general belief in his wisdom, ruthlessness and efficiency. He was also known to be a good administrator viz. his policies of local control leading to a more settled Empire. Reference should also be made to his qualities as a military leader with successful campaigns such as those in Rhodes, Belgrade and at Mohacs. Leadership should be balanced against other factors leading to his success such as his unopposed succession, his inheritance, his economic resources, the quality of his army particularly the Janissaries and the advantages of disunity of his enemies at the time with the Venetians and Safavids unable to challenge and the Habsburg Empire in political disarray.

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

**8 Exploration and Discovery 1450-1530**

- (a) 'Economic issues were the main factor in motivating Portuguese exploration and empire-building.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus:

An assessment of economic issues could include the Spice trade, search for gold and labour. Italian merchants had a virtual monopoly of the spice trade and costs were high. Exploration was motivated by the desire to find a cheaper and more reliable method of gaining the products of Asia. There were shortages of both gold and labour; earlier exploration suggested the availability of gold on the west coast of Africa, which also proved a useful source of slave labour for Portugal and later the sugar plantations in her colonies.

Economic issues should be set against other factors such as religious and political ones. There was a desire to proselytise and search for Christian communities e.g. the legendary state of Prester John as a counterweight to Muslim ones. Political issues might consider competition with Spain but the emphasis must be firmly on motivation not simply issues which aided Portugal.

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

- 8(b) To what extent were the military advantages of Spain the main reason for success in exploration and empire-building? [45]

Focus:

Candidates may distinguish between exploration and empire-building arguing that military advantages were more important to the latter rather than the former. They are likely to cite the example of Cortes and his fight against the Aztecs using iron weapons, gunpowder and horses, though might set these factors against ignorance and disease amongst the Aztecs and good generalship of Cortes.

In terms of exploration, candidates may argue for the importance of naval cannon to protect the explorers from the attacks of pirates and other nations, but are probably more likely to argue that other issues such as financial support or possibly the technical superiority of their equipment were more important. In both cases, military advantages should be weighed against other factors with a considerable discussion of the former even if it is eventually rejected as the main factor.

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

**9 The Holy Roman Empire 1517-15**

- (a) Assess the reasons why Charles V faced opposition from the princes within the Holy Roman Empire. [45]**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons why Charles faced opposition from the princes.

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

Candidates will need a clear picture of the nature of Charles' relationship with the princes and the diversity of that relationship within the Empire. Answers may focus on the religious developments within the Empire and how and why that created divisions; this may be illustrated by reference to the Schmalkaldic League. This may be linked to the desire of the princes to increase their political power and their fears of Charles and any increase in his powers. Candidates may refer to his election and the start of his reign (particularly the Compact of Brussels), the legacy he inherited, the impact of his absences, the reform movement, economic considerations and the formation of rival military leagues by both sides. There may be some reference to problems at particular Diets, such as Worms, Speyer and Augsburg, or to the Election of Ferdinand as King of the Romans. Some candidates may make reference to the growth of the power of specific princes, such as Philip of Hesse or successive Electors of Saxony, and this should be given particular credit.

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

- 9(b) How far was inflation the main cause of changes in German society and the economy in the period from 1517 to 1559? [45]**

Focus: Evaluation of a key economic development in the German economy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Effects considered might include the loss of trade, problems of poverty, problems with agriculture and food prices. Some answers may develop links with population growth and suggest that it was the two together which made the situation worse. Candidates may also consider the extent to which inflation was to blame for social and political unrest, such as the Peasant's War (1524-6). It is possible that some may argue that inflationary pressures created the instability that allowed Protestantism to take root; this is a valid point, but candidates should not ignore other effects of inflation. Candidates should examine the changes in German society and how far they were affected by inflation. It is not expected that candidates will cover all issues, what is important is the quality of the argument.

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

**10 Spain 1504-1556**

- (a) How successful was Charles I in dealing with the problems he faced as king of Spain in the early years of his reign? [45]**

Focus: An evaluation of the success of Charles as ruler of Spain in the early years of his reign.

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

Candidates are likely to identify a range of problems: these may include Charles' foreign birth and the fact that he had never been to Spain and could not speak its language and did not know the various customs, his absences at the start of the period and desire to be elected as Holy Roman Emperor and the fears that this created among Spaniards, the problems created by the regency he appointed and his reliance on Flemish advisors at the start of the period. There may be some examination of the issues of local liberties and a lack of unity and whether Charles was able to deal with the limits this imposed on his rule. Candidates may consider how successful Charles was in dealing with the Castilian nobility and the problems within towns and minority groups. It is likely that many answers will consider the various causes of the Comuneros Revolt and the Germanian unrest and then examine how well Charles was able to deal with them; this may well bring in some of the issues already mentioned. Some answers may argue that because much of the rest of his reign was calm and trouble free he was successful in the long term in resolving the problems he faced at the start of the period. However, others may argue that he personally was not very successful in dealing with these problems since he left Spain on being elected Emperor and the revolts were put down in his absence, by the Regent. Some candidates might place his role as King of Spain in the wider context of his monarchia and the problems created by the size of the lands he was ruling. Candidates should note the limitation to the period and should not seek to evaluate the whole reign.

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

- 10(b) 'Preventing French expansion in Italy was the most important aim of Charles I's foreign policy in the period from 1516 to 1556.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]**

Focus: An evaluation of the aims of Charles' foreign policy as King of Spain.

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

Candidates may consider his aims in a broad manner focusing on issues such as the integrity of Spanish borders or the desire to increase Spanish territory, other answers may differentiate between his aims against France and the Ottomans. Some candidates may even argue that Spain was too weak in this period to have a foreign policy and therefore any wars fought were imperial in nature; credit should be given for this argument. Many answers may focus on the personal rivalry between Francis and Charles and link this to events in Italy, particularly Milan; there may also be reference to issue of Navarre.

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

**11 France 1498-1559****(a) How far was Francis I an absolute monarch? [45]**Focus:

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

It should be noted that historiography is not an AS requirement and candidates who do not consider the historical debate should not be penalised, however those who make use of it to argue their case should receive credit. Candidates may consider the issue of centralised monarchy against territorial anomalies, administrative reform and the limitations, how far did the royal writ run in France, financial issues that increased royal revenues, the nobility and the regions, the role and power of local parlements and an assessment of the personal kingship of Francis I and his own beliefs about the nature of his kingship (reflected in Bude's *Instructions of the Prince*), royal propaganda and courtly magnificence. Candidates may also consider the problems created by war and how this limited what Francis could do and increased royal debts. The power of the monarch may also be contrasted with the way in which Francis ruled according to the law, respected the rights of his subjects and rarely attempted to influence judges (realities summed up in de Seyssel's *The Great French Monarchy* and its concept of a contract between monarch and subject).

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

**11(b) How successful was the French Church in dealing with the religious problems it faced in the period from 1498 to 1547? Explain your answer. [45]**Focus:

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

Candidates may argue that for most of the period the French Church was successful in dealing with the religious problems it faced. It is likely that most answers will focus on the issues of humanism and Protestantism. Better answers will explain the religious problems they created before analysing how successful the church was in dealing with them. Some may argue that the religious problems faced were limited as the French church appealed to most and reform was already underway and therefore it was relatively easy for the monarchy to deal with the problems. Answers may support this with reference to the active roles of the Sorbonne and parlements in the persecution of heresy, the weak trade links with Germany, which limited the spread of protestant ideas and the small scale of the French printing industry which also limited the spread of ideas. Specific issues that may be considered include: problems with Louis de Berquin, the Affair of the Placards, the Edict of Coucy, the Edict of Fontainebleau, the massacre of the Waldensians. Some candidates may also argue that because religious strife broke out later in the century the church was unsuccessful, but such a view would have to be supported.

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

**12 Warfare 1499-1560**

- (a) Assess the impact of the changes in infantry warfare in the period from 1499 to 1560. [45]**

Focus:

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. Candidates may consider the growth in the size and importance of infantry in the period, particularly with the growth in siege warfare, and the financial and logistical problems that this created. Candidates may refer to the decline in the importance/changing role of the cavalry, the impact of the Swiss pike and phalanx, the use of arquebus and other fire arms. There may be reference to the increased use of mercenaries, although it should be noted that the use of mercenaries was a traditional practice, although some may also argue that mercenaries could be unreliable. Candidates may also consider the importance of the need for specialist training. Some answers may refer to the rate and pace of the changes when assessing their relative importance. Better answers will support their arguments with reference to precise battles.

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

- 12(b) Assess the problems facing rulers in raising military forces in the period from 1499 to 1560. [45]**

Focus:

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of factors before reaching a balanced conclusion. There are a range of problems for candidates to consider which are closely linked and better answers will establish those links. Candidates may consider the most important problem facing rulers was the financial burden needed to raise the large armies that changes in warfare demanded and the problems of financing large standing armies. The growing importance of siege warfare also meant that armies were in the field for longer and this added to the problems; this could be closely linked to the Habsburg Valois conflict and the issue of inflation, but it also links to the impact of *trace italienne*. In order to counter some of these issues candidates may refer to the use of mercenaries, but their reliability may also be questioned. This may be balanced against the problem of raising national armies. Candidates may also consider the issue of specialist training that was required and the changing role of the nobility.

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

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

- (a) How serious were the problems facing the Catholic Church in the mid Sixteenth century? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Perceived problems within the Catholic church are likely to figure such as worldliness of Popes, abuses within the organisation, lack of education amongst the clergy etc. though in the interest of balance candidates might comment on some of the early attempts at reform in the 'New Orders' such as The Oratory of Divine Love, the Theatines and later the Jesuits. The development of Lutheranism should also be considered. Better candidates will make links showing how it sought to reform/exploit the abuses, e.g. indulgences, though candidates will not be expected to have a detailed knowledge of Luther's ideas. Some reference might also be made to the political context to emphasise the severity of the threat, but candidates should not stray into solutions.

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

- 13(b) How important was the Council of Trent to Catholic recovery by c.1600? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Some definition of the problems is necessary as context. Candidates will then need to give considerable coverage of the findings at Trent and the Tridentine decrees; the disciplinary aspects such as asserting residency, educational issues with the establishment of seminaries and doctrinal aspects such as the re-definition of papal authority and the sacraments. It is also necessary to consider how far they were applied, in order to assess their contribution to recovery. Candidates can simply address the importance of Trent within its own terms but might also set Trent against a range of other issues such as the work of Popes, Jesuits and other new orders and possibly the Index and the Inquisition in order to assess its relative importance.

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



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

- (a) To what extent was the Edict of Nantes (1598) the main factor in establishing the authority of Henry IV as King of France? [45]**

Focus:

Candidates might argue for the ever-present threat of the renewal of Civil War whilst the Huguenots remained alienated and explain how the Edict of Nantes reconciled them. Equally they could argue against the importance of the Edict by emphasising the importance of other factors, suggesting that Henry was well established by this time, giving evidence in terms of lack of opposition leaders, military success, conversion to Catholicism, pacifying the nobles and ending the war with Spain. Whichever approach is taken, considerable consideration must be given to the Edict in the context of the question. Candidates may well consider the more long term effects of the Edict but will still need to give some judgement on its relative importance.

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

- 14(b) How successfully had Henry IV dealt with resistance to his rule by 1610? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Answers are likely to focus on the opposition of parlements – particularly the registration of the Edict of Nantes, peace with Spain and the undermining of the Catholic League, Henry's conversion to Catholicism, his treatment of the nobility in general e.g. generous pensions but careful management of provincial governships, and specific risings such as those of Biron and Bouillon as well as peasant risings such as the Croquants. Candidates might look at both the long and short term effects, looking at the relative peacefulness of his reign and the unchallenged succession as evidence of success and/or the nature of his own death to argue lack of success. Some conclusion should be reached on his degree of success.

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

**15 The Dutch Revolt 1563-1609**

- (a) Assess the reasons for Philip II's unpopularity in the Netherlands. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates are likely to compare Philip with his father to establish his initial unpopularity e.g. his foreign birth, lack of local language, but point out that these problems were exacerbated by his apparent failure to engage with the Netherlands personally by neglecting local institutions such as the Golden Fleece, ignoring regional sensibilities and employing foreigners such as Granvelle. Policy issues are likely to involve the heresy laws and the plans for new bishoprics on both religious and political grounds, the best candidates making links between the two. The army of occupation under Alva and his policies such as the Council of Blood would also be relevant. Candidates should give some relative importance of factors to make a full assessment.

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

- 15(b) How important was regionalism in the Dutch Revolt? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates need to demonstrate some understanding of the political structure of the Netherlands during this period, as a group of separate states with individual liberties. It would be relevant to mention Philip II's early neglect of these in his attempted introduction of centralising measures such as bishoprics, heresy laws, neglect of the Estates General and the Golden Fleece. Later developments could include the division of the interests of the Netherlands after the pacification of Ghent and the use made by William of Orange of the administrative structures in the North to forge some sort of unity here. Candidates could set regionalism against other factors to assess its importance e.g. financial and economic issues for both Spain and the Netherlands, religion, leadership, foreign involvement etc.

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

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

- (a) How successful was Philip II in dealing with problems of Court faction and the provinces? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates are likely to focus on the problems between the Alva and Eboli factions and their main representatives. Whilst candidates might argue that Philip had good service from both these – the services of father and son Gonzalo and Antonio Perez as secretaries of state from the Eboli faction and the Duke of Alva as Governor General of the Netherlands, suspicion was rife and both were eventually removed. It might be argued that Philip actually encouraged the faction, as a way of dealing with the problem, in order to divide and rule. Links are likely to be made with the problems in Aragon through the disgrace of Perez. Ultimately, it could be argued that Philip was successful here in establishing his rights in Aragon, though at a cost.

Candidates might also give a more general treatment of the problems of the provinces e.g. their continuing separatism and assess Philip's successes here.

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

- 16(b) To what extent did Philip II defend the Catholic Church? [45]**

Focus:

On the positive side Philip might be seen as the spearhead of the Counter reformation with the application of the Tridentine decrees, establishment of seminaries and general reform of the church with the establishment of new bishoprics and the re-vitalisation of religious houses and initial encouragement of the Jesuits, the Inquisition and the Index and the treatment of the Moriscos. Candidates however, might consider alternative motives for some of these reforms e.g. greater political control, as well as examining his relationship with the Jesuits and the Pope. Although the Tridentine decrees were accepted in principle, certain provisos were made to assert independence from the Pope e.g. the right of the crown to make episcopal appointments. Some balance is required.

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

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

- (a) To what extent was Richelieu's religious policy the most successful of his domestic policies? [45]**

**Focus:**

Religious policy must be addressed i.e. Huguenots and Devots. The political motivation for religious policy was crucial here. Richelieu's over-arching aim was to increase royal authority the Huguenots represented after Nantes 1598 a "state within a state". Their revolt at La Rochelle gave him the opportunity to crush them politically and militarily whilst allowing them continued freedom of worship – the success of his approach is borne out with their active support for the Crown in the Thirty Years' War. The Devots were extreme Catholics who also threatened royal power through ideas rather than revolt and Richelieu banned their meetings and literature. In order to answer 'most successful' other policies must be examined.

Some of:- The exercise of Royal authority, Finance, Economy, Control of Nobles would provide sufficient evidence of contrast with limited success compared with Huguenots. What matters though is the ability to examine a range of issues in order to offer a judgement – there is no set response.

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

- 17(b) To what extent was France a major international power by the Peace of the Pyrenees 1659? [45]**

**Focus:**

A comparative approach between 1622 & 1661 would be effective a narrative of the main episodes of French foreign policy is unlikely to reach Bands I and II.

1622 – France probably 4<sup>th</sup> ranking power after Habsburgs. Spain and England with Holland a serious economic rival, but France had sufficient natural advantages to provide a strong base for international power.

1659 – France on the cusp of greatness. Habsburgs defeated in the west and forced to look east. Spain forced to its knees by the Treaty of the Pyrenees. England racked by Civil War then Restoration but Holland still a major economic rival.

Linking evidence which might briefly be offered – Policies, of Richelieu and Mazarin to break encirclement – participation and success in Thirty Years' War – The Treaty of Westphalia 1648 and the Pyrenees 1659. Judgement on how much of a major power France was can then follow.

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

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

- (a) To what extent were wars the main cause of Spain's decline by 1659? [45]**

Focus:

Whatever the line taken, the effects of wars on Spain must be examined. The failure to make permanent peace with Dutch, and Spain's renewal of the war continued the pernicious influence of debt on a weak economy. Spain's involvement on Habsburg side in Thirty Years' War although occasionally victorious further weakened her in relation to France. Spain's unwillingness to find peace with France after 1648 when favourable terms might have been gained led only to the relative humiliation of the Peace of the Pyrenees 1659. Balancing factors which may be examined include Spain's rulers, unable to reform (even when they actually tried to) hidebound social economic and financial structures. Responses which examine /question of degree of decline may well be answering a preferred question. Such responses will need careful examination for relevance though they may not be entirely without merit.

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

- 18(b) To what extent were Spain's rulers responsible for its economic problems from 1598 to 1659? [45]**

Focus:

Whilst Spain's rulers must take a major responsibility for its economic problems – Lerma's self-interest above national interests during the long truce with Holland for example – there is an argument for the intractable nature of Spain's economic problems linked to hidebound political and social systems. Olivares' rush to reform undoubtedly exacerbated matters – but he could hardly be accused of starting Spain's problems. Some identification /analysis of nature of Spain's economic problems will be necessary e.g. failure of overseas trade in face of English, Dutch and French depredations. The failures of internal economics – over reliance on Mesta, trade barriers, lack of economic incentives – The two-edged nature of "Bullion Bonanza", and links to war debts.

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

**19 The Thirty Years' War 1618-48**

- (a) Assess the reasons for the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War in 1618. [45]**

Focus:

Examiners should beware of responses which see the question as a jumping-off point and not as an end in itself, post 1618 is irrelevant unless used as part of a conclusion. Factors for consideration as causes of war may include the intransigence of Protestants: Mix of political fears with religion – suspicion of Imperial ambitions. Actions of Emperor and contributory events in Bohemia may be included. The key to a good answer is how effective is the assessment of relative merits and linkages between causes.

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

- 19(b) Assess the effects of foreign intervention on the course of the Thirty Years' War from 1629 to 1648. [45]**

Focus:

Although a blow-by-blow narrative is not required candidates may well refer to both Denmark and Spain which will deserve credit. The main focus however is likely to be Sweden and France.

An approach which examines reasons for intervention as a prelude to assessment of impact would have merit. Sweden's intervention to "save Protestantism" – although a strong motive of Gustavus Adolphus was never its sole purpose. Territorial gains in Palatinate, the extension of Swedish dominion in Baltic also very important. Impact was considerable – halted Habsburg success – briefly tilted balance of power to Sweden's military might. Gustavus Adolphus' death led however to Swedish retrenchment and increased role of France from 1635 on. France intervened because of fears of Habsburg encirclement; break the Austrian/Spanish axis; to establish defensible borders. The fact that France was a Catholic country apparently defending Protestantism demonstrates the reducing importance of religious issues. Perhaps the most important impact of foreign intervention was the weakening of Habsburg strength without however a decisive increase in power of its opponents leading to a long drawn –out conflict settled in 1648 more through exhaustion on both sides than decisive victory for either side.

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

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

- (a) “There was no scientific revolution in the first half of the seventeenth century.” How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus:

Most responses will agree with the quote but attempt at some balance of view will characterise answers in Bands I and II. The work of Kepler and Galileo is likely to dominate evidence for agreement or disagreement with the quote. However for Band I there should be some reference to other factors e.g. a growing “sense of science” as a result of economic imperatives and philosophical/theocratic argument over the period; Church persecution of heretical belief in scientific explanation of Astronomy/Universe ended effectively with Galileo. On the other hand “Science” was largely limited to developments in Maths and Astronomy during this period.

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

**20(b) Assess the reasons why merchants were important to the development of the Dutch economy in the first half of the seventeenth century. [45]**

Focus:

Because of the steer of the question all Bands may be accessed with focus only on merchants – there is no imperative for comparison with other factors. However an examination of the political/social and religious contexts in which merchants became important to the Dutch economy is an essential part of top Band responses. This includes – shortage of land gave incentive for social progress by economic means – unlike France for e.g. where opposite held. Oligarchic Dutch Governments did not indulge in the sale of offices to the highest bidder – Calvinist work ethic fitted with this, agriculture alone could not feed Dutch population. Governments positively encouraged economic enterprise in which the merchant was the central figure. Given all this it would have been more remarkable if merchants had not become important to the Dutch economy.

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

**EUROPE 1660 – 1718****21 Sweden and the Baltic 1660 -1718**

- (a) **How far had Charles XI solved Sweden's domestic problems by the end of his reign?** [45]

Focus:

No foreign policy is required here and will not be credited. Problems include: Noble power especially during his minority; Economic/financial – dwindling of copper supplies, costs of tax burden caused by maintenance of a large scattered empire. Evaluation would focus strongly on success of his kingship – The Reduktion – diminishing power of the nobles, improved administration/government, raised revenues. The development of a “popular” absolutism based on church, towns and peasants.

Less successful with economic growth though and the emphasis on a militia may have solved problem of agricultural desertion but forced a policy of defence rather than attack. Some may approach the question through consideration of Charles' absolutism, this is perfectly acceptable provided the focus is on domestic problems and solutions.

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

- 21(b) “After 1660 Sweden's empire was too large to be maintained.” How far does this view explain the decline of Sweden's empire by 1718?** [45]

Focus:

The highlighted issue must be addressed but no matter the line of argument pursued the significance of the rise of Russia under Peter will form a major feature of the analysis. Evidence which may be offered includes the legacy of a scattered empire after Westphalia offering opportunities for other states to challenge Sweden's control. e.g. Denmark and Russia and Baltic alliances ; that so long as Russia “slumbered” Sweden's empire could survive – i.e. it was an empire by default. Some may offer recklessness of Charles XII but this will require a balanced judgment. The development of a militia to form the basis of the army also limited Sweden's ability to mount offensives in the face of threats to its empire.

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



**22 France and Europe 1661 – 1715**

- (a) “The defence of France was the main purpose of Louis XIV’s foreign policy.” To what extent do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus:

Band I and II responses may well see this as an opportunity to raise the wider issue of Louis XIV foreign policy i.e. defensive or aggressive in nature. Whatever line is pursued the highlighted issue must be addressed. The drive to secure France’s borders in the early decades of his reign is an important feature. His great ambition to be the major force in Europe and the personal glory attached is also likely to be examined. Further evidence of aggression against the Dutch and later Spain may be offered. The key to a successful response lies with the avoidance of narrative without judgement on the main issue.

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

- 22(b) How far was the European balance of power more favourable to France in 1715 than it had been in 1661? [45]**

Focus:

Long war narratives are not required and strongest responses will focus around the comparison of the two dates. Here there must be 60/40 balance of two dates to reach Band I.

1661 – France was in a favourable position relative to all major powers, - Austria, Sweden, Spain, England and Holland. Much would depend on the ability of the young Louis XIV to take advantage of this position.

1715 – After half a century of war in which France dominated Europe, but aroused major coalitions against itself it is debatable whether the balance of power was still favourable to France. It can be argued that the English had emerged as France’s most serious rival especially when the Bellus Cassi changed to overseas empire. Sweden, Holland and Spain were all in decline but Prussia was standing on the cusp of military greatness in 1715 and the Habsburg empire remained a force to be reckoned with.

A judgement may well consider Louis XIV’s own condemnation of his achievements.

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

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

- (a) Assess the reasons for the success of Frederick William the “Great Elector” in strengthening his authority in Brandenburg – Prussia. [45]**

**Focus:**

There is a clear steer to focus on ‘success’ here and limits of success are not at issue as the command indicates. Foreign policy is irrelevant. Features of domestic rule include relations with Junkers, army, bureaucracy, government of disparate lands; finance and raising of revenue from Elector’s own demesne lands. Reasons for success lie in his strength of personality, his drive to absolutism is a good example of this, his deviousness and pragmatism, e.g. the deal he struck with the Junkers. He guaranteed land rights and control of peasants in return for their concession of political power. His emphasis on loyalty of the bureaucracy, his use of the army as a police and tax gathering force all ensured that by the end of his reign the Elector’s writ ran in each of his scattered territories. Provincial governors and staff were centrally appointed in each province. As with government so too the army. Regional commanders’ independent authority was considerably reduced by a rudimentary general staff which exercised central control in the name of Elector.

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

- 23(b) To what extent had the problem of regionalism been solved in Brandenburg – Prussia by 1713? [45]**

**Focus:**

The clear steer on regionalism means that there is no requirement for consideration of other problems. A comparison between 1660 and 1713 is necessary without a narrative of both reigns. Reference to 1640 -1660 is allowable under the spec. Band 1 responses may distinguish between regionalism as a way of life and the physical separation of the Elector’s scattered territories. In the former he solved many of the problems, in the latter case it took until 1772 to bring West Prussia under control. Solutions to regionalism may be offered through – growth of loyal bureaucracy, army and nobility via centralisation of control. Band I responses may note that there was some backsliding in central control under Frederick I. The fact remains that the means to developing a centralised state were in place by 1713.

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

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

- (a) Assess the importance of Amsterdam to the Dutch economic development in the second half of the seventeenth century. [45]**

**Focus:**

Band I and II responses may well view Amsterdam as a microcosm of Dutch economic development e.g. governments supportive of economic activity, the decline of the southern states (Antwerp) under Spain and religious / social structures conducive to economic activity, Amsterdam benefited enormously from the decline of Antwerp. It made great strides in development of banking and allied services. Its government was tolerant of entrepreneurs without regard to race / religion – e.g. largest synagogue in Western Europe was in Amsterdam. Some may note that Amsterdam peaked during this period and was already coming under severe competition from London. It was still central however to the Dutch economy.

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

- 24(b) How far do you agree that there was a scientific revolution in the second half of the seventeenth century? Explain your answer. [45]**

**Focus:**

The question steers to a debate on whether there was a “scientific revolution”, with or without inverted commas. Band I and II responses will not only analyse the contribution of Newton and other “Greats” – e.g. Leibniz but also provide an analysis of the context in which their work occurred. This was the age of “Virtuosi” who regardless of race / religion sought each other’s intellectual company through the sharing of theories and ideas. The explosion of learned societies many under royal patronage is hugely important in determining whether a scientific revolution occurred. The range of scientific developments also became wider – moving far beyond Astronomy. More perceptive responses will however note that Newton’s Principia Mathematicae was barely understood even by gifted mathematicians until after his death, and may use this as an argument against scientific “revolution” as an indice of a lack of a wide – ranging impact.

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

## 2586 European and World History 1789 – 1989

### Europe 1789-1795

#### 1 The French Revolution 1789-1795

- (a) To what extent were economic factors the most important in causing the Revolution of 1789? [45]

Focus: Assessment of factors

Candidates may or may not distinguish between more general economic factors and more specific issues related to government income and expenditure. They may discuss the long term problems caused by population pressure on subsistence agriculture and the short term pressures caused by poor harvests and subsequent bread shortages and inflation. Such discussion may set these issues in the context of the burdens of taxation on the Third Estate. Candidates may also discuss the financial problems facing the Crown. These issues may be linked to other factors in the build to revolution such as the deficiencies of Louis XVI as king, the influence of enlightened ideas and the effects of the American War of Independence, the resistance of the nobility to change and so on. Candidates may relate these directly to the events of 1789. The key is how far candidates address the question of relative importance and linkages between factors identified.

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

- 1(b) Assess the reasons why, following the Revolution of 1789, the monarchy was overthrown in August 1792. [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons

This is not a question about 1789 per se, but rather about the period 1789 to 1792. That said some of the themes that explain 1789 are still relevant in 1792 such as the character and ability of Louis XVI and recurrent economic crisis. Candidates should draw evidence about these from the period 1789 to 1792 to support their points. Candidates may also discuss some of the following: growth of distrust between revolutionaries and the king over such issues as the veto, the flight to Varennes, émigrés and the Clergy; the impact of the Civil Constitution of the Church; the growth and influence of different factions; the impact of the people of Paris; the impact of war; and the impact of renewed economic crisis. The key to a good answer is how far candidates effectively assess the relative merits and linkages between different reasons.

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

**2 Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815**

- (a) How far did the reforms made during the Consulate (1799-1804) maintain the principles of equality, liberty and popular sovereignty? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of policies

Candidates should discuss some of the following reforms in relation to the three principles identified: the Constitutions of 1800, 1802 and 1804 (especially that of 1800); the education reforms; the Concordat and Organic Articles; the Civil Code; economic policies. They may also discuss administrative reforms and police and censorship changes. In relation to popular sovereignty discussion will probably focus on the Constitutions and may well suggest that although the principle was apparently recognised in universal suffrage (and plebiscites) and the setting up of legislative bodies the reality was less clear. In relation to liberty, candidates may argue that whilst freedom of conscience was recognised, freedoms of speech, association and movement were restricted. In relation to equality, candidates may point to equality before the law (generally recognised) and meritocracy (at least for some).

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

- 2(b) To what extent was defeat in Russia the main reason for Napoleon's downfall in 1814? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Descriptive accounts of the Russian campaign are not required. In relation to Russia candidates are likely to stress: the material effects of the campaign – loss of manpower (especially veteran troops), horses, artillery; the damage to Napoleon's reputation and French morale; and the encouragement to others to resist and take up arms against Napoleon (especially General Yorck and the Prussians). However, the impact of the Russian campaign needs to be set in the context of other factors, such as the long opposition of Britain, the long term effects of the Continental System, the impact of the Peninsular War, the campaigns of 1813-1814 and the decision of Austria to join the war (1813); the decline in the quality of French arms relative to the improvements of enemy forces; the growing unpopularity of Napoleonic rule; and the (some would argue) personal decline of Napoleon as a general.

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

**3 France 1814-1848**

- (a) Assess the reasons for the overthrow of Charles X in 1830. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Among the reasons that candidates may evaluate are: the long-term heritage of revolution and revolutionary ideas; the attitude and policies of Charles X, particularly in relation to the Charter, émigrés and the Church; the influence of Ultras and conservatives; the opposition of liberals; the return of economic crisis; the decisions of 1829-30 and the Ordinances of St Cloud; the actions of the people of Paris. Candidates may discuss particular ministers such as Villele and Polignac and the sacking of Martignac as well as the attempts to restrict press freedom and other unpopular policies.

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

- 3(b) 'Louis Philippe was overthrown in 1848 because of the failure of his domestic policy.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates may point to the lack of policy in crucial areas such as social reform (apart from limited educational reforms and a feeble Factory law in 1841) and constitutional reform. They may also discuss the harmful effects of his repression of unrest in the 1830s and the return of censorship (1834). They may also stress the inertia of the government – its general policy of laissez faire and no change in economic, political and social affairs. Such discussion may be set in the context of other factors: Louis Philippe's lack of positive support; the risings and opposition he faced from legitimists, republicans and Bonapartists as well as liberals; the influence of particular ministers, especially Guizot; and the apparent weakness of foreign policy. There may well also be discussion of the return of economic crisis as a result of railway speculation and bad harvests and the events of 1847-48.

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

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

- (a) Assess the reasons why liberal and nationalist movements had little success in the Austrian Empire in the period from 1815 to 1847. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates may discuss a number of factors. They may consider the relative weakness of liberal and nationalist movements during this period, drawing on examples from Hungary (where there was some liberal and particularly nationalist feeling), Bohemia (Czech nationalism), Italy (more liberal and aimed at removal of the Austrian yoke) and Austria (liberal). The constituency for such movements was limited to students, elements of the middle classes and some elements in the nobility – there was little mass support. Candidates may also discuss the policies of the Austrian government, particularly under Metternich, with their emphasis on police, censorship and repression of liberal movements.

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

- 4(b) How far do you agree that disunity amongst revolutionaries was the main reason for the failure of the revolutions in the German Confederation in 1848-49? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Disunity can be interpreted broadly and candidates may refer to divisions over aims and methods, pointing to the disputes over Klein and Gross Deutschland, over the extent of liberal reform, over constitutional arrangements (federal or democratic republic), over attitudes to the masses (and fears of social revolution) and to minority nationalities and so on. Candidates may balance such discussion against other factors such as the role and attitude of Prussia (the king's rejection of the crown), and Austria, the lack of an armed force, the recovery of the nerve of the princes, economic recovery which lessened unrest and the lack of mass support for the federal project.

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

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

- (a) Assess the reasons for the outbreak of revolutions in Italy in 1848. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates should discuss some of the following: economic crisis in the mid-1840s, particularism/separatism in Sicily, the growth and agitation of liberal and nationalist movements, the apparent sympathy of Pope Pius IX, the ambitions of Piedmont, antipathy to Austrian rule, the example of the French Revolution and the hope of French support, and the paralysis of Austria after revolution in the Austrian Empire. The key to a good answer is effective assessment of different reasons by analysing, for example, their linkages and their relative importance.

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

- 5(b) How important was France in the creation of a united Italy in the period from 1848 to 1870? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of importance

Candidates might concentrate on the years 1858-60, but if so then the maximum band than can be reached by the answer is Band III. Awareness of the role of France in 1848-49 and in the years after 1860 should be rewarded. Candidates may argue that France was both a help and a hindrance to unification. Whilst liberals and nationalists hoped for French aid in 1848, France offered none and in fact helped crush the Roman Republic. However, candidates may well suggest that without the active support and action of Napoleon III in 1859, however, short-lived, it was unlikely that Italy would have been united, pointing to the crucial agreement at Plombières and the subsequent brief war against Austria that resulted in Villafranca. Candidates may also argue that thereafter, although Napoleon III still played a role, other factors were more important – in particular the actions of Garibaldi and the diplomacy of Cavour. French influence was important in guaranteeing the acquisition of Venice in 1866 as a by-product of the Austro-Prussian War and the removal of the French garrison in 1870 opened the way for the acquisition of Rome. Candidates need to set their analysis of France's role in the context of other factors (Piedmontese ambition, Austrian weakness, roles of Cavour, Garibaldi and others, nationalist and liberal movements, other elements of the international situation and so on).

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



**6 Germany c.1862-1890**

- (a) To what extent was Bismarck's diplomacy the main reason for the unification of Germany? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates must deal with the issue of Bismarck's diplomacy even if they wish to argue other factors were more important; equally they must set Bismarck's diplomacy in the context of other factors. In relation to Bismarck, candidates may refer to the diplomacy preceding the three wars from 1864 to 1871. Candidates may discuss the settlement with Austria and how the issue of France's desire for compensation was dealt with after the Austro-Prussian War and may also refer to relations with Italy and the negotiations with the southern states after the setting up of the North German Confederation. Such discussion may be set in the context of a favourable international climate and, of course, the relationship between diplomacy and war and the relative economic strength of Prussia. There may also be discussion of nationalism and liberal aspirations.

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

- 6(b) How successful was Bismarck in his policies towards Catholics and Socialists from 1871 to 1890? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success

Candidates may judge success against a variety of criteria including aims, results, and context. Candidates may set the policies toward Catholics and socialists in the wider context of securing unity and support for the new German Empire and the fear of potential enemies of the state (*Reichsfiende*). Candidates may also set his dealings with the Catholics in the context of his reliance on National Liberal support in the early 1880s. Candidates may discuss the supposed threats posed by Catholics (in the 1870s) and Socialists (largely in the 1880s) and the measures Bismarck adopted against them (Falk Laws and other anti-Catholic measures; anti-socialist legislation, such as the law of 1878. In relation to the Socialists candidates may also discuss the welfare and union policies of the 1880s aimed at killing socialism with kindness). Candidates may argue the policies failed because the Catholic Centre Party increased its representation in the Reichstag as did the Social Democratic Party. On the other hand, Bismarck was willing to deal with the Centre Party at the end of the 1870s on economic policy (at the price of ending anti-Catholic measures) and the Social Democratic Party never secured more than a small number of seats during the 1880s.

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

**7 France 1848-1875**

- (a) To what extent was Napoleon III a dictator in his rule of France from 1852 to 1870? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of nature of rule

Candidates may seek to assess the extent of 'dictatorship' by reference to criteria such as: limitations on personal freedoms, the extent of political limitations on power, the ability of Napoleon III to enforce his will and so on. Candidates may point to a contrast between the Empire of the 1850s and the increasingly 'liberal' Empire of the 1860s. In discussing dictatorship candidates may refer to: the constitution of 1852 and subsequent changes, the extent of Napoleon's influence over the legislative process, control of the press, election rigging and arrest of opponents, ministerial responsibility, use of plebiscites and so forth.

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

- 7(b) How successful was Napoleon III in increasing French prestige and influence in Europe in the period from 1852 to 1870? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success

Candidates may consider the following issues in their assessment: the Crimean War (1854-56), involvement in Italy (1859-60), the Polish Rebellion (1863), Mexico (1863-67), the Austro-Prussian War and its aftermath (1866-67) and the Hohenzollern candidature and Franco-Prussian War (1870-71). There may also be discussion of Paris as a centre of European culture. Candidates may also discuss the international context and suspicion of French ambitions despite Napoleon's protestations that '*l'Empire, c'est la paix*'. Candidates may argue that Napoleon had some success in the 1850s, especially with the Crimean War, but that thereafter his success was limited or non-existent. They may argue that misjudgement and lack of clear aims and consistency contributed to lack of success.

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

**8 Russia 1825-1881**

- (a) How effective was the policy of the Emancipation of the Serfs (1861)? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of effectiveness

To assess effectiveness candidates may discuss against a number of criteria: aims, context, those affected, long and short term consequences and so on. In relation to context candidates may discuss the five year gestation of the reform in the face of much debate and considerable hostility and that this shaped its nature. In relation to aims candidates may discuss the aim of modernisation and freeing peasants whilst attempting to maintain the social order and view this compromise as a restriction on its effectiveness. Candidates are likely to concentrate on the impact on the peasants and may balance discussion of the rights given to serfs against the restrictions of the mir, land distribution and redemption costs. Candidates may also discuss the impact on the landowning classes and their attitude to the regime. There may be some discussion of the gap between raised expectations and reality and the degree of change brought about in agriculture.

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

- 8(b) To what extent were the policies and actions of Alexander II's government the main reason for the growth of revolutionary groups in Russia in the 1860s and 70s? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates must discuss the effect of policies/actions of Alexander II's government even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. In relation to this candidates may consider impact of: the relaxation of censorship, freeing of political prisoners, liberalisation of universities etc at the start of the reign; the raising of expectations and disillusion with the reforms of the 1860s; and, the return of repression in the late 1860s. Consideration of these should be balanced against other factors such as the earlier development of opposition/criticism in Russia (such as the Westernisers), the influence of revolutionary ideas and their spread amongst the intelligentsia (Herzen, Pisarev, Lavrov, Bakunin, Chernyshevski and so on), the growth of populism amongst students, the failure of the 'to the people' movement and the development of Land and Liberty (and its split into Black Partition and The People's Will).

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

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

- (a) Assess the reasons why the North and the South were unable to reach a peaceful solution to their differences after the election of President Lincoln. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of Reasons

Please note that the specification requires no specific knowledge prior to 1860, although we can expect most candidates to put what they say about the coming of the civil war in the longer term context. Candidates may refer to perceptions of Lincoln and what he stood for and use the details of the election to show how he lacked any support in the South. Arguably Lincoln's election can be seen as the occasion rather than the cause of war. Attempts to prevent secession during the winter of 1860-61 all failed and Lincoln's inaugural address, despite holding out the hope of peace, failed. Candidates will need to examine why this was so – the reasons for secession and why this was unacceptable to the northern states – slavery, states rights, northern republicanism, economic division and so forth.

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

- 9(b) 'Lee, not Grant, was the greater general of the American Civil War.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]**

Focus: Comparison of individuals

Candidates may well point to the brilliance of Lee's generalship by drawing examples from the peninsular campaign in 1862, through Antietam, Fredericksburg to Chancellorsville. This may be balanced by some discussion of Gettysburg and Grant's final pursuit of Lee. Candidates may stress Grant's abilities in finally marshalling the North's superior resources effectively and using them effectively to bleed the South and break its morale. To come to a judgement about 'greatest' candidates will need to compare Lee to Grant to draw out their relative talents and abilities and also to explore their weaknesses. Candidates may argue either for Lee or for Grant, but must deal with both to score well.

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

**10 Politics and Reform 1877-1919**

- (a) 'The power of Trusts was the main issue facing presidents in the period from 1877 to 1896.' How far do you agree? [45]

Focus: Evaluation of issues

The issue of the power of trusts was certainly important and was an issue for every administration in this period and subsequently. However, there were other issues such as civil service corruption, currency, tariffs and trade, agrarian revolt and so on. Candidates may choose to argue that different issues were more prominent at different times or seek to give an overview.

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

- 10(b) How successful was Progressivism in influencing American politics in the period from 1896 to 1919? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success

Candidates may seek to discuss the nature of progressivism – a diffuse movement of reform at political, economic and social levels arising out of the challenges of modern society and conditions. General aims were to place public good over private interest for the betterment of society and this approach influenced politics in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, though its real impact on policy and legislation may seem limited to some restrictions on trusts, some attempts to deal with corruption, some democratization of the political process, some move to 'expertise' in government, some labour legislation, and prohibition.

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

**11 Western Expansion 1846-1900**

- (a) To what extent was Federal policy the most important factor in opening up the West from 1846 to 1900? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of factors

Federal policy in a number of areas is relevant here. In relation to transport and communications, the issues of telegraph and railroad promotion may be discussed. In relation to land, the effectiveness of such legislation as the Homestead Act and Morill Act may be discussed. In relation to Native Americans candidates may consider attempts at peaceful solutions and treaties, policing the frontier, Indian Wars, reservations and Americanisation. Such discussion must be focused on the issue of opening up the west and needs to be balanced against other factors – developments in mining and agriculture, the initiative of settlers, and how far federal policy followed rather than led westward expansion.

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

- 11(b) Assess the reasons why many Americans moved West in the period from 1846 to 1900. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates will need to identify a number of reasons and explain their relative significance and linkages. Candidates may discuss a range of 'push' and 'pull' factors. Among the push factors candidates may discuss the flight of many immigrants from poverty, persecution, lack of freedom and opportunity, but there may be greater discussion of the 'pull' factors: the incentives provided by federal government through the Homestead Act, for example; jobs on the railways or in the new towns; the lure of gold and silver mining; the opportunities for cattle ranching, and other farming activities. There may also be reference to the idea of 'Manifest Destiny'.

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

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

- (a) 'Reconstruction did very little to improve the position of Black Americans in the period from 1863 to 1877.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of impact of policy

Candidates may argue that although Blacks were given formal political rights in the Constitutional Amendments and were offered some help via the Freedman's Bureau, the reality for most Blacks was different. Candidates may point to: entrenched white opposition in the South, lack of resources for institutions like the Freedman's Bureau, the economic and social realities in the South, Blacks lack of educational opportunity, the limited degree of determination by the Federal government to defend Black rights, the Black Codes and so on.

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

- 12(b) Assess the reasons why there was no real improvement in the position of Black Americans from 1877 to 1912. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates may point to the erosion of civil rights during this period to suggest that in many ways the position of Blacks had got no better and had perhaps deteriorated since 1877 – the role of Supreme Court decisions like Plessy v. Ferguson, the Jim Crow Laws, re-emergence of white vigilante organisations, the poor economic and social position of Black Americans, the lack of educational and social opportunity. Some candidates may point to disagreements within the Black community as to how to improve their position with reference to the different approaches adopted by Booker T. Washington and William Du Bois.

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

**Europe 1890-1945****13 Russia 1894-1917****(a) Assess the reasons for the 1905 Revolution in Russia. [45]**Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates should identify a number of reasons and explain their relative significance and the linkages between them. They may point to the events of Bloody Sunday 1905 as the trigger for the unrest and strikes that spread across Russian villages and cities during the year. In addition they may refer to the impact of defeat in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5, and the longer term economic and social pressures that caused increasing unrest in the depressed economy from 1899. In addition they may discuss the growth of political opposition as liberals (Union of Liberation), agrarian (SRs) and Marxist (Social Democrats) socialists organized themselves into political parties seeking radical change in Russia, whilst extremists caused instability through assassinations of prominent figures.

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

**13(b) How important was Lenin in enabling the Bolsheviks to seize power in Russia in the October Revolution of 1917? [45]**Focus: Assessment of role of individual

The main focus should be on Lenin's role in the events of 1917, although candidates will need to balance his role against other factors, most notably the part played by Trotsky. With regard to Lenin candidates may refer to the hagiography associated with him and his influence on events and in this respect may discuss events such as his return to Russia in the sealed train, the April Theses and the slogans associated with them, the July Days, the resistance against Kornilov, and the events of October 1917. Discussion of other factors may include the actions and policies of the Provisional Government and St Petersburg Soviet, the growth in Bolshevik support, Trotsky's appointment as President of the St Petersburg Soviet and his chairmanship of the Military Revolutionary Committee, the lack of effective opposition to the coup and so on.

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



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

- (a) To what extent were German policies and actions the main reason for the outbreak of war in 1914? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Whatever the candidate argues, there must be sufficient treatment of Germany's role in causing war to score well. Candidates may refer to *Weltpolitik*, German militarism and nationalism, the personal role of the Kaiser, the Moroccan crises, the naval race with Britain, military plans, the Fischer thesis and specific elements of German foreign policy, such as the 'blank cheque' given to Austria in June 1914. Such material needs to be balanced against the role of the alliance system, arms races, Balkan instability, domestic problems, imperial rivalry and the aims and actions of other powers.

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

**14(b) To what extent can the Treaty of Versailles be considered fair? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of view

No particular answer is being sought, but candidates should explore the case for and against the 'fairness' of Versailles. Candidates putting the case for may justify the treaty on several grounds: Germany's degree of responsibility for the war; their own treatment of Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litvosk; the justified concerns of France over future security and for reparation for the damage done on French soil; the recognition of the need for Polish access to the sea if a viable Polish state was to exist; the inclusion of the clauses setting up the League of Nations as a guarantee against future war and so on. The case against may refer to: the shared responsibility of all combatants for the war; the need to ensure that the fragile democratic government of Germany was not overburdened with penal terms and extreme punishment; the need for a more lenient peace if war was to be avoided in the future and so on.

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

**15 Italy 1919-1945**

- (a) To what extent was Mussolini the main reason for the rise of the fascists to power in Italy by 1922? [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Mussolini's talents and abilities need explaining and assessing – opportunism, skills of oratory and propaganda, leadership etc – even if candidates wish to argue that other factors were more important. The role of Mussolini needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: the impact of WWI; nationalism and the 'mutilated victory'; discontent with liberal governments and *transformismo*; the economic crisis and the fear of socialism; the connivance of establishment; the role of the king and the events of 1922 and so on.

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

- 15(b) How successful were Mussolini's economic and social policies to 1940? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of success

Candidates need to focus on evaluating success and may do so by reference to aims, results and historical context, for example. A broad range of aspects can be considered under the umbrella of economy and society, but candidates may include some of the following: economic policy (the 'battles' for grain, land, lira etc., the corporative state, self-sufficiency and protection), the battle for births, propaganda and indoctrination, education and youth movements and so on. Some candidates may explain the ways in which Mussolini hoped to change Italians and use this as the test to judge success. It is likely that many candidates will argue that successes were more apparent than real.

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

**16 Germany 1919-1945**

- (a) 'The impact of the Great Depression was the main reason for the rise of Hitler to power.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates need to deal with the Depression even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. They may well argue that the Depression was a necessary but not sufficient reason helping to explain Hitler's rise. Candidates may point to the severity of the social and economic crisis and link it to the rise in extreme politics, explaining how it exposed weaknesses of Weimar Democracy, led to the break-up of Grand Coalition, rule by decree, and the failure of Weimar parties to win popular support. This needs to be balanced against other factors: the fear of communism; the legacy of Versailles; the failure of democratic and socialist parties to see or unite against the Nazi threat; the inherent appeal of Nazism; the skills of Hitler, Goebbels and the Nazi party machine; the role backstairs intrigue of 1932-33 and so on.

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

**16(b) Assess the reasons why Hitler faced little opposition from 1933 to 1939. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons

Candidates need to explain and assess a range of reasons, exploring their relative significance and linkages between them. They may point to the early stifling of opposition in 1933 to 34 through the banning of political parties and trades unions, the censorship and control of all media, the nazification of administration and justice, the ruthless purging of the party in the Night of the Long Knives, the role of the SS and Gestapo and concentration camps in creating a climate of fear, the role of propaganda and attempts to indoctrinate. Better candidates may go on to suggest that there were positive reasons for not opposing the Nazis as well: the restoration of some kind of order after the chaos of the depression years; the relative economic recovery; the success of Hitler's foreign policy and so on.

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

**Europe and the World 1919-1989****17 International Relations 1919-1941**

- (a) Assess the reasons why there was no major conflict in the 1920s. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates may discuss the following reasons: the impact to the end of WWI and subsequent war weariness as the 'war to end all wars' had ground to a halt. Winners and losers had little capacity to continue or start off another major conflict. Importance and results of Paris peace conference and the Treaty of Versailles should be considered in that while this caused resentment, disarmament of Germany and Austria and reparations helped to reduce the capacity for immediate further conflict. More positively, creation of the League of Nations provided a new body to regulate and arbitrate e.g. Aaland Islands dispute. Agreements during the 1920s built up to what became the 'spirit of Locarno' after 1925 with Stresemann, Austin Chamberlain and Briand providing diplomatic lead. Drawing all these aspects together and making links between these will point to a high level answer.

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

- 17(b) Assess the reasons for the outbreak of war between the USA and Japan in the Pacific in 1941. [45]**

Focus:

Candidates should focus on the need to consider both Japan and the USA's contribution to developing tension in the Pacific up to 1941. Best answers might consider which was more to blame in conclusions. For the USA, the development of American trading domination of the Pacific rim during the 1920s and the particular impact of the Great Depression by the 1930s to exclude all other countries by tariff walls could provide a good start. Their military domination of the region from the end of WWI and the Washington Naval treaty of 1922 should also be considered. During the 1930s, the continuation of foreign policy aims in the region gave the Japanese plenty to be jealous of. Japanese internal politics and economics provide a good starting point; the impact of the depression by the early 1930s and the development of military influence over civilian government should be traced from the Manchurian crisis, through the war against China after 1936 to Pearl Harbour in 1941. Whilst the Japanese respond to the perception of US imperialism, their own active policies of expansion must be considered as significantly contributing to the war starting in 1941.

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

**18 The USSR 1924-1953**

- (a) How successful were Stalin's Five Year Plans in modernising Russia? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

The focus needs to be on discussing the success of Stalin's Five Year Plans for industry and agriculture. Particular evaluation of success can be made by considering the political and social as well as economic reasons for and objectives of these policies. The debate about modernisation can reasonably be expected to be considered, though most answers will look at the detail of the Plans. Success criteria might include the USSR's survival beyond the 1930s (to the Great Patriotic War and towards the Cold War).

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

- 18(b) How successfully did Stalin expand the power and influence of the USSR in Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1953? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Answers should concentrate on Soviet attempts to control Eastern Europe from the perspective of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. They could include evaluation of the effectiveness of economic, political and social constraints; Stalin's divide and rule tactics on recently liberated states and the imposition of Moscow's own brand of communism. Perspectives back from 1953 will enable strong evaluation of Stalin's success in exploiting his opportunities and thwarting the challenge from the West. The example of the Berlin Blockade could be used to consider how effectively Stalin played his hand.

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

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

- (a) How successfully did the USA contain communism in Europe from 1948 to 1956? Explain your answer. [45]**

Focus:

Answers should concentrate on US attempts to contain communism in Europe. The Truman Doctrine would be a good starting point. Candidates could include evaluation of the effectiveness of economic, political and social policies; the strong response to the Berlin Blockade, the use of the Marshall programme and the creation of NATO should all be used to evaluate how successful the USA was. Perspectives on what was happening in Eastern and Western Europe could be applied to reach considered conclusions.

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

- 19(b) How far did the revolts in Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968) threaten Soviet control of Eastern Europe? [45]**

Focus:

Each of these key events needs to be considered in the light of its significance in threatening Soviet control in Eastern Europe. The crushing of the Hungarian Uprising in 1956, it could be argued to demonstrate how effective the Soviet Union's military control was in backing its political imperatives. On the other hand, the Czech uprising was more an admission of problems for the USSR's policies in Eastern Europe, yet its success in crushing the uprising was more short term and provided opportunity for further mounting resentment. Candidates may argue that in the short term, successful crushing of the revolts was not a direct threat; better answers might include assessment of linkage between 1956 and 1968 and the longer perspective of the growing problems for the USSR in maintaining control in Eastern Europe.

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

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

- (a) Assess the reasons why there was an arms and space race between the USA and USSR in the 1950s. [45]**

Focus:

A range of different factors can be considered which put pressure on the USA and USSR and led to an arms and space race: containment, the arms race, the Korean War, Dulles, Iran and Baghdad pact, Suez crisis, decolonisation in SE Asia, Cuba. The contexts of ideological, political, military and economic rivalries could all be considered. Stalin's death and the new direction of Khrushchev had major implications for the policies of the USSR. In the USA McCarthyism, support for Republicans and support for increased spending on arms were all important.

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

**20(b) Assess the reasons for the USA's military intervention in Vietnam. [45]**

Focus:

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for. Answers should evaluate the reasons for US intervention in Vietnam as the French decided to withdraw, with attention paid to 'domino theory'. The particular appeal of Communism to the rural peasantry and the failure of conventional military intervention need to be considered. The USA's domestic social and political issues should also be brought in to provide balanced discussions.

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

## 2587 Historical Investigations 768 – 1216

### Charlemagne

#### 1 Study all the Passages.

Using these four Passages and your knowledge, assess the view that the main motive for Charlemagne's wars was the defence of his empire. [45]

#### Focus:

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

The Passages link well to areas of debate as to the reasons for Charlemagne's wars. Passage **A** has some links with **D**; Passages **B**, **C** and **D** have links. Passage **A** sees the proliferation of wars as significant and stresses submission, the creation of clients or vassals, religious faith, annexation and, as in **C**, the importance of the Saxon wars; emphasis is placed upon the religious and territorial motives. That focus on faith and Christianisation is also found in Passages **C** and **D**. Passage **B** places much emphasis on warbands, the search for booty and rewards in gold, silver, horses (etc); military obligation is mentioned but so, too, the need to reward professional soldiers by plunder. The latter is a factor in Passages **C** and **D**; also **C** sees the Saxon wars (or rebellions) as very important and makes links between conquests to the South in Charlemagne's growing empire to events in the North. Passage **D** provides something of an overview: warrior status of followers is set alongside Christian values, the achievement of glory, but also plunder, treasures and tribute. Own knowledge can be adduced in support: Charlemagne's wars, early (as in **A**) and late in the reign (for example, against the Danes – a defensive war); contemporary estimates of the factors involved in those wars (a high religious content); the extent and nature of Charlemagne's empire and the problems involved, so influencing aims (defence, security); the problems of military commitments, recruitment and maintenance of armies (rewards, patronage); prestige gained (as in **C**).

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



**2 Assess the impact of Charlemagne's Imperial Coronation (800) on his policies for the remainder of his reign. [45]**

Focus: An explanation and analysis of a major feature of the reign

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

This is an area of much debate amongst historians, premised on the nature and significance of the Coronation itself. In large part, this reflects the ambivalence of much of the contemporary evidence as well the interpretations of actions and events 800-814. The focus here is not on why Charlemagne became Emperor or on 'decomposition' *per se* (though elements of that debate could be used here, with care). The focus is on whether the Emperorship brought any discernible changes in approach and policy. Some historians have argued that there was substantial change; others that there was much continuity. Some have seen 800 as a turning point; others debate this view. After the Coronation, Charlemagne did use the (new) imperial title of *Imperator et Augustus*, but also the older formulation of *Rex Francorum et Langobardorum*. He was careful in his use of title, so to keep good relations with the Byzantine Emperor, with whom he negotiated but also fought at times. There is debate here. Also, some historians believe there was a new Imperial monarchy, one of much endeavour and energy, formulating many laws; but others see the period as one where an ageing ruler, increasingly tired if not exhausted, legislated much simply to try to maintain order and discipline, combat corruption and weakness. The period also coincided with a decline in military activity, certainly of an offensive nature. Relations with the Church and the Papacy were solid; these can be examined. Reform; laws; strategic and military policies; the succession (the 806 provision being important) can be assessed as policy areas. The 806 plans have themselves been debated. There, in the *Divisio*, he made no mention of the empire or of the imperial title, although his son Louis was given the title of Emperor in 813.

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

- 3 Assess the factors that influenced Charlemagne to promote culture and learning in his empire. [45]**

Focus: An explanation of a major feature of the reign

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

This is an area that has been viewed in different ways, again according to the interpretation of contemporary words and deeds and tangible evidence left behind. Some historians have argued for a true 'Renaissance' – 'Carolingian Renaissance' – here, while others have disputed this as a viable, helpful descriptive term. Some have located ideological purposes here (Christianisation of society, promotion of standards and education, dominance of religious and spiritual values); others see more pragmatic considerations (needs of administration and government, the literacy of servants, the underpinning of the Church and support for its place in society). Some debate the religious core, others see different issues. There is debate over the personal involvement, interest and direction of Charlemagne: some support this view; others see more of a practical dimension, a form of political growth and state building. Of course, links can be made between these views. Reference can be made to Alcuin and other scholars, the 'palace school' (itself challenged by some historians). Aachen, cultural as well as educational features, book production, Carolingian miniscule, attempts to educate the lay élites, support for monasteries and churches, the centrality of literate churchmen in governmental areas can all be adduced in knowledge areas.

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

**King John****4 Study all the Passages.**

**Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that King John was responsible for the breakdown of relations with the barons. [45]**

**Focus:**

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

This arena has caused much debate, with some notable shifts of interpretation of evidence. An established, traditional view would emphasise John's manifest failings as a king, creating an ever-widening rift with his barons. More recent views would present a more nuanced set of views, in part reflecting changed opinions of John's kingship. Passage **A** indicates the provisions deemed necessary to limit John's actions, reflecting deep concerns and insecurities. On one level, Passages **B** and **C** point up failings of John as a king and of his kingship; so, too, if more implicitly, does **D**. But **B** and **D** point up the perhaps pivotal role of the Northerners while **C** places John in the context of the Angevin system of government and a sense of tyranny (reflected in many later historians' works). The consequences of 1204 (**B**)a, a grasping King but also negligent, at times self-interested barons (**B**, some of **C**), over-eager barons speculating and becoming victims of feudal laws and fiscal arrangements (**B**), the treatment of individuals or groups (**C**, **D**), John's presence in England and intrusive kingship (**B**, **D**) all figure. **C** does raise the idea of a baronial collectivity opposing the King, reflected in **A**; this can be linked to some views, not wholly of an older kind, about political and constitutional issues ('community of the realm', etc) being raised after 1204. Own knowledge can support these areas: key events after 1204, John's fiscal demands, financial and legal flexibility; the nature of his rule; patronage; those favoured, those not, regional problems; the demands of his policies to regain the Continental lands, the problems and unrest of 1212-14 and 1215-16.

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

- 5 **‘The loss of Normandy and other Angevin lands in 1204 was due more to the strengths of Philip Augustus than the weaknesses of King John.’ How far do you agree?** [45]

Focus: Assessment and explanation of a major event of the reign

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

There has been much recent debate in this arena. One view sees John's weaknesses as crucial: the loss of Normandy (etc) reflected his incompetence as a king, as a military leader; he was no Richard I (or indeed Henry II). While due recognition was given to the growing strength of the French monarchy, the errors made by John were central. More recent thinking has altered perspectives. There has been argument that, no matter what John did, he lacked the resources of the French king. Much has been made of the financial, diplomatic and military capacity of Philip Augustus; John's resources were simply inadequate, not least given inflationary pressures; some have pointed up the consequences of expensive wars and defences prior to 1199. Philip Augustus wanted war and was a skilful political operator, handling the appeal of Hugh of Lusignan to great advantage and asserting his feudal suzerain powers. But not all historians agree. There is an argument that both sides were relatively evenly matched; it is implied at very least that a Richard I would not have succumbed. Emphasis is returned thereby to John and his personality. Focus has been placed on his ruthless use of mercenaries inside Normandy, the absence of any real defence plans for the Duchy, his poor treatment of the Norman aristocracy (many had, it appears, pro-French leanings), his failure to re-affirm old and useful alliances (e.g. the Empire) and to stir up the evidently disaffected vassals of Philip Augustus in areas of North and Eastern France (itself only recently unified). Attention can be given to the feudal-political context, to the importance of the Treaty of Le Goulet and its context, the Lusignan marriage, the complexities of Southern French-Angevin politics, the treatment of Arthur and the actual campaigns plus abandonment of Normandy by John.

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

- 6 Assess the view that King John gained far more than he lost in his conflict with Pope Innocent III. [45]**

Focus: Assessment of major ecclesiastical conflict

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

Historical opinion here has changed, in places considerably so. One view, based on the nature of contemporary chronicler evidence, was that John was all at fault and was bound to lose – and lose badly. More recent views have been more nuanced. There is a view that he had success: he upheld royal prerogative areas as long as he could; in the end he retained useful rights; he had support, initially among many churchmen, longer-term among a good number of the political élite; the Church functioned in a number of areas; the Interdict had limited effect. John clearly gained considerable revenues from the Church via regalian rights and vacant sees and livings (seven bishoprics, seventeen abbacies by 1213). One view of a complete capitulation has been replaced by a view of skilful political manoeuvring, whereby John gained papal protection and was able to use that against rebellious barons and even against Langton, the source of the conflict. John did negotiate over time and may well have maintained his regalian stance but for events and developments in 1212 (international situation, possible French crusade against him, power of excommunication, growing baronial unrest). Submission to the Pope, once seen as a national disgrace and symbol of a weak king, is now regarded in an altogether more positive light, the reign ending with king and papal overlord pitted against rebel barons and archbishop of Canterbury. Reference can be made to the genesis of the dispute in 1205 and to rival claims and attitudes but the balance of the answer must be on the outcome in 1213 and after.

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

## 2588 Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725

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

### Philip II

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the main aim of Philip II's internal religious policies was to increase his power over Spain. [45]

#### Focus:

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

A supported and evaluative judgement should be reached. There is debate on whether Philip's internal religious policies were primarily to serve the Catholic faith or to strengthen his political control. Areas of debate within the Passages are: the finances of the Spanish Church; use of the Inquisition; the cases of Carranza and Perez; Philip's piety and sense of religious mission. Own knowledge might include a use of the cruzada; the Carranza and Perez cases; other religious, social and political uses of the Inquisition: such as moral education, social control, encroachment on the Spanish judicial system; the Morisco and Aragonese Revolts; debate on the Tridentine decrees; the Black Legend and death of Don Carlos. Events in the Netherlands are not relevant to internal policies.

Passages A and D agree that Philip II used the Spanish Church as a political tool. A discusses Philip's financial exploitation of the Spanish church to pay off his debts and loans, showing the diversion of the cruzada from its original purpose of funding crusades against the infidel. There may be discussion and evaluation of his motivation in fighting the Turks, and this may be made relevant if linked to the defence of Spain from co-ordinated external and internal attacks. D suggests that the Inquisition was used as a political tool in the case of Carranza, also mentioned in A and B. D cites other examples of its political use in the cases of the Aragon Revolt and the Perez case.

Passage B and C agree that Philip was not politically motivated in his religious policies. B states directly that he did not use the Inquisition to advance his political aims, and this view may be cross-referenced with the opposing view in D. Whereas C stresses Philip's sense of religious mission, which aided his political decisions, B accepts Philip's high-handed actions towards the Church, but argues that he saw his own interests and those of the Church as the same. This is a view accepted by many revisionist historians, unlike Black Legend writers who viewed Philip's Catholicism and use of the Inquisition as tools of his Spanish tyranny. There is mention of the Tridentine decrees in B, which might lead to use of own knowledge in discussing the debate on whether they were used to bolster Philip's political power or genuinely to reform the Spanish Church.

A balanced judgement should be reached evaluating Philip's mistakes and their impact on the course of revolt. It is quite possible that other mistakes or factors may be identified. If so, they should receive the same balanced evaluation.

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

- 2 **Assess the view that Philip II was to blame for Spain's financial and economic problems during his reign.** [45]

Focus: The relative importance of Philip's financial ineptitude, his grandiose schemes and the inherited system in explaining Spain's financial and economic problems.

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

Spain's financial and economic problems are likely to be defined. These might include – **financial**: inherited debt, a financial system based on borrowing and corruption; sale of lands and offices; heavy taxation of Castile to pay for war, and four bankruptcies;

**economic**: very weak agriculture, manufacturing and commerce; an adverse balance of payments in foreign trade; lack of development of New World markets and goods.

The debate focuses on whether Philip's inheritance saddled him with an impossible problem of an untaxed nobility, corrupt officials, a system of juros, asientos and Genoese loans which drained New World bullion before it arrived or whether his extravagant building projects and foreign schemes undermined any attempts at reform. There might be some discussion of whether his wars were avoidable. His personal inability to understand figures might be used in argument, together with his unwillingness to embark on reform of the traditional system. Mention might also be made of the positive changes during his reign – an increasing influx of silver from the Americas and the acquisition of Portugal and its empire. An overall judgement should be reached balancing the various reasons for financial and economic weakness during his reign. Candidates whose answers focus largely on financial problems can have access to the highest Bands.

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

- 3 Assess the view that Philip II's military decisions were the main reason why he was unable to end the Dutch Revolt. [45]**

Focus: Philip II's part in Spain's failure to end the Dutch Revolt by 1598.

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

The debate centres on the relative importance of military, political, religious and geographical factors in explaining why Spain was not able to end the Dutch Revolt during Philip II's reign. Militarily, Philip decided to send Alva in 1567 when he might have ended the Revolt by going to the Netherlands himself. The momentum of Parma's victories against the United Provinces was broken in 1588 when Philip ordered him to divide his forces and meet the Armada, and again in 1590 when he was sent to France to check the advance on Paris by Henry of Navarre. This prevented Parma succeeding in ending the war by his hitherto successful military campaign and allowed the northern provinces to regroup under the leadership of Maurice of Nassau, who was more than a match for the weak military commanders who succeeded Parma after his death following the Battle of Rouen in 1592. Politically, Philip's suppression of Dutch privileges played a major part in inspiring the political philosophy of the Dutch Republic. Though he decided to phase down the military campaign and negotiate by sending Requesens to replace Alva in 1573, his refusal to allow form of Protestant toleration in negotiations at Breda in 1575, and thereafter, inspired the officially Calvinist United Provinces never to compromise with Catholic Spain and fuelled Dutch propaganda. It could be argued that Philip's bankruptcies were a cause of military failure, e.g. the Spanish Fury 1576, and therefore not due to his military decisions but his mishandling of finances. It could also be argued that William of Orange played a major role, together with his conversion to Calvinism, in inspiring the rebels never to compromise. Foreign intervention; the slump caused by the blockade of Antwerp; the rise of Amsterdam to economic prosperity and the flooding of the low-lying northern provinces, criss-crossed by rivers, also played their part in creating a military stalemate.

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



- 4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the seriousness of the clashes between Elizabeth I and Parliament has been exaggerated. [45]

Focus:

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

The Passages argue from a range of perspectives, focusing on different issues that have at some stage been considered by historians to have represented a serious clash between Crown and Parliament. Passages **A** and **D** suggest serious clashes over the parliamentary privilege of freedom of speech, the Church settlement and monopolies. On the other hand, Passages **B** and **C**, while not claiming there were no clashes or conflicts, deny the seriousness of the disagreements that occurred. **A** argues that the clashes occurred in every session and became increasingly acute. Candidates may provide examples of these clashes, such as those concerning Peter Wentworth, but may also deny the seriousness of his outbursts, perhaps on the grounds that his was a solitary voice in the House. **D** is narrower in the scope of issues, but does identify genuine clashes. Candidates may add other examples of clashes, such as the parliamentary demands for the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots. Like **D**, **B** refers to a broad community of interest between crown and parliament, although the emphasis here is on the skilled management of parliament by the Privy Councillors who at times orchestrated apparent opposition for their own purposes. This suggests that a different clash, between queen and Privy Councillors, was behind apparent challenges from the Commons. **C** plays down the seriousness of clashes by emphasising the queen's dependence on parliament and the nature of that institution and its members. Challenges from MPs are considered to be from individuals rather than groups and they concerned specific issues. Graves argues that they did not escalate into anything more wide-reaching. Candidates may also refer to the methods used by the government in an attempt to ensure that clashes did not reach serious proportions: royal prerogative in calling, dissolving, proroguing parliament and the use of the veto, assurances from the Queen about contentious issues, and so on. In evaluating the views they will need to address the issue in the question, of whether or not the seriousness of the clashes they are considering has been exaggerated.

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

- 5 **Assess the view that Elizabeth remained single because there was no suitable husband for her.** [45]

Focus: the reasons that Elizabeth remained single.

Candidates should assess a number of views about the reasons Elizabeth remained single, focussing on the one identified in the question. There were a number of candidates to be her consort and of these Robert Dudley and Alençon will probably be considered the most serious. The main objections fall into three categories: the problems associated with any English candidate such as the rivalry and factionalism that would be created among the English nobles (and in particular in Dudley's case the previous treachery of his family); the problem of religion associated with any Catholic foreigner; and the problem that foreign Protestants were of insufficient standing. These reasons need to be weighed against other arguments for Elizabeth remaining single: the failure of her Privy Councillors to agree on a candidate, including their reluctance to relinquish influence to a consort and their factionalism as well as objections on the counts listed above to individual candidates; Elizabeth's reluctance to marry because either she would relinquish power or she was psychologically affected by childhood experiences and hence disinclined to marry (along with the associated risks of childbirth). Candidates do not need to include all the reasons listed, but should evaluate a number of views including that identified in the question, before reaching a judgement.

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

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

- 6 To what extent do you agree with the view that Catholicism was revived by the missionary priests in Elizabethan England? [45]

Focus: the characteristics of Catholicism in the reign of Elizabeth I.

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

The debate on Catholicism centres around two main areas: the extent to which Catholicism survived in the first decades of the reign with little leadership and the lure of conformity with the Church of England, and the effectiveness of the missionary priests with regard to the extent to which they were able to reach and enthuse the Catholic population of England during the reign. There is debate over both aspects, and candidates may refer to both, but must address the issue of the effectiveness of the missionary priests. While some historians argue that by 1574 survivalism was weak because of the lack of leadership at both papal and priestly level in the early years, with Elizabeth not excommunicated until 1570 and many Marian Catholic parish priests retaining their positions after the Elizabethan Church settlement, others argue that there was considerable continuity of belief, with recusancy laws barely enforced in large areas of the country and no desire from central government to push Catholics into open revolt. The evidence of the rebellion of the Northern Earls suggests that there was no widespread support for Catholicism in terms of a change of regime. This may be used to argue that survivalism was not strong and hence (given that about 2-3% of the population was Catholic by 1603) the missionary priests were effective, but may equally be used to demonstrate that the significance of lack of leadership from abroad meant that, since they survived in significant numbers, English Catholicism was not necessarily revived by the missionary priests. There is debate over the missionary priests: which areas did they access, were their efforts confined to gentry households or did they minister to poorer and urban Catholics? How effective was the government in capturing and executing priests? The extent to which they are regarded as having been effective will determine the extent to which Catholicism may be regarded as having been revived from 1574 onwards. Candidates may use evidence concerning the Archpriest controversy to determine the characteristics of the English Catholic community at the end of the reign.

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

- 7 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that during the Protectorate it was impossible for Cromwell to work successfully with Parliament. [45]

Focus:

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

Passages **A**, **B** and **D** all argue that Cromwell experienced major problems in working with the Protectorate parliaments. Most of the examples cited are concerned with the first parliament, although general points also relate to the second. In **A** and **B** the incident referred to shows Cromwell using the Army to force the Instrument of Government on the MPs and the problem here is explained in **D** in more general terms, leading to an argument strongly in line with the view in the question. Candidates may expand on this point, citing examples of clashes over incidents such as the James Nayler case, or provide more general knowledge of the unpopularity of Cromwell's views on liberty of conscience among the ruling elite, including the Council over the readmission of the Jews, and the more extreme measures introduced by some Major Generals in an effort to bring about a 'reformation of manners'. Passage **C** provides a completely different view, and candidates may provide examples from their knowledge of cooperation, such as the introduction of the Humble Petition and Advice, amended after Cromwell refused to accept the crown. The ending of the unpopular Rule of the Major may be used as an example of cooperation, since Cromwell did not attempt to defend the Rule of the Major Generals from parliamentary refusal to renew the decimation tax. Candidates should evaluate the different arguments, perhaps suggesting that despite the co-operation over financial concerns alluded to in **C** the Protectorate was never solvent, and the Major Generals experiment was introduced partly in an attempt to solve the problem of financing the Army. On the other hand, the Parliaments did vote taxes at a level significantly in excess of those allowed by parliaments before this, and candidates may consider that the problem here was not the non-cooperation of parliaments, but the level of military presence necessary to defend the regime, leading to an insurmountable problem in financing the regime.

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

- 8 To what extent did Cromwell's rise to prominence by 1646 depend on his military successes? [45]

Focus: the reasons for Cromwell's rise to prominence.

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

Candidates may consider arguments about the significance of Cromwell's social and family ties which may have led to his election into the Long Parliament, as well as the extent of his influence in that parliament. Cromwell was part of an influential network including the Earl of Warwick, the Earl of Bedford, Lord Saye and Sele, and John Pym. Their common Puritan outlook placed Cromwell firmly in the camp of those challenging Charles I and hence may have contributed to his rise to prominence. On the other hand he is described by contemporaries as having been too extreme in his language to command respect in the Long Parliament, at least during the first session. During the Civil War Cromwell had a number of successes as captain of his own regiment, a colonel and later Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Eastern Association and finally as Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the New Model Army. However, it can be argued that it was propaganda rather than exceptional military talent that brought him to prominence or that his role with his men away from the battlefield, securing their pay and disciplining them morally that was more significant. Equally, candidates may consider arguments about Cromwell's role in the attack on Manchester and Essex and the introduction of the Self-Denying Ordinance. Cromwell may have used political skill and wile rather than his military talents to obtain his exemption from the Ordinance.

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

- 9 **‘Cromwell’s role in the constitutional changes of 1653 demonstrates that he was motivated by personal ambition.’ How far do you agree with this judgement [45]**

Focus: Cromwell’s motives during a period which led to him becoming Head of State.

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

Cromwell’s motives in several of the constitutional developments in 1653 have been debated. In April he used a company of soldiers to dissolve the Rump Parliament, in a move that resembled Charles I’s attempt to arrest the five members in January 1642. The possible reasons for this are that the Rump had failed to make the radical changes in religion demanded by the Army, and that the Rump was about to call fresh elections that would have led to a more conservative parliament. Cromwell may, therefore have been motivated by loyalty to the Army, the need to maintain Army influence in order to remain influential himself, the desire to introduce more liberal religious laws or the desire for power for himself, as power was seized by the Army Council of which he was head. The introduction of the Nominated Assembly that met from July may equally have been motivated by the desire to retain control, as many of the members were nominated by the Army Council, or by the desire for ‘godly reform’ as other members were nominated by the gathered churches. The handing back of power to the Army Council clearly gave Cromwell power again. The introduction of the Instrument of Government at the end of the year gave Cromwell great but not unlimited power. The extent to which he drove events or to which others in the Army Council took the initiative in the new constitutional arrangements is debateable.

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

**Peter the Great**

- 10 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Peter's financial and industrial reforms were successful.**

**[45]**Focus:

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

All the Passages suggest some success. Passage **A** refers to the increased yield from taxation and Passage **B** supports this. Passage **A** also considers that the elimination of idlers was a good thing. Passages **C** and **D** have a variety of successes in industry and trade such as new industries and the development of old ones, the new trade routes and ports and the establishment of a merchant navy. Passage **B** claims the most benefits with the increased income, the balanced budget and the avoidance of foreign loans and refers to what was achieved with the money. The economy was less successful with regard to the impact on the peasants, with the universality of taxation in **A** both on people and things, their lack of skills in **C** hampering progress as well as their reluctance to work on Peter's projects, partly because of their dislike of being regulated by the clock. Passage **D** agrees that the burden fell heavily on the peasantry, while private enterprise was weak and that only the power of the Tsar ensured that reforms were carried out. Candidates could argue that these reforms allowed Peter to fight Sweden and so were successful in the long run. Russian iron production increased considerably. But they could also point out that the changes were piecemeal and often worked at cross purposes or were over-regulated. The impact on the peasants could be further emphasised and illustrated. The dependence on foreign input as mentioned in **C** and **D** was not rapidly overcome.

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

- 11 'More of a barbaric ruler than a man of reason'. How far do you agree with this verdict on Peter the Great? [45]

Focus: the extent to which Peter showed directly opposed characteristics.

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

Candidates can illustrate the contrasting interpretations of Peter and those in the higher Bands should reach a supported judgement. The *barbaric* nature of his rule can be seen in his personal displays of temper and drunkenness, the cruelty with which he put down the revolt of the Streltsi, his use of torture, notably in the case of his son Alexis and his treatment of the peasants labouring at St Petersburg or conscripted into the army. Many churchmen considered him *barbaric* for his blasphemous orgies. Candidates could assess how far he differed from contemporaries in their views as to whether he was *barbaric*. Some examples, such as the Drunken Synod could be interpreted as *barbaric*, or as reasoned reaction to the reactionary elements in the church.

Alternatively Peter's reforms can be seen in the context of the Age of Reason, with their westernising tendencies. His bureaucratic reforms, the introduction of the colleges, his subordination of the church to his control, the building of a new capital, educational and cultural changes and his codification of the laws can all be utilised as examples.

Candidates do not need to cover all the aspects mentioned, although a range is needed for the top Bands. There may well be an imbalance between the discussion of each part of the quotation.

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



- 12 **Assess the view that Peter the Great was personally responsible for the differing degrees of success against Turkey and Sweden.** [45]

Focus: Was the crucial factor in explaining Peter's patchy performance his own personal role and decisions or was it external factors, beyond his control?

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

The debate is likely to centre on how far Peter's errors and successes were responsible and how far external factors were decisive. On Peter's side he was to blame for the premature declaration of war which led to the disaster at Narva, resulting from the inexperience of his troops. But he then recognised the need for extensive military reforms and for perseverance. In the next few years he concentrated all Russia's resources on the objective of defeating Sweden. In the later campaigns he mounted a successful propaganda assault on the Cossacks and won them over. His use of artillery was crucial at Poltava and his use of galleys a vital factor at Cape Hango. Similarly his campaign to capture Azov in 1696 was well planned. But his failure on the Pruth resulted from a risky strategy, not unlike that of Charles XII at Poltava. He learned from his errors and was cautious towards Turkey, recognising he lacked the resources to fight Turkey and Sweden, while the population and defences of Turkey were stronger and the Baltic an easier target than the Black Sea.

On the other hand there were plenty of aspects of the campaigns which resulted from external factors. Sweden lacked the economic infrastructure to maintain her early victories and became diverted into Poland. Charles fought very effectively in the Narva campaign, but was then lulled into a false sense of security and thought he could defeat Russia whenever necessary and so from 1700-1708 was occupied in Poland, whom he wrongly saw as the greater threat. When Charles invaded Russia in 1708 his army was quickly exhausted and the limited Swedish population could not sustain his losses. His supply lines were over stretched and Mazeppa proved an unreliable ally. The Russian winter was another factor. Turkey suffered from the declining quality of the Sultans and the defeats inflicted by the Habsburgs and had no desire to add to its territories, concentrating on keeping what it had. The Turks missed an opportunity to exploit Russian weakness in 1711 and made a moderate treaty.

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

## 2589 Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955

### Napoleon I

If answering on this Option, candidates **MUST** answer **Question 1** and **ONE** other question

1. **Study all the Passages.**

**Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Napoleon's main aim in European states was to give them the benefit of French ideas and systems of government.** [45]

Focus:

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

**Key issues:** The passage which most directly supports this view is passage **A** (Cronin). The other passages all refer to the export of French ideas and systems of government but deny that this was to do with the main aim of spreading the benefits of the ideas or systems. **B** (Dufraisie) suggests that whilst Napoleon did export ideas and systems to states run by family members, elsewhere the reason for the introduction of French ideas were pragmatic – they would help reinforce the power of the prince or help states meet French military and economic demands. This latter view is echoed in **C** and **D**. In **D**, Ellis accepts that ideas and systems were exported but suggests there were other motives at work as well – the needs of France and Napoleon – to support military aims or provide kingdoms for his family. In **C**, Esdaile is more forthright arguing that the export of ideas as a key aim was a myth perpetrated by Napoleonic **propaganda** and that the reality was that the sole purpose of the Empire was to serve the interests of Napoleon and France. Candidates may supplement these views with their own knowledge about the exactions (both in resources and men) made on the Empire and satellite states, of the provision of kingdoms for family members and estates for Marshals (especially in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw). Some may also refer to Stuart Woolf's ideas about the 'integration of Europe', or develop the ideas in **B** and **D** that what happened depended on the particular circumstance of particular areas. Some may even refer to the idea that Napoleon supposedly aimed to free subject peoples and realise the national aspirations of Poles, Italians and Germans.

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

- 2 **Assess the view that Napoleon's rule in France was nothing more than a dictatorship.** [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on Napoleon's rule

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

**Key issues:** The nature of Napoleon's rule of France has long been debated and candidates have much material they can draw on. Candidates may discuss the views of historians who have stressed that from the start Napoleon's rule resembled dictatorship by stressing the authoritarian elements inherent in government and institutional arrangements (top-down, centralised), the lack of accountability (pointing to the sham nature of the Constitution of the Year VIII), the trappings of a 'police state' (censorship, propaganda, use of spies, informers, restrictions on movement and arbitrary arrest), the rapid moves away from constitutional forms to the Empire in 1804, the control of the Church and so forth. Such discussion should be balanced against other interpretations which stress the reforms of the Consulate and the recognition of rights established during the Revolution (equality before the law, freedom of conscience, property rights, access to education, the Civil Code and the acknowledgement of popular sovereignty in the Constitution of the Year VIII). Others may prefer to argue that a distinction should be made between the years of the Consulate and those of the Empire and that in the latter Napoleonic rule became more obviously authoritarian.

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

- 3 Assess the view that Napoleon's attempt to defeat Britain through the Continental System was the main cause of his downfall. [45]**

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the reasons for Napoleon's downfall

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

**Key issues:** This is a key area of debate and candidates should be aware of a range of different interpretations. Candidates should discuss the relative merits of this interpretation by evaluating, for example, the importance which Napoleon attached to defeating Britain (there may be discussion here of the aims of the Continental System), the impact of the Continental System in Europe and its role in fomenting opposition and in straining Napoleon's resources, and its role in the decisions to invade Portugal and take over Spain, and to invade Russia in 1812. Candidates will need to assess alternative interpretations which stress the importance of military defeats, developments in armed forces, the building of coalitions, the growth of opposition and so on. Different historians at different times have emphasised the role of different factors such as these (and have suggested a range of pressures beyond the Continental System that played a role in shaping Napoleon's policies towards, for example, Spain and Russia), Candidates may well show the links between different factors and relate them to the impact of the Continental system

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

**Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80****4 Study all the Passages.**

**Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the social reforms of Disraeli's ministry of 1874-80 represented a new focus on the working class for the Conservative Party.** [45]

Focus:

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

Passages **A**, **C** and **D** all suggest the reforms were considerable: *substantial* in **A**, *single greatest package* in **B** and *distinctive* in **D**. **B** adds that the Trade Union legislation was radical and aimed at the working classes. But most of the Passages do not see the reforms as novel in their aims. **A** argues that the middle classes mattered more to the Tories, **B** that the measures were uncontroversial, **C** that they were practical responses and **D** that they were aimed at promoting national unity. Further aspects of the policies centre on the party political aspect. **A** and **B** argue that they were aimed at dividing or outflanking the Liberals, but **C** suggests they were very similar to Liberal policies. There was nothing new about the Conservative loyalty to the Church mentioned in **B** and **C** or the view that state intervention should be kept to a minimum as instanced in **C** and **D**. **B** does argue that social reform had not previously been seen as a Conservative concern and **B** and **C** refer to the 1872 speeches in which Disraeli outlined his aims for a Tory government. There is debate about how far this was a new programme and candidates may discuss this. The genuineness of Disraeli's attachment to the working classes '*the palace is not safe when the cottage is unhappy*', as opposed to the party political advantage he felt he could gain, may well also be considered.

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

**5 Assess the role of Gladstone in shaping the Liberal Party by 1868. [45]**

Focus: the extent to which Gladstone shaped the Liberal party as compared with other factors.

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

The debate is centered on whether the ideas central to Liberalism were those of Gladstone or of others. Gladstone's financial prudence and integrity together with the moral basis for his policies and his growing contacts with Nonconformist ministers in the 1850s were important factors in the shaping of Liberalism and candidates may refer to his budgets as illustrating these views. He also enjoyed and indeed cultivated, mass popular support. There was also a powerful radical element led by John Bright, in the Liberal party leading to support for Garibaldi, the Union in the American Civil War and for a strong measure of parliamentary reform. Gladstone picked up on the latter with his *pale of the constitution* speech in 1864. Russell refused to bring Bright into his government in 1866 but his need of radical support led to the reform bill of that year. Candidates are likely to conclude that Gladstone was the prime influence, but that the Liberal Party contained several different components which all made a contribution.

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

- 6 **Assess the view that Disraeli's policies regarding the Eastern Question were in British interests.** [45]

Focus: Did Disraeli follow foreign policies which served the interests of Britain or were Gladstone's criticism valid?

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

Candidates could argue that Disraeli always served British interests. The purchase of the Suez Canal shares protected a vital route to India, the source of British power and wealth at the expense of rivals France and Russia. It also provided much-needed revenue. His firm attitude over the defence of Turkey prevented Russian expansion and threats to India and his diplomacy at the Congress of Berlin won praise, even from Bismarck, concessions and Cyprus. Britain was seen to count once again in the European forum as in the days of Palmerston, which Disraeli believed was in British interests.

Alternatively, as Gladstone asserted, Suez could lead to involvement in Egypt and expense. France was ruffled and Parliament disregarded. With the Bulgarian Atrocities, Gladstone argued that disregard of the moral dimension was not worthy of Great Britain. Furthermore Jingoism was distasteful, Russia an exaggerated threat and the supposed gains at Berlin a mirage. Cyprus was useless as a naval base and involved expense. Disraeli's aims could be seen as relating more to electoral advantage than British interests. Candidates may reach a qualified conclusion and may suggest that the short term gains were in British interests but in the long term the advantage is more questionable.

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

**Bismarck and the Unification of Germany****7 Study all the Passages.**

**Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Bismarck deliberately treated Austria leniently in The Treaty of Prague of 1866 [45]**

Focus: What were Bismarck's goals and what methods did he use to achieve them?

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

Candidates should be aware of the debate that surrounds Bismarck's claim in his memoirs that his treatment of Austria was deliberately lenient in 1866 as he planned to complete unification by fighting a war with France. As such he claimed the wisdom of not making Austria a vengeful enemy in 1866. Passage A refutes Bismarck's claim and says there was nothing particularly lenient about the Treaty and that he probably made relations worse rather than better. B suggests that although the terms were moderate there was nothing deliberate about this. Taylor sees Bismarck as an opportunist rather than a planner and refutes the view that Bismarck had any long term aims with the Treaty. Instead Bismarck was only concerned with consolidating what had been achieved in a manner that would not give offence to either the Austrians or the French. Passage C states Bismarck's own view that he was seeing the Treaty in its wider terms and deliberately made it a lenient one. The reference to "allies" might be seen as a reference to Bismarck planning a future war with France – a view that he gives in his own memoirs. D suggests that although Bismarck urged caution with Austria the terms of the Treaty were not that lenient and their consequences were far-reaching for both Prussia and Austria. As such they marked the end of Austrian influence in Germany and presented Bismarck with his 'blank cheque' for unification. As a group, the passages differ both on whether the terms of the Treaty were lenient or not and they also differ in the degree of intention shown by Bismarck.

In support of their evaluation, candidates could attempt to put the Treaty in its wider context by referring to some of the following. In terms of supporting the claim in the title, candidates could mention Bismarck's insistence on terminating the war quickly so as to preserve Prussia's army from a war of attrition and the secret clauses of the Treaty concerning the South German States. Candidates might even extend the debate further by suggesting that his intentions for a war with France were later shown by his deliberate manipulation of future events such as the Luxembourg Crisis and the Hohenzollern Crisis. In terms of refuting the claim, candidates may refer to the setting up of the North German Confederation which quite clearly saw the replacement of Austrian control in Germany by Prussia. They might also refer to Austria's losses in Italy as the result of her defeat by Prussia. In terms of the wider argument and in refuting the notion that Bismarck was planning for another war, candidates might refer to Bismarck's speeches at the time in which he publicly denied war aims against France, or indeed, any desire to complete the unification of Germany.

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



**8 To what extent did the military reforms of 1862 enable Prussia to achieve dominance in Germany by 1867? [45]**

Focus: To evaluate the factors that led to the growth of Prussia

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

Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the process by which Prussia established its predominance over the other German States (and indeed her neighbours). Candidates are mostly likely to recognise and debate the importance of the army reforms in the process of unification up to 1867. They might well consider the following: that the reforms allowed Bismarck to wrest control of government from the Liberals; that they contributed to the defeat of Denmark (which led to the acquisition of Schleswig and Lauenburg); that they led to the defeat of Austria and the establishment of the North German Confederation.

However, candidates should also be aware that “blood and iron” alone did not bring about Prussia’s predominance. Candidates could also discuss the role of the Zollverein not just in terms of binding the German states closer together but also as leading to the exclusion of Austria. They may discuss the wider growth of the Prussian economy and industry – not least the central roles played by iron, coal and railways. Clearly the diplomacy of Bismarck will be another factor for consideration. Also candidates may well point to a favourable international situation for Prussia and a much weaker one for Austria as being contributory factors. Weaker responses may well produce these in the form of a list, whereas stronger answers may well explore the interdependence of these factors. Finally, more astute candidates may question the assumption in the title and point out remaining limitations to Prussian dominance in Germany in 1867, e.g. that the south German states were still independent.

The best answers may combine a number of factors and discuss how they might be interrelated.

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

9. **‘There was no master plan to unite Germany.’ To what extent is this an accurate view of Bismarck’s aims in the period from 1867 to 1871?** [45]

Focus: Evaluation of Bismarck’s aims and policies in the period 1867 to 1871

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

Candidates need to review and examine Bismarck’s actions from 1867 onwards. Candidates are likely to discuss either one or both of two possible aspects of the question. The first debate is whether Bismarck had a clear intention to unite Germany, the second is whether he had a master plan to equip himself to do so. The debate about the latter may be done by comparing Bismarck’s later claim that he set out to unite Germany, with a more critical look at events as they occurred at the time. Was Bismarck working to a clear timetable of events or was he merely responding opportunistically to circumstances as they presented themselves? Candidates should base their discussion across the whole period given in the title and not just the end date. Events for consideration might include: the establishment and nature of the North German Confederation; the Luxembourg Crisis, the Hohenzollern Crisis, the Ems telegram, war with France and finally the establishment of the Empire in 1871. Candidates need to examine critically Bismarck’s actions and not just be led by what he later claimed in his memoirs. They may also refer to the discrepancies between his later writings and what he said in many of his public speeches at the time. In terms of Unification, candidates might also discuss Prussia’s relations with the South German states in 1867 and whether it was desirable or possible for their inclusion at that stage. Once again, they may wish to compare Bismarck’s speeches on the matter with his actions.

In terms of debate and interpretation, arguments in support of the statement might include the notion that Bismarck simply set out in an opportunist manner to secure his own and Prussia’s interests by thwarting the plans of German Liberals. In other words he simply championed German Unification because he wanted to prevent others (mainly the Liberals) imposing their own solution on the German problem. In this respect candidates might mention Bismarck’s Junker background; his support of the Prussian monarchy; the nature of the 1867 and 1871 constitutions; the role of the Prussian army; Prussia’s predominance within the Zollverein. All of these suggest a model of Prussian aggrandisement over Germany rather than a true support of German Unification and Bismarck is closely associated with each. Arguments against the statement suggesting that Bismarck was indeed working to unite Germany might include: the more “federal” and liberal elements of the constitutions of 1867 and 1871; Bismarck’s deliberate intervention and manipulation of events such as Schleswig Holstein, Luxembourg and Spain (Hohenzollern crisis). All of these might suggest the work of a “clever puppet master” working to unite Germany where all others before had failed.

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

**Roosevelt's America****10 Study all the Passages.**

**Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Depression was caused primarily by overproduction. [45]**

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

In **A** candidates could mention, as suggested in the steer, that the misdistribution of income was a major factor. However, implied in this statement is the fact that there was limited demand for goods, hence over supply. In **B** candidates could point out that overproduction of agricultural goods occurred due to the return to normality in European agriculture following the First World War. However, it does not mention industrial overproduction. **C** provides a whole list of factors of which overproduction is merely one. declining industries, misdistribution of wealth, weak banking system etc. The historian implies that it was the combination of these reasons not merely one that caused the Depression. **D** suggests that the Depression was caused by international factors associated with the impact of the First World War.

Using their own knowledge candidates could also mention share speculation and the Wall Street Crash, they could mention the impact of US tariff policy (Fordney-McCumber 1922 and particularly the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1931) as turning the Stock Markets Crash into a depression. They may mention that the Republican administrations' laissez faire and tax policies created the climate for future economic problems.

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

- 11 **Assess the view that the failure of National Prohibition was mainly due to problems of enforcement.** [45]

Focus: An evaluation of the debate on the reasons for the failure of Prohibition

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

Candidates have the opportunity to debate the reasons why Prohibition failed. They have the opportunity to assess the issues of enforcement. Too few revenue officers were assigned the task of enforcing prohibition. Also their salaries were sufficiently low to allow organised criminals to bribe successfully large numbers of officials.

Candidates may also state that the US's very long coastline and borders with Canada and Mexico (both 'wet' states) made it virtually impossible to patrol effectively. To counter the argument candidates may mention the involvement of organised crime as a major factor in failure. Organised crime set up an effective production and distribution network of illegal liquor. Candidates may also mention that ethnic groups such as Irish, German and Italian Americans openly flouted the law and refused to conform to prohibition.

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

- 12 To what extent did the United States follow an isolationist foreign policy from 1920 to 1941? [45]

Focus : Evaluation of debate on US Foreign Policy in the Inter-War period.

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

Candidates have the opportunity to debate the nature of US foreign policy between the wars. In support of the view that the US was isolationist candidates may mention the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles and membership of the League of Nations made by the US Senate. This can be linked to Harding's support for 'normalcy' in his period as president (1921-1923). Candidates may mention that US did not get involved directly in European affairs in the inter-war period in the way both Britain and France became involved. The US stayed aloof from the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) and was not involved in the Munich Agreement of 1938. In 1939 the US did not enter the war. It was only after the Japanese attack of 1941 that the US was forced to enter World War II.

To counter this view candidates may mention that US actively involved in disarmament (Washington Naval Treaty of 1921). The US did engage in European affairs as witnessed by the Dawes Plan and Young Plan on German reparations. The US was actively involved in Latin American affairs throughout the period. In the 1920s the US intervened in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. Finally, FDR did offer cash and carry and lend lease to Allies between 1939 to 1941.

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

**Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24**

- 13 Using these four passages and your own knowledge assess the view that the Bolsheviks won the Civil War (1918-21) largely as a result of the use of terror. [45]**

Focus:

Passages **A** and **C** focus on the positive factors behind the Bolshevik victory with **A** identifying the geographical advantages of the internal lines held by the Bolsheviks and the support they received from workers and peasants. The importance of internal lines is also mentioned in **B**. **C** places greater emphasis on the military contribution made by the Red Army and the role of Trotsky. In contrast, **D** focuses on the use of force through the activities of the Cheka. It points out that so severe was the intimidation that even some Bolsheviks were alarmed at the degree of violence but they were persuaded to keep quiet because the Civil war threatened the very existence of the Bolshevik Party. **B** offers a different perspective focusing on the problems faced by the White armies – their lack of unity and their brutal methods which helped alienate the Russian people.

In terms of own knowledge candidates could comment on the role of Lenin and could certainly discuss the impact of War Communism which is not developed in the passages.

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

- 14 **Assess the view that weak leadership was the main reason the Bolsheviks had achieved limited impact in Russia by 1914.** [45]

Focus: explanation of the reasons behind the failure of the Bolshevik Party to make more of an impact up to 1914.

The failure of the Bolsheviks to make a significant impact before 1914 can be explained partly in terms of the ideas and tactics adopted by Lenin and the Bolshevik leadership and partly as a result of both Tsarist repression and Russia's economic backwardness. Lenin's insistence on a small highly dedicated revolutionary elite led to a split within the Social Democrats in 1903 with the Bolsheviks thereafter being in a minority and therefore having limited impact. Lenin was outside of Russia for much of this period and when he did appear in 1905 he initially criticised the St Petersburg Soviet for its involvement in the events of that year and in 1906 he initially advocated boycotting the Duma elections. The lack of economic development in Russia meant that it was difficult to put across the Bolshevik message and the activities of the authorities made it very difficult for the Bolsheviks to develop any significant influence. The debate is likely to centre around interpretations which criticise the Bolsheviks in general and Lenin in particular as opposed to more sympathetic views which stress the enormous obstacles facing the Bolsheviks in this period.

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

- 15 Assess the view that Lenin was largely responsible for securing power for the Bolshevik Party in Russia in October 1917? [45]**

Focus: explanation of the reasons for Bolshevik success in October 1917.

Students should be able to identify a number of contributions made by Lenin after his return to Russia in April 1917. His 'April Theses' in which he rejected cooperation with the Provisional Government; his slogans – 'peace, bread and land' and 'All-power to the soviets' – both of which matched with the concerns and expectations of the people. There should also be some discussion of Lenin's role in the events of October 1917 particularly in overcoming the reluctance of fellow Bolsheviks to seize power in that month.

On the other hand there does need to be some discussion of the mistakes/weaknesses of the Provisional government, particularly in handling the Kornilov affair and Kerensky's ill-judged attempt to suppress the Bolsheviks in October 1917. The Mensheviks and SRs were discredited as a result of their cooperation with the Provisional Government leaving the Bolsheviks as the only viable alternative. Was Lenin leading the movement to overthrow the Provisional Government or was he utilising popular dissatisfaction against the authorities in order to secure power for the Bolsheviks? The debate will centre on differing interpretations of the degree of importance which should be ascribed to Lenin in these events.



**Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-39**

- 16 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Britain's main reason for conciliating Germany in the 1920s was economic self-interest. [45]

Focus:

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

The debate is whether Britain's conciliatory attitude to Germany in the 1920s stemmed from self-interest – the need to re-establish economic stability in Europe for British trade and the need to stabilize finance to assist Britain's major role in world finance or whether other motives such as fear of another war, dislike of France, concern for her Empire or weak military capacity or idealism were more important.

All four passages refer to economic concerns (**A** – the war had devastated the mechanisms of international trade; **B** the need for the recovery of British export industries and the hostility to reparations **C** – need to safeguard trade and rebuild investment **D** – need to find an outlet for German trade) However the thrust of the explanations is different. **C** has the most emphasis on economic matters but also refers to Empire and Britain's greater world role needing peace. It also refers to unwillingness to defend Versailles. Economic considerations could be linked to defence spending.

There is ample scope for explanation of Versailles and defence and questioning whether other factors like public opinion or belief in internationalism were more important.

**B** argues the most strongly for British policy being based on self interest and leading politicians to regard Versailles as wicked following objections to its economic clauses, However, this could be seen as narrow. British policy was reverting to a traditional policy and there was a genuine feeling that the sacrifices of war should not be in vain. Certainly **A** seems to support this – by 1934 the terrible losses had not been forgotten and LG writes emotionally – mentioning trade but stressing the need to avoid human loss on such a scale. Some might question whether more practical considerations such as defence cuts which he had started with the 10 Year Rule were more potent considerations. However **D** might back up the idealistic strain of **A** – but there is a strong element of just ignoring problems which were inconvenient in France and Eastern Europe rather than attempting to get a lasting settlement. Candidates could support the view by reference to post Locarno developments and the attempts to settle reparations and help Germany (Dawes, Young Plans, entry of Germany to League 1926, early evacuation of Rhineland

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

- 17 Assess the view that concern about the inadequacy of British armed forces was the main reason for British policy towards Germany from 1933 to 1938. [45]**

Focus : considering the relative importance of defence issues as a factor in British policy

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

The debate here is whether the effects of sustained defence cuts after the War reduced the ability of Britain to take decisive action against German breaches of Versailles or whether this was merely an excuse and that other motives – lack of allies, public opinion, fear of war, concern for the Empire and so on were more important. Answers are expected to deal with the key issue and not dismiss it summarily and go on to talk about other issues.

Concern about defence is well documented and chiefs of staff did advise that Britain's armed forces could not cope with threats from Germany, Italy and Japan simultaneously. Imperial defence took up a lot of the army's capacity and was made worse by problems in Palestine and India. Economic difficulties made the Treasury reluctant to rearm and public opinion favoured international negotiation and were unsympathetic, at least in the early 30s to increased taxation for defence. There were no plans for any joint military action with France by 1938; British forces could not have done much to interfere with either the annexation of Austria or an attack on Czechoslovakia. However, German strength was overrated and there is little doubt that Britain could have acted in 1936 but the motivation was not there. Political factors like public opinion ( Peace Ballot etc.) and dislike of Versailles, lack of support from Dominions and lack of any firm continental allies may have been dominant. Plenty to discuss here and some change over the period – Chamberlain's policy driven by belief in taking positive and proactive steps more than just being constrained by defence limitations, perhaps.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.**

**18 Assess the importance of public opinion in bringing about changes in British policy to Germany in 1939 [45]**

Focus : Assessing the importance of one factor in bringing about major policy change.

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

The debate is whether public opinion was disturbed by Munich when the immediate threat of war had passed, disliked the racial violence in Germany in November 1938 and was shocked by the occupation of Prague. It could be argued that this pushed Chamberlain into the Polish guarantee, to some attempts at alliance with Russia and then into war in September. The Conservatives became aware of greater support for anti-appeasement rebels and the mood of cabinet and back benchers changed. Labour took a more realistic view of defence and the possibility of war. The alternative view is that Chamberlain himself and other previous supporters of appeasement like Halifax came to see that change was needed independent of public opinion and more influenced by factors such as stronger military power as Britain's rearmament programme increased. There was more likelihood of support from the Dominions, France and even USA.

Though there is some doubt about whether public opinion was ever as favourable to appeasement as has been thought, given Chamberlain's manipulation of the press and so the change might not have been as dramatic as the question suggests, it is likely that most answers will focus on arguments about different factors such as defence. Whether public opinion was influential given Chamberlain's limited guarantee to Poland and his lack of plans to actually do anything in the event of Poland being attacked; his half-hearted approaches to Russia and his delay in declaring war may be questioned. However, it is clear that a repeat of Munich was not acceptable in September 1939 and whether it was public opinion or changes in the ruling elite of the Conservative party could be discussed. It is important to keep an open mind about approaches to this question given that there is also a debate about whether there was significant change in Chamberlain's attitude at heart, but however limited, the guarantee and the Birmingham speech did represent some change.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.**

**Stalin and the development of the Cold War in Europe 1941 – 55**

- 19 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe from 1944 to 1948 were mainly carried out to expand the power of the Soviet Union. [45]

Focus:

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

**A** suggests that Stalin's takeover of Eastern Europe was mainly prompted by his continuing fear of Germany. **Lee (A)** argues that '*Stalin had a profound distrust of Germany*' and that this was underpinned by the impact of the Nazi invasion and occupation of the Soviet Union during the Second World War: '*The Soviet Union had suffered devastating losses at the hands of the Nazis in the Second World War*'. **A** also states that Stalin feared '*the rebirth of fascist militarism*' in Germany. **B** also highlights the impact that the Second World War had on Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe post-1945: '*The damage inflicted on the Soviet Union during the war defies description*'. **Ward (B)** suggests that Stalin was forging '*a buffer zone from the ruins of the Nazi empire*'. However **B** sees this as a consequence of Stalin's fear of his former allies, especially the USA. Ward describes how the Soviet Union was '*exhausted by the Second World War and confronted by warlike Americans armed with nuclear weapons which they were evidently willing to use*'. Candidates may support this from their own knowledge by reference to Hiroshima and / or Nagasaki. **C** outlines the case for seeing Stalin's goals as expansionist. **(C)** explains that '*the defeat of Nazi Germany in 1945 gave Stalin the opportunity to spread communism throughout Eastern Europe*'.

*The Red Army controlled large areas of Eastern Europe and was in a position to enforce Soviet policy.* Candidates may support this from their own knowledge by reference to events in Poland, Czechoslovakia or any other country in the Soviet 'bloc'. However **Phillips (C)** states that '*this view of Stalin as an expansionist needs to be challenged*'. He argues that '*the extension of Soviet control to Eastern Europe can be seen as a defensive measure; the creation of a buffer zone to protect the Soviet Union from invasion by the west*'. Candidates may support this by reference to previous invasions, for example during the First World War or the Russian Civil War (1918-20). In **D, Gaddis** argues that '*Stalin's goal therefore was to dominate Europe as thoroughly as Hitler had tried to do*'. **D** sees Stalin as being determined to expand the Soviet Union, both territorially and through the expansion of its '*sphere of influence*'. However, his motives for doing so are not entirely explained by **Gaddis** in relation to expanding the power of the Soviet Union: '*Stalin's post-war goals were security for himself, his regime, his country and his ideology, in precisely that order*'. He argues that '*paranoia and absolute power came together in Stalin*'. This is echoed in **C** by **Phillips'** reference to his '*expansionist and aggressive Soviet foreign policy*' being seen as a consequence of '*the totalitarian nature of Stalin's Soviet Union*'. The majority of these passages explain Stalin's actions as being predominantly defensive, prompted by a fear of the west (**B & C**) or of a resurgent Germany (**A**). Candidates may suggest that these views are revisionist. Some may note that Gaddis, the most recent publication, challenges the post-revisionist view by so firmly viewing Stalin as expansionist (the traditional or orthodox view) and some may attribute this to recent research in the archives of the former Soviet Union.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your team leader.**

- 20 Assess the view that disagreements about the Second Front were the most important reason for the collapse of the 'Grand Alliance' by 1945. [45]**

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the collapse of the wartime alliance by 1945, balancing wartime disputes between Stalin and his allies against other factors and evaluating whether the collapse was inevitable.

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

The debate is centred around the reasons why the wartime allies were in dispute, Candidates at this level should be well informed as to how the USSR endured the brunt of the suffering against Nazi Germany and the extent of Stalin's frustrations in relation to the timing of a second front in the west. Candidates may argue that from 1942 to 1944 this was the most important cause of disputes. Candidates should understand that following the launch of Operation Overlord this was a declining area of dispute. Candidates ought to contrast this cause of disputes with others such as arguments about the future of Germany and the increasing unease of the allies at the Red Army's actions in Eastern Europe, most especially in Poland. Candidates may trace disputes about Poland back to The Nazi - Soviet Pact of 1939 and the Tehran Conference of 1943. Candidates might argue that the 'Percentages Agreement' between Churchill and Stalin in 1944 suggests that Churchill was happy with the creation of 'spheres of influence' in Eastern Europe as long as GB 'got her share'. Candidates may demonstrate an understanding of how disputes about the shape of post-war Germany became more critical in 1945, and will be likely to refer to Yalta and Potsdam. Candidates may well suggest that issues arose at the very end of the war in relation to the USA's possession and use of atomic weapons against Japan. A valid line of argument would make the case for the causes of disputes changing and evolving through time in line with the fortunes of war. Equally validly the deep-seated differences between the west and the USSR could be seen as having united such unlikely partners in a stormy relationship. Candidates may choose to argue that these ideological, cultural and political differences between the west and the USSR were the cause of misunderstandings and disputes between the wartime allies and that once their common enemy had been defeated it was then inevitable that such unlikely partners would split.

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

- 21 **Assess the view that the nuclear arms race was the dominant factor in East - West relations in Europe during the period from 1948 to 1955.** [45]

Focus: An evaluation of relative importance of the various factors that influenced East – West relations in Europe during the period from 1948 to 1955 balancing the importance of the nuclear arms race against other factors.

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

The debate is centred around the relative importance of the various factors that influenced East – West relations in Europe during the period from 1948 to 1955. The USSR's development of the atomic bomb by 1949 was certainly a very significant landmark in the development of the Cold War, opening the US up to McCarthyism and the fear that they were losing the Cold War. The development of the nuclear arms race from 1949 clearly had a significant influence on East-West relations, as did the further development of H-bombs in 1952. Arguably this led to a stalemate between the 'super-powers'. However, candidates may show knowledge of key advisers to Eisenhower, such as Le May, who believed that the intensification of the arms race would enable to win the US a 'decisive victory' in a nuclear war. Candidates may well wish to compare the importance of the nuclear arms race to the importance of other events in this period such as the Czech Coup of 1948, the Berlin Blockade of 1948 / 1949, the formation of NATO in 1949, and Stalin's death in 1953. Candidates are likely to consider the Berlin Blockade as an important event in the development of the Cold War from 1948 to 1955. Candidates are likely to stress the importance of the Berlin Airlift and the eventual outcome and its consequences. Despite the rhetoric of the Truman Doctrine the Berlin Blockade arguably marks the first failure of Soviet expansionism. Arguably the final division of Germany into West and East Germany was also a consequence of the failure of the blockade, although candidates could suggest that this was inevitable by then. Stalin's death clearly marked the end of an era, although candidates may argue that the crushing of the East German revolt in 1953 suggested little had changed. Candidates who make a similar point about Hungary in 1956 may be rewarded, although as this event is outside the specification knowledge of it must not be expected. Candidates who use events outside Europe (also not in the specification) during this period to support their answer may be rewarded if these events are used relevantly in support of their arguments. However, the focus of the question is the Cold War in Europe so answers that suggest that the fall of China or the Korean War were more important in the development of the Cold War in Europe in this period are invalid.

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

## 2590 Themes in History 1066 – 1796

### England 1066-1228

#### The Government of England 1066-1216

- 1 'The role of the crown was the most important factor in the development of English central government during the period from 1066 to 1216.' How far do you agree with this judgment? [60]

Focus: assessment of the importance of the crown compared with other factors in the development of central government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Throughout the period kings played an important part in the development of central government. William I established Norman rule effectively. Subsequent kings recognised the need to develop government so that it could function effectively in times of the monarch's absence abroad and appointed and dismissed those officials such as the chief justiciar (and its prototype in the time of Ranulf Flambard) and chancellor, for example Hubert Walter, who came to run government on a day to day level. William II, Henry I and Henry II in particular set in motion reforms which led to increased centralisation of government and a more rigorous judicial system. The importance of their role is arguably demonstrated by the relative weakness of government in times of weak kingship, especially under Stephen.

However, candidates need to assess the role of the crown in the context of other factors contributing to the development of central government. Some may argue that it was the success of officials such as Flambard, Roger of Salisbury, Longchamps, Hubert Walter etc in fulfilling their roles which enabled government to develop. Some may emphasise the significance of absenteeism itself, or of the continental possessions, as the driving force behind the financial and judicial reforms as kings tried to maximise their finances through systematic control and centralised justice, and behind the development of the chief justiciar as a great office of state. At a lesser level these reforms led to increased use of officials, for example in the Exchequer or in the administration of writs, especially from Henry II's time. Others may point to the role of the church, or of churchmen, in the development of government as the leading officials were also often churchmen.

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

- 2 Assess the view that the most significant developments in the growth of common law in the period from 1066 to 1216 happened before the reign of Henry II. [60]**

Focus: assessment of the importance of developments before Henry II's reign compared with other factors in the growth of common law.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A number of developments before the reign of Henry II contributed to the growth of English common law. William I inherited the strong kingship of Anglo-Saxon England which enabled royal authority to be effective over the country, the Anglo-Saxon writ and the shire and hundred courts. To this he added the development of feudalism which, with its distribution of land in return for service, led eventually to the development of a standardised common law for cases involving land-holding. Moreover, increased standardisation which was essential to the growth of common law resulted from common feudal custom and seigneurial courts following common practice. Henry I's contributions included the use of local justiciars which promoted a common enforcement of the law and the redirection of some cases from honorial courts to the shire courts. Canon law and church courts also helped to develop a common law in the period before Henry II's accession. However, some candidates might well argue that Henry II provided much stimulus to the growth of common law and set up much of the machinery which made it effective. He helped to standardise and systematise procedure and bring more business into the royal courts through, for example, the use of the returnable writ, the grand and possessory assizes, professional justices, general eyres, juries and the tightening up of the criminal law through the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton. Some candidates might also point to the judicial clauses of Magna Carta to demonstrate that significant developments happened in the later part of the period too.

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



- 3 Assess the extent to which the continental possessions of the crown affected the conduct of English central government in the period from 1066 to 1216. [60]**

Focus: assessment of the importance of the continental possessions of the crown in causing the relative breakdown of government compared with other factors.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Although rebellions happened throughout the period government only came anywhere near to breaking down in Stephen's reign and during the civil war in John's reign and it is therefore likely that candidates will focus on these periods. Arguably, both the possession and the loss of the continental lands helped to cause rebellion which brought the government close to breakdown. Stephen's involvement in Normandy meant that he could not concentrate on the situation in England so that it deteriorated. From 1144 barons also wished to limit the difficulties they were experiencing in having two overlords, one in England and one on the continent, and this was a factor in their decisions during the civil war. This also caused difficulties for barons under John after 1204. In addition, John's attempts to raise money for the campaign to regain Normandy helped relations between him and his barons to deteriorate. Having lost their overseas lands both Stephen and John were present in England for most of the time so incurring the resentment of their barons which might otherwise have been directed to their officials. Moreover, absenteeism as a result of the continental possessions had led the Angevins to develop particularly strong rule in England and baronial resentment of this helped to encourage the barons to rebel in 1215. On the other hand, all monarchs in the period had continental possessions and they did not usually lead to even partial government collapse. Answers in the top bands will assess the importance of these factors but will also provide comparative assessment by examining them in the context of a range of other factors which helped to bring government close to breakdown. These could include: baronial self-interest as barons took steps to safeguard their positions such as building up their authority in Stephen's reign in areas which had slipped from government control; loss of church support as Stephen was deserted by the papal legate, Henry of Blois, and John was excommunicated and England placed under interdict; or the personalities of the monarchs since Stephen's inability to see things through to a conclusion and John's reputation for opportunism, cruelty and unreliability did little to build up baronial loyalty.

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

**Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228**

- 4 **‘Monarchical support was essential to the success of archbishops of Canterbury in strengthening the English Church.’ How far do you agree with this judgment in relation to the period from 1066 to 1228?** [60]

Focus: evaluation of the importance of monarchical support to archbishops’ success in strengthening the church.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will probably focus on the archiepiscopates of Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton as these are in the specification and this is perfectly acceptable, but credit should be given to relevant reference to other archbishops. Arguably the most successful archbishop of Canterbury in strengthening the church and the one who did least to weaken it in any way was Lanfranc who had the full support of William I. Together they increased the prestige of the church by making it an important factor in the establishment of Norman rule in England; with William’s support Lanfranc held reforming councils which brought greater unity to the church and he also brought it into closer contact with the European church while having no desire to undermine William’s authority by involving England in the investiture contest. William backed Lanfranc over the primacy and also allowed the development of separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Anselm’s compromise with Henry I over investiture in 1107 meant that the church benefited from increased independence since Henry relinquished investiture with the ring and the staff and because the investiture conflict itself caused no further problem in England. By contrast, there is evidence that lack of monarchical support could lead to relative archiepiscopal failure. Anselm’s poor relations with William II led to his exile which weakened his authority over the church for a while, and Becket’s quarrel with Henry II allowed the king to try to control the bishops and allowed the pope to increase his control so undermining the independence of the English church. Langton, whom John was unable to accept and who could not enter England until 1213, had least opportunity to strengthen the church.

However, better answers will recognise that the situation was less clear cut. Anselm’s exile brought him into contact with the full force of Gregorian reform ideas on investiture so that on his return to England in 1100 he was keen to uphold the church’s rights and independence. Becket was also an ardent supporter of the rights of the church who, through his determined stance against Henry II, helped to strengthen ecclesiastical courts and through his martyrdom and canonisation increased the reputation of the church. Sometimes archbishops achieved success irrespective of the support or otherwise of the monarch: for example, Anselm’s reputation as a theologian, Theobald’s promotion of canon law and Walter’s legatine authority all helped to further the power and prestige of the church.

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

- 5 'There was more continuity than change in the relationship between the archbishops of Canterbury and the archbishops of York.' How far do you agree with this judgement in relation to the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]

Focus: assessment of the degree of continuity and change in the relationship between archbishops of Canterbury and other members of the English episcopate.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Throughout the period two factors meant that the archbishops of Canterbury had no automatic superiority or authority over the archbishops of York and to this extent, at a formal level, there is continuity in their relations. There was no unequivocal resolution of the primacy issue and no guarantee of papal support for Canterbury's position as popes were determined to eradicate primatial authority and bring bishops under their own control. However, the impact of these underlying factors was not consistent. At times relations between Canterbury and York were good: Lanfranc achieved personal recognition of his supremacy over York in 1072 and the pope's granting of legatine authority to Canterbury in 1125 helped to improve relations as it gave Canterbury supremacy without recognising his primacy. However, at other times relations were much worse, for example in 1115 when Thurstan of York refused to recognise the primacy of Canterbury. Other factors also affected their relationship. Papal support for York, as during the Becket affair, could weaken Canterbury's position vis a vis York. Appointing someone else as papal legate, as with Henry of Blois, also affected Canterbury's authority and hence his relations with York. Relations between Canterbury and York dipped when Canterbury was in exile, as with Anselm or Becket, or unable to enter the country (Langton). Political problems also affected relations. Difficulties over appointing a successor to Thurstan at York in Stephen's reign led to schism which undermined the authority of York while Henry II's use of York to crown Young Henry enhanced his authority and infuriated Becket. By the thirteenth century the heat had gone out of the arguments between Canterbury and York as both archbishops had more problems with their own provincials. To gain the higher bands candidates should assess the degree of continuity and change and reach an overall conclusion.

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

**6 How successful was papal intervention in English affairs in the period from 1066 to 1228? [60]**

Focus: evaluation of the extent of popes' success in intervening in English affairs.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Popes had a number of reasons for intervention: furthering church reform; undermining primatial authority because they felt it detracted from theirs; political reasons; and perhaps fundamentally, imposing their will in order to both demonstrate and enhance papal power over church and monarch.

At the beginning of the period Gregory VII had little success in intervening in English affairs once William had sailed for England flying the papal banner. Lanfranc steadfastly refused the summons to Rome, so avoiding exposure to Gregorian reform, and William resisted Gregory's attempts to persuade him to become a papal vassal. By the end of the period Innocent III was much more successful in imposing his will on England: he placed England under an interdict and excommunicated John. John eventually extricated himself from the predicament Innocent had created by recognising Innocent's appointee as archbishop of Canterbury and offering England as a papal fief. Innocent later demonstrated his power again by suspending Langton. This was a more successful and dramatic series of interventions than any before. However, there were examples of successful papal action throughout the period. Popes had some success in promoting church reform, e.g. through support for Anselm against William II which eventually resulted in Anselm's bringing the investiture dispute to England and its resolution in the form of a compromise by which the king lost some of his power. Weakening of primatial authority was successful in the short term e.g. supporting Henry of Blois against Canterbury, although the archbishop did not lose his power in the long term. Popes were able to extend their influence over legal cases by encouraging appeals to Rome e.g. in Stephen's reign. There were also less successful interventions: threatening to place England under interdict in the Becket dispute did not bring resolution of the quarrel. Candidates need to evaluate a range of examples in the context of their definition of papal success.

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

- 7 How far were economic and social rebellions in Tudor England caused by a breakdown in landlord-tenant relations? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the causes of social and economic rebellions

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus their analysis on social and economic rebellions and, as such, any discussion of political and religious causes is likely to be largely irrelevant. Grievances about taxation, enclosures, rack-renting, high food prices and low wages underpinned the disturbances of 1489, 1497, 1525, 1536, 1549 and 1596, and candidates could usefully assess the role of central government policies and local issues and personalities as a cause of rebellion. The breakdown in landlord-tenant relations was most apparent in 1549, and candidates might examine why this occurrence was so widespread. Better candidates may suggest that the role of the clergy, nobility and gentry as landlords was vital in the maintenance of order and for the most part, this prevailed. If disturbances occurred, they often did so in spite of good social relations. Moreover, the absence of any large-scale social and economic rebellions in Elizabeth's reign showed that, by enacting legislation to combat social and economic problems, the government had learned from earlier misguided policies, notably in the 1530s and 1540s. Arguments that strike a balance between local issues and national policies as a cause of rebellions may well characterise the best answers.

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

**8 Assess the role of propaganda as a means of maintaining political stability in Tudor England. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of propaganda in the context of upholding political stability

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Expect candidates to examine the role of propaganda and other factors that enabled stability to be maintained. The Tudor state placed great stress upon the populus obeying the 'magistrate' and employed a range of propaganda to achieve it. Candidates may point to the political and religious propaganda of the 1530s that was sponsored by the government and directed by Cromwell, for example Gardiner's *De Vera Obedientia*, Starkey's *Exhortation to Unity and Obedience*, Morison's *Remedy for Sedition*. Preaching in pulpits and distributing pamphlets reminded people that they must obey the monarch and his magistrate. Dudley's *Tree of Commonwealth* (1509), Cranmer's *Homily on Obedience* (1547), the *Mirror for Magistrates* (1559), Parker's *Book of Homilies* (1562) and Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* (1590s) emphasised the 'Great Chain of Being' at times of popular unrest, as did much of the literature in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century. Coins and imagery were also employed by the Tudor state, Henry VII adorned his buildings with roses and Edward VI minted coins. Bands I and II candidates should set these examples against other means of maintaining stability, such as the state passing and enforcing penalties against acts of disorder as a deterrent, strengthening the powers of JPs and local authorities, developing a county militia, and pursuing policies which were not unpopular. Better candidates may see a link between increasing evidence of government propaganda and years of unrest. Less effective responses may describe or explain the role of propaganda rather than assess the role it played.

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

**9 Assess which rebellion presented the greatest challenge to Tudor governments from 1485 to 1603. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of several rebellions to determine which presented the greatest threat

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to select a rebellion, analyse how it challenged the government and assess its threat by comparing it with other rebellions either implicitly or explicitly. Focusing exclusively on one rebellion with no attempt at a comparison will confine their answer to **Band IV** or below. Candidates may suggest that rebellions fall into two categories: those that protested against government policies and ministers, and those that sought to overthrow the regime. Arguably the former, such as the Yorkshire, Cornish, Amicable, Western, Ket and Oxfordshire rebellions, was less challenging than the more politically motivated rebellions, such as Simnel, Warbeck, Northumberland, Wyatt, Northern Earls and Essex, but they could still pose a serious challenge. Wolsey's position was undermined by the Amicable protest, Cromwell by the Pilgrimage, and Somerset by the Western and Ket's rebellions. Most arguments are likely to consider the nature of a rebellion's challenge – its size, location, duration, organisation, leadership, objectives, internal and external support – and the government's responses, its own political and economic condition, and the effectiveness of measures taken to counter the challenge. Candidates are likely to argue in favour of the Pilgrimage (on account of its size, organisation, support and duration), Wyatt (due to its location, objectives and government weaknesses) or Simnel (international support, size, objectives and weaknesses of Henry VII).

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

**10 How far did the Tudors have consistent aims in their foreign policy? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of foreign policy aims across the period

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main aims behind Tudor foreign policy were national security, trade agreements, continental expansion and dynastic alliances. National security and trade agreements were consistently pursued although, if there was a conflict of interest, trade yielded to political security. Keeping the Netherlands neutral or out of enemy hands was a constant objective. Dynastic and marriage alliances were consistently pursued by Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary, and less so by Edward VI and inconclusively by Elizabeth – although the latter used her unmarried status as a pawn in foreign diplomacy. Candidates should point out however that there were inconsistencies in the Tudors' attitude towards war. Henry VII avoided war if possible but engaged in continental alliances; Henry VIII devoted much time and money to waging war against Scotland and France; Somerset continued this policy towards Scotland but Northumberland totally changed it; Mary was also opposed to war but was drawn into it by Philip, and Elizabeth avoided direct conflict for as long as possible before going to war with Spain for the last 18 years of her rule. War was a last resort for most of the Tudors with the exception of Henry VIII and Somerset. Religious reforms also brought changes in allies and foreign commitments. The best candidates are likely to explain the more prevalent trends and account for any inconsistencies.

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



- 11 Assess the impact of the personalities of English monarchs on relations with France from 1485 to 1603. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of personalities as a factor affecting Anglo-French relations

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Anglo-French relations were affected by a number of factors, one of which was the personality of English monarchs. Candidates should consider the Tudor rulers, all of whom went to war with France, and where appropriate French rulers, some of whom were particularly aggressive and ambitious towards England and Scotland. Henry VII tried to avoid war but felt he needed to restrain Charles VIII from overrunning Brittany and threatening England. The vain Henry VIII liked war and wanted to extend English lands in France but was rebuffed by the equally prickly Francis I, who used the Scots to the advantage of France. The weak and Protestant inclined Edward VI had to contend with the war-minded Henry II, who was determined to recover Boulogne, and Mary, ever loyal to her husband, was forced to surrender Calais to France in 1558. Elizabeth, eager to avoid financing a war to recover Calais, sought a rapprochement with France after 1564, and was aided by their expulsion from Scotland in 1560. Thereafter, she did her best to befriend the French without ceding to their demands. Candidates are likely to argue that although personalities were important, additional factors influenced relations, especially the role of Spain as an ally and later an enemy of England, and the changing religious and political conditions in France, England and Scotland. A balanced argument is expected from the better candidates.

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

- 12 To what extent was Tudor foreign policy influenced by English interests in the Netherlands? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the influence of the Netherlands upon England's foreign policy

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The Netherlands was important to England throughout the Tudor period for economic and political reasons. Henry VII established trade links with Burgundy, which grew stronger as time passed and held firm in spite of interruptions in 1493-6, 1503-6, 1527-8 and 1562-4, until the Dutch Revolt in 1572. The subsequent decline led to a re-assessment of overseas markets and the Elizabethan interest in transatlantic trade. Burgundian support for the Yorkists brought political security to the fore in Henry VII's reign but Henry VIII's friendship with Charles V, and Mary's marriage to Philip, lessened its political significance until the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt. This necessitated Leicester's intervention in 1586-7, which hastened war with Spain. The growth of Calvinism in the Netherlands in the 1550s onwards brought religion as an issue – Elizabeth's implicit support for the Sea Beggars and Dutch rebels (explicit after Nonsuch) ensured the Netherlands after 1572 was central to Tudor foreign policy and remained important enough for Elizabeth to secure Dutch cautionary towns in the 1590s in return for English aid after the Armada. Better essays should assess the importance of the Netherlands to England and compare it with other factors, such as responding to the more powerful states of France and Spain, and securing dynastic alliances. Weaker essays are likely to offer a chronological narrative and comment, with an imbalanced assessment of the Netherlands and other determinants.

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

- 13 To what extent were English monarchs responsible for clashes between crown and parliament in the period from 1558 to 1688? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of parliamentary clashes affecting monarchs over time

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should assess the main political issues facing English monarchs from Elizabeth to James II in respect of their culpability. The personalities and policies of English monarchs played a key part in creating and fomenting problems and candidates are likely to refer to the spendthrift James I, who dissolved 3 of his 4 parliaments in a pique of temper, Charles I who believed his prerogative had no limits and vowed never to call parliament again in 1629, and James II who never gained parliament's trust and support. The views and policies of monarchs caused disagreements throughout the period, though it may be noted that Elizabeth and Charles II had fewer disagreements because they handled their political problems more skilfully and had more attractive personalities. Candidates should therefore open up their argument to other possibilities for the cause of disagreements. Changing political and religious circumstances in England, for instance, or the reluctance of landowners and merchants to increase their taxation would be valid areas of discussion. The developing nature of parliament may also be considered. It exercised increasing financial control over the monarchs and used this lever in the 17<sup>th</sup> century as a constitutional weapon. The key areas of conflict were over financial, military, religious and constitutional issues and a thematic approach is likely to work well as candidates seek to explain the origin of the political problems.

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

- 14 How do you account for the changing role of parliament in the course of the period from 1558 to 1689? [60]

Focus: Explanation for changes in parliament's role

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Parliament's role changed during the period. Elizabethan parliaments met occasionally when the crown needed finance or popular support. They had no rights and were generally cooperative but a few MPs were keen to convert their privileges into something more permanent. This desire became more pronounced under James I and by 1625 parliament was more outspoken about government policies, ministers and royal favourites. In the 1630s -1640s parliament learned the art of opposition, and then government. After 1660, it was an integral part of administration, fiercely guarding the people's rights and opposing arbitrary rule insofar as it could. Their explanation may include the policies and personalities of the rulers, the manner in which parliamentary proceedings developed, the growing influence of puritans in the Commons and how their opposition to government policies increased their political confidence to demand more political power. Some candidates may see the civil war as pivotal in the transformation of parliament. Better candidates are likely to focus on evaluation of the reasons and organise their essay thematically; less capable candidates may well give an account of crown-parliamentary relations and only offer an assessment in their conclusion.

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

- 15 Assess how the Church of England influenced the development of the English monarchy during the years from 1558 to 1689. [60]**

Focus: Assessment of the ways in which the Church of England influenced the development of the monarchy

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The Church of England had an important impact on the development of the monarchy. Candidates are likely to refer to its support for legislation against Roman Catholics and opposition to reform-minded puritans in Elizabeth's and James' reigns. In each case the monarchy's authority was strengthened but as the 17<sup>th</sup> century advanced it also resulted in an alienation of the Commons. Charles I's close affinity with the Church – his attachment to Arminianism and Laud's endorsement of his personal rule – rendered the possibility of an absolute administration, which resulted in parliament's condemnation of the bishops, the abolition of the Lords and execution of the king. By dominating the Restoration Settlement, Anglicans could restrict attempts by Charles II, James II and William III to establish greater toleration or further their own religious preferences. The Church also united in opposition to James II and, by endorsing the Glorious Revolution, further limited the monarchy's authority. Candidates should discuss the ways in which the Church influenced the development of the monarchy. The best answers are likely to identify and assess key moments of change.

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

- 16 'The Restoration Settlement (1660-65) was the most important turning-point in the development of the Church of England in the years from 1558 to 1689.' How far do you agree with this statement? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the Restoration Settlement compared with other turning-points in the development of the Church of England

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A turning-point may be taken to mean a moment of significant change when subsequent relationships and developments were different, and candidates may well argue that the Restoration Settlement was one of the most important turning-points in this period. It brought the revival of Anglicanism at the expense of dissenters and Catholics, and the Clarendon Code secured its position which it defended in the face of pressure from Charles II and James II. Other turning-points however need to be examined. One could be the Excommunication of 1570 and the growth of Catholic plots against the crown which led to a rise in anti-Catholic sentiment that was never totally lost. Another might be James I's and Charles I's support for Arminianism and the crown's failure to assist Protestants in the Thirty Years' War, which led to a division in the Church, made worse by the policies of Laud. For some, the Civil War will be the major turning-point because it divided the Church into High and Low groups and led to its demise in the Interregnum. The better essays should consider several turning-points, including the Restoration Settlement before reaching a reasoned conclusion.

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

- 17 Assess the reasons why relations between English rulers and Catholics changed in the course of the period from 1558 to 1688. [60]**

Focus: Assessment of reasons for the change in relations between English rulers and Catholics.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Better candidates will understand the difference between rulers (government is acceptable) and parliament, and also between Roman and English Catholics, and focus on assessing the reasons why relations with Catholics changed. These may include (1) the rulers' personal beliefs (2) pressure from parliament and the Church of England (3) popular xenophobia (4) the role of the Papacy and Jesuits (5) relations with Ireland (6) foreign conditions and relations. Weaker answers may describe the changes, perhaps chronologically, without evaluating the relative significance of different factors. Relations between Elizabeth and Roman Catholics began moderately well but declined steeply after 1570 - the Excommunication, Catholic plots to kill the Queen, the arrival of Jesuits and the outbreak of war against Spain. Relations improved under James I who favoured toleration and relaxed the penal laws. Some candidates may point out that the Gunpowder plot was not typical of Anglo-Catholic relations. Charles I allowed Jesuits into England, married a Catholic and pursued a pro-Catholic foreign policy in the 1630s but his proto-Catholicism alarmed many Protestants. Cromwell was the most anti-Catholic of rulers: he exacted revenge on Irish Catholics and excluded English Catholics from the toleration enjoyed by most religious groups in the 1650s. Relations improved under Charles II who used his dispensing power to support and protect individual Catholics, skilfully handled the Popish plot crisis, and allied with France. James II, who hoped to convert his subjects to Catholicism, became one himself but was unable to carry the rest of the country with him.

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

- 18 How accurate is the view that Elizabeth I was the most successful ruler at dealing with problems presented by Puritans from 1558 to 1688? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of Elizabeth's management of Puritanism compared with other rulers.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. The main problems Puritans presented were their reluctance to acknowledge bishops' authority, their refusal to pay church tithes, their rejection of church rituals that were deemed unbiblical, the desire of some sects to elect their own ministers and secede from the established church, their influence in many rural and town parishes, the support from some academics and MPs to reform the prayer book and their revolutionary potential which was evident in their political activities in the 1640s. Candidates may suggest that the extent and nature of these problems varied from period to period, partly as a result of how English rulers handled them. Candidates are likely to assess Elizabeth's skill at dividing and ruling Puritans through her council, bishops and parliament. Candidates should devote all their answer to assessing Elizabeth either directly or by way of comparison with other rulers. James I mishandled Puritans from the outset, neither satisfying their demands nor suppressing their complaints. Charles I failed to appease or control them and his policy of persecution intensified their opposition and resulted in civil war. Cromwell suffered for giving Puritans too much freedom and subsequently had to suppress many of their activities. By 1660 Puritanism had developed into well-established sects. Presbyterians were strongly represented in the Convention parliament and Charles granted more concessions albeit temporarily. Candidates may refer to the absence of problems in the rest of the period, which is in part a reflection of Charles' political skill and the comparative weak condition of Puritanism.



- 19 To what extent did the strength of the French nation state from 1498 to 1610 depend upon the achievements of Louis XII and Francis I? [60]

Focus: Evaluation and comparison of the contributions of Louis and Francis to the developing strength of the nation state

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to compare the situation in 1547 with later developments. Louis XII and Francis I helped to construct a more efficient and more centralised administration around their strong personalities. Expect a discussion of central administration, financial and religious reforms, papal relations, legal codes, suppression of over-mighty nobles, and the expansion of lands. Louis continued some ideas from Charles VIII (e.g. start of the codification of laws) but most of Francis's reforms were original, and these could be usefully examined. Henry II continued in the same vein but better candidates may point out that difficulties remained after 1547, such as weak royal finances, religious tension, and ambitious nobles with military power. The nation state relied heavily on strong leadership, which the later Valois kings failed to supply. Good answers should refer to the civil war years to illustrate some of these problems as well as the permanence of many of the foundations laid by 1547. Henry IV built upon these but he also contributed significantly to strengthening the nation state by laying sound economic foundations, resolving religious and social divisions, and restoring France's international standing (in respect of Spain, Savoy, the Valtelline, the United Provinces and Cleves-Julich).

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

**20 How effectively did French governments deal with religious issues from 1498 to 1610? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of success/failure of governments at handling religious issues.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to answer this question either by looking at religious issues thematically or by evaluating each reign in turn. The main religious issues were:

(1) the monarch's relations with the Papacy concerning its temporal and spiritual authority in France; Francis I resolved this very effectively in 1516 though the Paris Parlement still had reservations.

(2) the need to reform the French clergy; little was achieved to enhance clerical standards and salaries and the Trent decrees remained unregistered.

(3) the threat of heresy; dissenting groups like the Waldensians were persecuted by regional parlements, the Sorbonne and the Chambre Ardente (1547).

(4) the growth of Huguenotism; a serious problem from the 1520s that faced Francis I, Henry II and the later Valois rulers; it was weakened by civil war and partially resolved by Henry IV at Nantes.

(5) the spiritual needs of the people; humanists were suppressed by Francis I and there was little improvement apart from individual initiatives from some bishops and lay orders.

Candidates may suggest that on balance most governments dealt ineffectively with religious issues, which underscored the civil wars, divided society and weakened the monarchy until the reign of Henry IV. Weaker responses are likely to focus heavily on various governments' inability to prevent the Wars of Religion.

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

- 21 **Assess the role of the nobility in the development of the French nation state from 1498 to 1610.** [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the nobles' role in the development of the nation state

Candidates are likely to assess the ways in which the nobility contributed to or hindered the development of the nation state, and the best answers will not stray from this path. The nobility held key offices in both church and state and not only served the king but also served themselves in the provinces. They led and raised armies during the Italian wars, which served the state positively, but the same troops were turned against the well-being of the state and monarchy in the wars of religion. Nobles were royal governors, law enforcers and administrators, and most under a strong ruler such as Francis I served the state very loyally. A minority flouted the law, lined their pockets and disobeyed the king, at times demonstrating how much harm they could inflict at all levels of society. Some candidates may use particular noble families, such as the Montmorencys, Bourbons and Guises, to illustrate their argument throughout the period. Candidates should be aware of the changing relationship between the nobility and crown, most notably during the reigns of Francis I and Henry IV, when the major families were subdued, and in the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III, when they exercised considerable political influence over the crown to the detriment of the nation state.

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

- 22 **Assess the reasons why the Papacy was essential to the revival of the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century.** [60]

Focus: Explanation for the importance of the Papacy in the Catholic Church's revival

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates will agree that the Papacy was essential to a revival of the Church but this question requires reasons rather than a narrative account. The main factors are likely to include: (1) the unity and leadership given to the movement by the Papacy; (2) personal exemplars provided by the Papacy that set a standard for others; (3) reform of the Curia and city of Rome; (4) the spiritual response needed to rebuff Lutheranism and Calvinism; (5) calling a General Council that might overcome national rivalries among secular leaders and prevent further secessions from the Church; (6) endorsement of new orders and support for existing orders. Reasons cited should be supported with examples of papal activity e.g. **Paul III** (commissioned a survey of the church, called the Council of Trent, founded the Roman Inquisition and Index, and acknowledged the Jesuits), **Paul IV** (revised the Index, encouraged the Inquisition), **Pius IV** (issued the Tridentine Decrees), **Pius V** (reformed the Curia, Catechism, Breviary, Missal and improved Rome), **Gregory XIII** (refurbished Rome, encouraged Jesuit missionaries), **Sixtus V** (reformed the Curia, established 15 'congregations', rebuilt St Peter's, enforced episcopal residence), **Clement VIII** (revised the Vulgate, issued a new Index). These contributions could be compared with the limited progress achieved by earlier popes such as **Alexander VI** (secular-minded and corrupt), **Julius II** (patron of the arts, warrior prince, convened Lateran council), **Leo X** (nepotist, simoniac, ended the council, banned Luther), **Clement VII** (allowed Lutheranism to expand, papal lands to be invaded and Rome sacked).

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

- 23 Assess the reasons why the Catholic Reformation in Spain and Italy was more successful than elsewhere in Europe in the course of the sixteenth century. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for successes in Spain and Italy compared with elsewhere.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates may suggest that success in Spain and Italy between 1500 and 1600 depended upon the following factors:

(1) the absence or limited appeal of Protestantism, but its popularity elsewhere; mainly rural communities were more conservative in their attitudes towards change and reluctant to abandon traditional practices

(2) the proximity of the Papacy to the Italian states – this encouraged reform among bishops, the Roman Inquisition and secular rulers

(3) the political and religious conditions in Spain - due to legacy of Ximenes, activities of the Inquisition and personal zeal of Philip II

(4) the more urbanised states resented papal taxation, and were more receptive to Protestant ideas and propaganda spread by the printing press – most evident in the Holy Roman Empire, but censorship was exercised by the Index in Spain and Italy.

(5) Catholic missionaries were well received in Italy and Spain, but resented in some other Catholic states e.g. France.

Candidates may point out that the reformed Catholic Church had the greatest impact in Spain, Italy, Portugal, Poland, Hungary, southern Germany and Austria, and was least successful in England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, the Spanish Netherlands, northern and western Germany, and Scandinavia. Reward answers that focus on explanations for comparative success and which also demonstrate areas of limited success in Spain and Italy.

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

- 24 Assess the impact of the new religious orders on the revival of the Catholic Church in Europe in the years from 1500 to 1600. [60]**

Focus: Assessment of the impact of the new religious orders

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should evaluate the work and impact of the new orders on the Church and society by 1600. The Jesuits are likely to be central to most answers - the quality of their education was highly admired and their influence in schools, colleges and universities had a lasting effect in Germany and Italy; the strength of their preaching in the face of Protestantism saw the Church recover 'lost' souls in Austria, Hungary Poland, the southern Netherlands, and parts of southern Germany; they were excellent publicists and ready to meet the challenge of Protestantism; they acquired the support of wealthy patrons and secular rulers, and as papal agents often performed diplomatic tasks, being particularly influential at the final session of Trent. Other new orders such as the Theatines, Ursulines, Angelici, Barnabites, Oratorians and Discalced Carmelites also performed much needed charity work, mainly in Italy, and the Capuchins, who began in Ancona, spread to several countries and numbered 7,000 by 1600. These orders sought to raise the educational and spiritual standards of ordinary Catholics. Bands I and II answers need to assess their work, much of which preceded the Jesuits. The better essays may focus on the extent to which the activities of many of these orders were successful but also be aware why some orders, particularly the Jesuits, were more effective than others.

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

- 25 'The factors that made Spain a great power in 1598 were also responsible for its weak condition a century later.' How far do you agree with this statement? [60]

Focus: Assessment of reasons for Spain's deteriorating condition in the 17<sup>th</sup> century

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should assess the reasons for Spain's greatness in 1598 and compare them with the reasons for her decline a century later. Good responses will probably make direct comparisons and identify both similar and different factors. Common factors were: (1) the Spanish kings and their administrations – especially Philip II and Charles II (2) royal finances and the economy – silver bullion, juros, asientos, debts, American trade could be usefully compared (3) the Spanish Empire – a source of power and wealth that became a major liability (4) Spanish military and naval power – supreme and feared in 1598 but puny and incapable by 1700 (5) Spanish Church – a scourge of heretics and source of internal unity that became oppressive and reactionary. Dissimilar factors are: (1) the military and economic rise of France – a weak and divided nation in 1598 that became the dominant force in Europe (2) the Netherlands had not assisted Spain in its rise to greatness – it was a constant burden until 1648 but not a problem thereafter (3) the loss of Portugal and its empire – it contributed little to Spain's greatness but its quest for independence weakened Spain (4) separatism in Catalonia, Aragon and Naples – a potential weakness in 1598 that turned into frequent revolts throughout the century. Knowledge of Philip II's reign is not required but candidates should have an understanding of his legacy and problems in 1598. Reward essays that show a firm grasp of continuity and change over time and which demonstrate the impact of particular factors.

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

- 26 Assess the importance of the Dutch Revolt (1621-1648) as a cause of Spain's international decline in the years from 1598 to 1700. [60]**

Focus: Assessment of the Dutch Revolt as a cause of Spain's international decline.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The ongoing Dutch Revolt in 1598-1609 and 1621-48 weakened the Spanish treasury, diverted military and naval resources from other areas of Europe, brought defeat, and encouraged England and France to attack Spain, and Portugal to strive for (and get) its independence. The loss of the United Provinces at Munster led to the permanent loss of valuable trade and economic resources and weakened Spain's self-confidence, invincible reputation and prestige as a world power. However, it can be argued that peace with the Dutch enabled Spain to concentrate on fighting France and the 1650s saw several victories. Expect candidates, however, to offer a counter-argument and suggest that other factors were as much if not more important as the Dutch Revolt. Foremost is likely to be the rise of France which played a key role in Spain's decline from 1628 onwards. It fomented rebellions in Catalonia and Portugal, encouraged England and the United Provinces in their wars against Spain, and exhausted and defeated Spain in 1628-31, 1635-59, 1667-8, 1672-9, 1689-97, seizing lands in Italy, the Netherlands and Alsace. As a result, Spain suffered financially, economically and politically. Another argument is that Spain's international decline owed more to economic and political factors. Candidates may point out that Olivares' attempt to reform the economy and armed forces met with much opposition, that Philip IV's desire to assist his Austrian cousin committed Spain to a war it did not need, and that Charles II and his advisers lacked the ability and resources to halt Spain's decline in the face of Louis XIV's aggression. A combination of factors, therefore, explains Spain's international decline and these are needed to set the Dutch Revolt in context.

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



- 27 Which administration do you hold most accountable for Spain's decline in the years from 1598 to 1700: the administration of Philip III, Philip IV or Charles II? [60]**

Focus: Comparison of the administrations of three kings responsible for the decline.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

It is likely that many candidates will hold Charles II most responsible and Philip III least responsible for Spain's decline, if only because Charles was a physically and politically weak king who presided over the near collapse of the empire, whereas the problems facing Philip III were nothing like as serious. Charles' reign saw unprecedented levels of bankruptcy, administrative chaos, divided counsels, military defeats in war and rebellion, loss of lands to France and Portugal, and a total inability to defend Spain's frontiers. On the other hand, candidates could argue that Spain's decline owed most to Philip IV and his advisers. Inept policies by Olivares but endorsed by the king caused domestic revolts, increased royal debts, lost lands at Munster and the Pyrenees, and brought considerable political unrest. Some candidates may also hold Philip III responsible for entering the 30 Years' War, for encouraging a renewal of war against the United Provinces, for expelling the Moriscos, and for allowing Lerma to run up high debts without tackling essential financial problems. Better candidates should point out that each ruler was compromised by his inheritance though conditions in 1665 were worse than in 1598 or 1621. Moreover the rising challenge of France, which did so much to hasten Spain's decline, was much more apparent after 1621. For marks in Bands I and II, answers must compare the administrations of all three kings before reaching a judgement.

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

- 28 Assess the importance of economic factors in explaining the rise of France from 1610 to 1715. [60]**

Focus: Comparative evaluation of France's economy in its ascendancy

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on explaining the importance of the economy in the wider context of rising French power and assess its strength and limitations during the period. Most essays are likely to stress (1) the growth in population in the course of the period (2) the improvement in state finances (3) the expansion in trade, industry and transport under Colbert. The combined effect enabled Louis XIV to fund and equip his massive army, to challenge the Dutch commercial dominance, and to enhance his country's wealth and his own patronage at Versailles. Better answers should be aware of various limitations which may include (1) Richelieu and Mazarin's difficulties in raising taxation that was unhappily shouldered by the bourgeoisie and peasantry (2) inadequate agricultural produce which bedevilled all administrations

(3) insufficient numbers of ships to rival Dutch and British merchants effectively. Bands I and II answers should show how the economy assisted in the rise of France, assess its limitations and then compare it with a range of other factors. Among these may be the role of Louis XIV, the contribution of ministers (e.g. Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert, Louvois), the highly centralised administration, the power of the armed forces and their successes at the expense of Spain and the Netherlands.

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

- 29 To what extent did the foreign policies of Richelieu and Mazarin lay the foundations of France's ascendancy as a European power in the years from 1610 to 1715? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the Richelieu's and Mazarin's contribution to the rise of France as a European power

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The key to a good answer will rest on which factors candidates believe enabled France to become a European power and how well they evaluate the foreign policies of Richelieu and Mazarin. Between 1624 and 1659 France acquired influential European allies (notably Sweden, England and the United Provinces), overtook Spain as the dominant power, gained lands at Westphalia and the Pyrenees, and built up the most formidable of armies. Richelieu set the policies in motion and Mazarin brought them to fruition. Louis XIV and his ministers built upon their foundations (e.g. utilised terms from Westphalia and Pyrenees to claim Dutch, German and Spanish territories) to make France supreme among European powers. Better candidates may point out that important changes also occurred in Louis's reign: Colbert further developed the economy, and Louvois and Le Tellier strengthened the armed forces. Louis also modified his foreign policy as events unfolded and coalitions against him were created, and it may be argued that France's ascendancy as a European power owed most to his leadership and ambition. Candidates need to set the foreign policies of Richelieu and Mazarin against other factors, and among these may be internal developments during the ministries of Richelieu and Mazarin as well as under Louis XIV. However, they need to link these directly to 'France's ascendancy as a European power' if they are to reach Bands I and II.

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

**30 How absolute was the monarchy of France in the period from 1610 to 1715? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of absolutism in France during this period

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A definition of 'absolute monarchs' would be helpful since neither Louis XIII nor Louis XIV was totally absolute. Polemicists like Loyseau and Le Bret wrote of Louis XIII's absolutism; Richelieu weakened the nobility; recalcitrant Estates and Huguenots lost their privileges; *intendants* grew in number and authority; the Paris *Parlement* was instructed to register edicts; uncooperative bishops were dismissed; and a *chambre de l'arsenal* (political tribunal) operated from 1631-43. But the monarchy was hedged with limitations. The king and his ministers could not do as they wished; magnates remained strong and the Estates-General showed their power in 1614; Richelieu failed to raise revenue to meet war costs or stop corruption among tax farmers; he had to negotiate with the *pays d'état* to extend taxes, and they resisted his use of *élus*. Candidates may suggest that the French monarchy became 'more absolute' under Louis XIV: his demi-god status at Versailles; the writing of Bossuet; Louis' control over national and regional assemblies, *parlements* and royal councils; his highly developed administration, salaried *intendants* (agents of absolutism) and bureaucracy of *officiers*; his largest standing army in Europe; state censorship; treatment of Fouquet, Huguenots, Gallican Articles. However, his power was also limited by corrupt officials and a failure to reform royal finances; *parlements* that obstructed royal edicts; religious dissenters that survived persecution; aristocratic governors that still acted independently; corporate bodies that retained privileges; and seigneurial and church courts that impeded a uniform legal system.

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

- 31 To what extent did the accession of Louis XVI in 1774 mark a turning point in the development of French absolutism during the period from 1661 to 1789? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the accession of Louis XVI as a turning point in the development of French absolutism during this period

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates might agree or disagree about the importance of 1774 but they must discuss it as a turning point and set developments before and after it in the context of the whole period. A turning point should be seen as a major change and relevant features should be explained and linked to French absolutism. Relations with *parlements*, estates, the church and papacy, the nobility, royal finances, the difficulty of introducing significant reforms to the ancien régime, the personalities of the monarchs and the growth and influence of opposition groups, are some areas that might be assessed. The reigns of Louis XIV and Louis XV need to be evaluated and some might regard 1661 or 1715 as valid alternatives to 1774. Louis XIV's reign shaped the nature of French absolutism and Louis XV showed its limitations as well as its strengths. Some might refer to the natural weakness of an absolute monarchy during his minority when France was ruled by a Regency (1715-23).

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

- 32 To what extent can the period from 1661 to 1796 be described as 'The Age of Enlightenment'? Explain your answer. [60]

Focus: Assessment of the validity of an historical judgement

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to assess this description in relation to France, Austria and Russia and focus on religious, scientific, political, economic and social developments. It would be helpful if the term 'enlightenment' is defined. Some candidates may view this as a predominantly 18<sup>th</sup> century movement but better essays may refer to French writers in Louis XIV's reign as well. Most candidates are likely to discuss the French *philosophes* and probably refer to Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau and Montesquieu. Some answers will point out that as the Enlightenment only appealed to a few literates in society and as it was limited chronologically, it would be an exaggeration to describe the whole period as 'the age of enlightenment'. Some may suggest the 'Age of Reason' as a more appropriate description, highlighting the increasing importance of science and religion for enlightened thinkers, criticism of the church's intolerant and reactionary attitudes, and the development of political despotism in many states that, to some writers, was at odds with enlightened thinking. It is important that better answers address the whole period in their assessment.

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

- 33 **‘Absolute in theory but limited in practice.’ Assess this view of the power of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great in Russia.**

[60]

Focus: Evaluation of theoretical and practical power of Peter and Catherine in Russia

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Absolutism was part of the natural, divinely created order, and in theory both Peter and Catherine were all-powerful. In practice, however, their achievements were more limited. Candidates need to compare and evaluate Peter and Catherine in respect of their relations with the nobility, church, merchants and serfs, and assess the extent to which they were able to overcome the vast and backward areas of Russia, and the dead weight of Russian traditions and powerful conservative groups. Some candidates might focus more on Peter than Catherine but a balanced approach is required for Bands III and above. Candidates should consider the nature of ‘absolute in theory’ in the light of the church’s teaching and society’s beliefs, and some evaluation is expected for Band I essays. It is likely that most answers will focus on the practical limitations of the two rulers, and the better essays may well compare and contrast their power. Catherine was limited by her sex and foreign nationality; Peter, on the other hand, faced a more truculent church and aristocracy.

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

## 2591 Themes in History 1763 – 1996

### Britain and Ireland 1798 – 1921

- 1 Assess the reasons why Sinn Fein was more successful than other groups in achieving the aims of revolutionary nationalism in the period from 1798 to 1921. [60]**

Focus: An assessment of the relative success of the revolutionary nationalist groups.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates will need to focus comparatively on those groups who sought an independent, republican and possibly Gaelic Ireland, from Wolfe Tone through Emmet, Young Ireland, the Fenians and IRB, the Land League to the Irish Volunteers, the IRA and Sinn Fein (1905). Better candidates might point to failure even by Sinn Fein as Ireland was partitioned, Dominion status nominally accepted and naval bases conceded. Nonetheless it was Sinn Fein that secured an independent Irish Parliament, government and military. Factors that could be considered include military, comparing Michael Collins guerrilla tactics (focused on the RIC – police) with those of outright rebellion (Tone, Emmet, Young Ireland and Fenian ‘outrages’) which could easily be put down. Only Land League violence presaged Sinn Fein’s tactics. Leadership is a fruitful area, from Romantic gesture through to the careful planning of DeValera and Collins. Mention could be made of foreign backing – half hearted by the French in 1798 and the Germans in 1914, more important in the form of US money and diplomatic pressure for the Fenians and Sinn Fein respectively. Electoral politics is also crucial. Those pre Parnell scorned it, seeing it as too dependent on Westminster politics. The Land League used it to good effect, in secret association with Parnell. Sinn Fein used it in 1917/1918 and beyond, becoming the most effective Parliamentary party since Parnell. A newly democratic Britain had few non coercive responses to this. It was aided by the bankruptcy and collapse of constitutional nationalism. The support of the Catholic Church and Tenant Farmers also helped from 1918, if not before. Risings are a fruitful area for candidates, especially their linkage with major wars (Wolfe Tone; the Easter Rising). The latter was ably cultivated by Sinn Fein to promote a myth that it was a Sinn Fein rising.

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



- 2 **‘The First Home Rule Bill of 1886 was the most important turning-point in the history of the Union with Ireland.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1800 to 1921?** [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of the First Home Rule Bill in the history of the Union with Ireland.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates will need to compare the 1<sup>st</sup> Home Rule Bill to other important events between 1800 and 1921. Possibilities might be: Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829 with its concessions on the religious nature of the Union which led to office holding for a potential Ascendancy successor group, the catholic Tenant Farmers who became, progressively, of considerable importance as the key group in the Union. The Famine arguably focused cultural and social resentment against the union and created an influential Irish ‘nation’ abroad in the US (Fenians) who masterminded famine and terror aimed at the Union. The Risings, especially that of Easter 1916, could be considered, although as a ‘rising within a rising’ it could be dismissed if not linked to the wider context (the first world war, reprisal, Sinn Fein tactics, Conscription and the 1918 Reform Act which transformed the electoral situation in Ireland). It certainly ensured that the 19<sup>th</sup> century Union would not survive. When discussing Home Rule in 1886 candidates could dismiss it on the grounds that constitutional nationalism had long espoused it (O’Connell, Butt and Parnell) and that it failed in 1886 (and again in 1893 and 1912). However the case for its importance is that it had been championed by a major political party and government and remained the obsession of Gladstone until his death. He was prepared to break the then Liberal Party to achieve it. It dominated the Irish agenda, as far as British governments were concerned, until 1921 (the Government of Ireland Act of 1920 simply proposed two Home Rule parliaments for Ireland, that of Ulster being achieved). Nonetheless it was still reform within the Union and provoked much opposition.

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

- 3 'Coercion proved more effective than concession in maintaining the Union with Ireland.' How far do you agree with reference to the period from 1800 to 1921? [60]

Focus: A comparison of the effectiveness of methods used by governments to secure the Union with Ireland.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates will need to examine the effects of these two different approaches in maintaining and pacifying the Union at various stages, bearing in mind that various parties had their own priorities and preferences. It is possible to argue that coercion was more effective if applied with sufficient force (and ran from the suspension of Habeas Corpus through to military force and, in the form of the Black and Tans, state terrorism). Huge losses were inflicted on Ireland following Wolfe Tone rising in 1798. A large part of the army was stationed there throughout the century. Ireland was not seen as a problem between 1800 and the mid 1820s. Legal supervision and force characterised the 1840s. The 1850s, and most of the 1860s, saw relative peace. Force was again used, culminating in Parnell's imprisonment in the early 1880s in response to the Land War, whilst Balfour applied a two edged policy. Coercion under a military government was applied again between 1916 and 1921. Although periods of stability were achieved it could be argued that coercion was counter productive, as in the early 1880s or post 1916, the latter leading to partition, quasi independence and the end of the Union in the South. Better candidates might focus on changing circumstances which ensured coercion was less well received, especially 1912-1921. As the Irish electorate increased it could have serious effects, as the 1918 election showed. Concession, especially when linked to satisfying grievances (Maynooth and Disestablishment in 1869; or Land Reform 1870 – 1903) could be effective, bringing the Catholic Church and Tenant farmers 'on side'. This too however was seen by some as encouraging Irish radicalism, whether O'Connell, Parnell or agrarian organisation. It could and did have serious effects on political parties, Home Rule splitting the Liberals and energising Ulster, creating the problem of dealing with two distinct and contrary Irish nationalisms. Better candidates could point out that British government used both coercion and concessions in tandem.

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

**War and Society in Britain 1793 – 1918**

- 4** 'Reform of the army and navy was mainly driven by the need to recruit.' How far would you agree with reference to the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the reason for army and navy reform

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to address the relative importance of the need to recruit in relation to other factors at various points of reform (Napoleonic war reform; Howick in 1847, Cardwell, Haldane, Kitchener and Fisher). To demonstrate the primacy of recruitment one could cite examples from the Napoleonic Wars as Britain moved from the recruitment of mercenaries to the situation reached in the 1840s where 11-12,000 recruits annually were required to make good the wastage. Howick's Enlistment Bill in 1847 (the 10 year option) and various naval measures hoped to create reserves and find a solution to empressment. Disease would also create havoc. In 1853 an Act allowed 16-17 year olds 2 years training before 10 year service. However the Crimean War's ad hoc methods demonstrated it had not been solved. Cardwell's army reforms were partly driven by prosperity and the drying up of Irish recruitment, hence the need to be more humanitarian. Haldane and Fisher similarly were concerned with this, whilst Kitchener's primary purpose was to recruit a huge volunteer army in 1914. Candidates could also argue for the importance of other factors – the need to re-organise to secure the needs of Britain and her Navy and the need to respond to popular pressures and the press, especially post Crimean and Boer Wars. Military and naval disaster could also prompt a re-examination, as could the ever present pressures to cut costs (Cardwell's army reform). Domestic political circumstances could also play a part, such as opposition to particular commanders, the need to react to strategic threats or to battles like those between Palmerston and Gladstone.

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

- 5 To what extent were imperial interests the main factor in determining Britain's naval and military strategy in the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]**

Focus: An evaluation of the factors in determining strategy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. There is much to suggest that this was the case for most of the period, especially 1793 – 1807 and again from 1815 – 1907. Naval strategy was founded on trading and imperial interests throughout the period (except 1803 – 1805 and 1914 – 1918). Fleets were stationed to guard trading arteries and especially routes to India. A Bluewater Strategy suited an imperial country. Similarly the army became essentially a colonial one, forswearing a continental commitment. The Crimean War essentially saw such a colonial army sent to fight in Europe. The Boer War was the same and, initially the French Revolutionary Wars and the First World War (the B.E.F). However there are two other very important factors in British strategy. European interests often distorted the above, most notably in the Peninsular War and on the Western Front during the First World War. Britain preferred dealing with Europe via allies (Napoleonic War) and a carefully maintained balance of power, only occasionally exercising power to assert herself in chosen areas (Greece, Italy, Crimea, the Scheldt, Malta, Acre, Alexandria etc). Also of key importance was the UK's domestic security when threatened by invasion (Napoleon's invasion fleet at Boulogne and the threat of being cut off by the race to the sea in 1914). This ensured that continual commitments were made to defend the Low Countries, the Grand Fleet was stationed at Scapa Flow and a huge army was built up on the Western Front. Better answers will be aware of changing circumstances and the nature of British defence.

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

**6 How effectively was war opposed in Britain in the period from 1793 to 1918? [60]**

Focus: An evaluation of the effectiveness of opposition to war.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates could take different approaches to this. One possibility is to examine it through individual politicians or campaigners such as Paine, Cobden, Bright, Gladstone or Morley, in which clearly some, given their political position, were a lot more effective in curbing war. Gladstone for example waged a successful campaign as Chancellor to limit the possibility of war with France in the 1860s. He also brought down Disraeli's government via the Midlothian campaign. Yet he and others were less effective on other occasions, notably the Opium Wars, where Palmerston was able to win a snap election. A difficult approach is to focus on groups and their campaigns (like the middle class Peace Society). Possibilities would be the Gladstonian Liberals and their opposition to imperial campaigns in the 1870s, Little Englanders in the Boer War (who eventually succeeded in publicising the 'methods of Barbarism'), the Foxite Whigs and the Painite Radicals' in the 1790s and conscientious objectors in the First World War. Successful candidates will focus on their relative effectiveness, a matter of some controversy. Clearly the Painite Radicals, despite the Corresponding Societies and other radical techniques, failed. Far more successful were the Nonconformists who, through press ownership and the Liberal Party, were able to mount successful campaigns against war with Russia and imperial adventures. The socialists of the ILP and the Old Liberals had less success in preventing the First World War or in bringing about a negotiated peace. Local Nonconformity, especially in some northern towns, did succeed in providing communal support to conscientious objection in the prevailing pro war spirit. Clearly elected officials, backed by Liberal newspapers and Chapel pulpits could be practically effective in a way that individual stances (Siegfried Sassoon and the Soldier's Declaration) could not.

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

**Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948**

- 7 To what extent were Liberal social reforms (1906-14) the most important turning point in the approach of governments to poverty from 1834 to 1948? [60]**

Focus: an assessment of the contribution of the Liberal social reforms in attempts to tackle poverty.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. The Liberal social reforms certainly seemed a departure from laissez-faire individualism and a move towards state interventionism on a scale that was unprecedented. There was a clear focus on the separate categories of poverty and specific measures designed to help particular groups (children, the elderly, the sick and the unemployed). There was also an acknowledgement that the reasons for poverty were linked (e.g. 1911 National Insurance). However, candidates should attempt to provide a balanced analysis pointing out that the reforms constituted a minimum (not optimum) form of state provision and were not planned as a comprehensive package. Some of the developments could be viewed as flawed and showing little change from the past. In a way, Old Age Pensions were simply a refined form of outdoor relief and National Insurance was a limited extension of the services previously supplied by Friendly Societies and Industrial Insurance Companies. The Poor Law continued to be the main institution for dealing with the poor until 1928 and a comprehensive 'cradle to grave' provision was not introduced until 1945. Thus, there would be a good case for arguing there was more continuity than change in the way the poor were treated throughout the period.

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

- 8 Assess the reasons why governments struggled to deal with public health issues from 1834 to 1948. [60]**

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for the relative slowness of public health reform.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. The prevalence of laissez-faire thinking meant that those who favoured government intervention to confront public health issues would always struggle to get their wishes met. Hence, the 1848 Public Health Act was permissive and the legislation of the last quarter of the nineteenth century contained loopholes that vested interests continued to exploit. When government involvement became more acceptable (especially after the First World War) there were still major financial constraints that hindered progress. The cost of war, international economic instability, the opportunity cost of public health reform and fears about raising taxes at national and local level, all contributed to a rather conservative approach to public health reform. In fact, it is fair to say that most improvement was the result of the benevolence and enterprise of individuals at grassroots level (e.g. Chamberlain, Cadbury), although the Second World War seemed to provide a turning point, resulting in the New Towns Act and Housing Act of 1946. Candidates may also discuss how progress depended on the rate of technological development (e.g. Underground drains, intra urban transport and advancements in medicine (e.g. The discovery of water borne microbes). Generally, they should take a fairly broad view of the term 'public health' and avoid a chronological description of changes to housing legislation. Answers reaching Bands I and II ought to contain a judgement about the relative importance of factors and show how they might be linked.

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

- 9 To what extent were government welfare policies influenced by a genuine concern to improve the lives of the population from 1834 to 1948? [60]

Focus: an assessment of the motives of governments in attempts to deal with welfare needs.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. ...

Candidates should think hard about what motivated governments in their attempts to deal with the welfare needs of the masses and what evidence they can use to support their observations. It is possible to argue that there were clear instances throughout the period when politicians adopted an altruistic approach to meeting welfare needs. This was apparent, to some extent, with the passing of factory legislation in the nineteenth century, the housing acts of the 1870s and 80s, and the extension of educational provision. The Liberal social reforms were partly a result of genuine concern over child welfare, family poverty and rewarding the elderly for their contributions to society. Inter-war welfare provision also stemmed from a wish to create a better society for people who had bravely fought in the First World War. However, it is possible to argue that the economic and social policies of politicians throughout were based on expediency. For example, nineteenth century public health reforms were partially the result of the fear of cholera outbreaks, which affected all social groups. Legislation to do with education was often linked with a wish to improve economic performance. The 1906-14 reforms were connected with questions about national efficiency and a wish to effectively maintain an Empire. The unemployment measures from 1918 to 1939 were designed to avert social unrest, (hence the 'dole'). Often, measures were carried out to win political support. Candidates should not be expected to provide detailed and specific evidence about the motives of individual politicians and particular parties, but an attempt to provide a balanced analysis and evaluation is to be expected for the higher bands.

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



**The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992**

- 10 To what extent was the development of the Labour party mostly dependent on economic and social change during the period from 1868 to 1992? [60]**

Focus: an assessment of factors that influenced the labour party.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should take a broad view of what constituted the labour party and movement (e.g. trades unions, other pressure groups, the party, role of individuals, events) and balance economic and social change against other factors. Generally, certain parts of the labour movement, particularly trades unions, made good progress when the economy performed well (and vice versa). Economic prosperity meant the demand for labour was high and placed the representatives of the working classes in a strong bargaining position. For example, it was no coincidence that General Unionism and the infant Labour party emerged in the last decades of the nineteenth century by when the economy had recovered significantly from the Great Depression of the early 1870s. Labour was relatively weak in the inter-war period, but strong again in the 'swinging', prosperous 1960s. Social change was also crucial to progress. Urbanisation and the emergence of class consciousness, the expansion of educational provision, the rise of the mass media and the spread of non-conformist religions all contributed to the growth of the labour movement. However, candidates should discuss the relative merits of other influences, particularly extensions to the franchise, the weakness and failings of the Conservatives and Liberals at specific points in time, the impact of war and other external factors, such as the rise (and fall in Europe) of communism. A balanced response is to be expected for answers gaining marks in Bands I and II.

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

- 11 **‘Parliamentary reform was the most important influence on the development of democracy from 1868 to 1992’. How far do you agree with this statement?** [60]

Focus: an assessment of the significance of changes to the Houses of Parliament.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to argue that changes to the Houses of Parliament did have significance, although it is possible to argue that other developments were far more important for the growth of democracy. Reforms to the Lords were probably more important than those of the Commons. Answers may well focus on the 1911 constitutional crisis and the reduction in the power of the Lords reinforced by the 1948 reform. However, there were notable changes in the Commons as electoral reform (extensions to the franchise, redistribution of seats, ‘secret voting’) changed its composition. These seemed to have a positive impact on the development of democracy, although some innovations such as the televising of parliament, were more contentious. Better answers should measure the importance of these changes against other influences, such as the widening of the electorate, the emergence of new political parties, the changing role of the prime minister, educational reforms, the role of the mass media and the growth of pressure group activity.

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

- 12 To what extent was the First World War the main turning point in changing the social and political roles of women during the period from 1868 to 1992? [60]

Focus: an assessment of factors that influenced the role of women in the development of democracy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should start with discussion about the impact of the First World War on the role of women. They are likely to consider the contribution of women to the war effort, and how this appeared to be linked to the achievement of getting the vote. In turn, this seemed to lead to representation in parliament by women (the first female MP was elected in 1918; by 1929 2.3% of MPs were women), and a further extension to the franchise in 1928, which encompassed all women over the age of 21. Before the war, the traditional view was that the role of women in politics was the preserve of the middle classes, and largely involved membership of two pressure groups; the NUWS (1897) and the WSPU (1903). Some may argue that the formation of these associations were more significant than the effects of war. Others could point out that this constitutes a narrow view. Women were also active in politics via links with trade unionism (e.g. The match girls), local government and institutions linked to social reform (e.g. School Boards). Better candidates are likely to argue that the political status of women in the second half of the period (i.e. Post 1945) had little to do with the First World War, but was more directly linked to the new social egalitarianism that emerged from the late 1940s onwards. Finally, a valid observation might be that in relative terms, by the end of the period, the role of women had changed marginally despite the influence of Thatcher.

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

**The Development of The Mass Media**

- 13 **‘American influence on the development of the mass media in Britain was limited.’  
How far do you agree with this judgement on the period from 1896  
to 1996?** [60]

Focus: the growing influence of techniques and programmes from the USA

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.  
Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The specification refers to the influence of new techniques and programmes from the USA, so most candidates are likely to have knowledge of the new types of programme which began to appear in the broadcast media of radio and television (talk shows, soaps, fast-moving situation comedies, cartoons, DJs, specialist channels, ‘jingles’ etc) as well as developments in techniques and aspects in the latter part of the period such as cable & satellite multi-channel availability in TV . However, it is hoped that the better answers will show recognition of American influences on the press (including aspects of the industrialisation of the press, content and look) as well as the more obvious influence on the newer media. Arguments in support of the premise may include the strong persistence of home-grown influences, for example ‘tabloid’ and mass appeal newspapers owed as much arguably to British traditions of cheap novels and fly-posting as they did to transatlantic examples, while the broadcast media both for a long time adopted a distinctive formality and type of programming that was very different from the character of American counterparts, as well as resisting the commercialisation of the USA. Also, answers may rightly make the point that American influence fluctuated and in many ways tended to be strongest in the early stages of the new technologies, for example television. Finally, some candidates may want to make the point that ‘American’ may include Canadian, and the role of Beaverbrook for example.

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

- 14 To what extent did the role and importance of the press change from 1896 to 1996 because of the emergence of radio and then television? [60]

Focus: the growth of the national press and the role of the press in the age of television; the changing balance between the three main roles of the press, radio and television.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. It is important that candidates should recognise that although the question appears to focus on the later part of the period after the emergence of the new broadcast media, it is essential for success that the whole period is considered and used, and that just as much thought goes into establishing what existed in the earlier period so that comparisons can be made. Indeed this is a comparison question and successful answers are likely to be structured accordingly. However, examiners should be prepared to accept a wide range of interpretations of 'role' and 'importance' in candidates' essays, and even for 'importance' to include some discussion of whether the impact of the press on society and government changed because of the emergence of radio and then television. Legitimate approaches would be to assess whether the relative importance of the roles to educate, inform and entertain of the press were affected by the rise of the new media; whether circulation, influence or range of the press were affected; if governments were more or less influenced by the press. Effective answers are also likely to set the influence or competition of radio and television against other possible explanations of the changes in the press, such as changes in society more generally.

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

- 15 To what extent did governments and politicians successfully adapt to the challenges posed by the growth of the mass media from 1896 to 1996? [60]**

Focus: the impact of the new forms of mass communication on government

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. The emergence of mass media and new forms of communication posed a huge challenge to politicians and governments who had hitherto found it comparatively easy to manage the information available to the public. The challenge was made all the greater because of the coincidental extension of the franchise and improvements in mass education and literacy. Some politicians and governments saw the opportunities offered by the developments and responded positively or manipulated the new media skilfully (Lloyd George, Baldwin and Churchill might be used as examples earlier in the period, while Wilson and Margaret Thatcher are often good later examples); politicians who were less alive to the opportunities or less effective might include Eden or Douglas Home or Heath.

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

**The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1918**

- 16 To what extent did technological change revolutionise warfare in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of specific technologies on the warfare of this period

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Two lines of debate might be expected, one accepting the question, the other rejecting it. For the former, candidates might argue that the increase in firepower and range of both artillery and small arms on the battlefield had major effects on the conduct of war in the period. Evidence for this might be the increase in casualties, the need for the use of cover and more dispersed formations. At a strategic level developments in transport and communication allowed for the rapid movement of soldiers in war and superior control. Examples might be the Wars of Unification, the American Civil War and WWI. The opposite case might argue that the conduct of war did not keep up with technological change due to the conservatism of the military establishments of the period or individual leaders. Here continuity would dominate the essay. All of the cases cited above will fit this argument. Some candidates might argue for a middle case. They might argue for more revolutionary activity in certain narrow time frames in the period 1792-1918. Technology developed at a far slower pace in the earlier part of the period with its impact on war greater as time went on. The Wars of Unification and WWI spring to mind. An alternative might be to argue for revolution in tactics but continuity in strategy or vice versa.

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

- 17 To what extent did superior planning and preparation determine success in war in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of planning and preparation on the warfare of this period

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. The question prompts a discussion of the organisation of war by the combatant powers of the period. Napoleon was the first to develop a true general staff and this was taken to new levels of effectiveness by the Prussian general staff of the middle and later part of the period. The planning of WWI is an obvious case for discussion. Candidates might point to ineffective planning and preparation as a basis for argument, a good example of deficiencies in this era was the army of Napoleon III and Austrians in 1866. The failure of planning and preparation might be a useful way to argue against the premise of the question. Logistics could be a component of the essay. The American Civil War fits into the mainstream of debate. Better candidates must balance these two factors against others, but a discussion of planning and preparation must form the core of the essay.

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



- 18 To what extent was Napoleon the most important influence on the development of generalship in the period from 1792 to 1918? [60]

Focus:

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Two responses might be expected. The first might concentrate on the role of individual generals. In which case Napoleon's key role in the development of generalship would either be accepted or rejected. If the latter course were followed then one might expect a series of other individuals advanced as candidates for being the most influential on the development of generalship. A second type of response might reject the role of individuals all together and argue a case for continuity and slow evolution of generalship.

Candidates might argue that Napoleon's influence caused a major change in generalship that set the model for all 19<sup>th</sup> century generals to follow. The works of Jomini and Clausewitz and their influence might form part of this debate. Against the argument is the changing nature of war in the period and the need to revise methods of generalship. The rise of more 'managerial' generals in the middle part of the century, especially the Prussian general staff, might be discussed. This could also apply to WWI.

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

**Europe 1792 – 1919****The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815 – 1919**

- 19 Assess the view that the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 was the most important turning-point in the growth of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919. [60]**

Focus: Evaluation of the relative significance of the Franco-Prussian War as a turning point in the growth of German nationalism in the period 1815 - 1919.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period. Candidates should focus on the phrase 'most important turning point' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. In assessing the significance of the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 candidates are likely to stress the decline of Austrian influence in Germany, the North German Confederation and the consequent domination of Germany by Prussia. What follows is not an exclusive list of other potential turning-points, but obvious consideration could be given to 1848-49, 1862, 1870/71, 1888 (and / or 1890) and 1914. Clearly answers of the very highest quality can be written without considering all of these potential turning points, but the most able candidates will demonstrate a breadth of vision and a good understanding of the moments that shaped the destiny of German nationalism. Any answers that are limited to the importance of the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866, however full and accurate, are severely flawed and may not be awarded more than Band III.

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

- 20 'German nationalists had little influence on the creation and development of Germany from 1815 to 1919'. To what extent do you agree with this view? [60]

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the creation and development of Germany.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the dominant factors in the creation and development of Germany during this period, from the development of the nationalist movement after 1815 to the development of more radical nationalism in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. Candidates may argue that the emergence of romantic nationalism had an impact on the creation and development of Germany. Candidates may argue that the divisions within the nationalist movement weakened their impact. However, candidates must show that they understand that intellectual German nationalism was not the sole factor determining the creation and development of Germany in this period. Any answers that are limited to the importance of German nationalism, however full and accurate, are severely flawed and may not be awarded more than Band III. Candidates should be able to contrast the importance of nationalism with other factors: e.g. by explaining the importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870 / 71. Military strength depended upon economic strength: 'Coal & Iron' rather than 'Blood & Iron' could be usefully debated. The leadership role played by Bismarck in determining the shape, extent and development of the German Empire may usefully be discussed. Candidates could argue that Bismarck's ideas owed little or nothing to nationalism and that therefore the contribution of nationalism to the creation of Germany was minimal. The impact of Kaiser Wilhelm II from 1888 was arguably as significant on the further development and fortunes of Germany.

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

- 21 **Assess the view that the German nation was just as divided from 1871 to 1919 as it was from 1815 to 1870.** [60]

Focus: An assessment of the extent to which the German people were united in this period, and whether they were more united from 1871 onwards than previously.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the extent to which the German people were more united in the period following the creation of the Second Reich than they were up to 1870. There are many possible approaches to this question as candidates may consider unity territorially and / or politically and / or economically and / or socially. Candidates should argue both for and against this proposition. Candidates may understand that the Prussian Empire in 1871 represented Kleindeutschland and was an enlarged Prussia. They may argue that it was a Prussian Empire rather than a German Empire; it certainly did not unite all the German people even geographically. The exclusion of Austria from the process of German unification may be dealt with, though candidates may refer to Bismarck's creation of the Dual Alliance as significant. Divisions within the German Nation after 1871 might be illustrated through the Kulturkampf and the rise of socialism, or the domination of the Reich by the elites. However, candidates may also argue that territorial boundaries rarely exactly match where the people of that nationality live and that divisions within a nation based on class or culture do not necessarily define the unity or otherwise of that nation. All modern nations have exhibited such divisions. They could certainly argue that the German Empire from 1871 physically united the majority of Germans. Candidates may argue that the German nation was very divided from 1815 as a consequence of decisions taken at the Congress of Vienna, but could also argue that the German Confederation from 1815 did loosely bind most Germans into a Confederation with a Diet. Candidates may also make the point that from 1866 the vast majority of German states were already united behind the leadership of Prussia. Candidates may argue that the growing emergence of the nationalist movement after 1815 to the development of more radical nationalism in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries demonstrates an emergence of greater national unity amongst the German people during this period. Candidates may argue that the First World War both united the German nation, at first, but that divisions soon arose and were entrenched by 1918. Similarly, whilst Versailles divided the nation geographically it united the nation in condemnation and bitterness of the 'diktat'.

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

**Europe 1855 – 1956****Russian Dictatorship 1855 – 1956**

- 22 Assess the view that the urban working classes of Russia were treated worse by the communist rulers than by the Tsars during this period. [60]**

Focus: Comparative assessment of the condition of the industrial and urban working class peoples of Russia during this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on an understanding of the experience and impact of communism on the living and working conditions of Russia's industrial and urban working class. Some candidates may compare and contrast Marxist ideology with the actual experience of life in the USSR. Candidates should compare the experience of the working class under the tsars with their experience under the communists. Candidates are likely to limit their evaluation of life for the proletariat under the Tsars from around 1890 as there were comparatively few urban workers prior to Witte's 'Great Spurt'. However, some candidates may deal with the whole period from 1855 as there were serfs working in factories prior to Emancipation in 1861. Candidates may treat Russia's peasants as part of their discussions as the growing proletariat consisted largely of urbanised peasants, but the main focus should involve a consideration of the experience of Russia's industrial working class or proletariat and candidates who fail to discuss the industrial and urban workers may not be put into Bands (I) or (II) or (III). Candidates are likely to compare the impact of industrialization on the lives of the people, both before and after 1917. Similarities could include the grim experience of industrialization experienced by the proletariat, both as a consequence of Witte's 'Great Spurt' and Stalin's Five Year Plans. Candidates may wish to compare the scale of the suffering under Lenin and Stalin with that experienced before 1917. Candidates may argue that the working peoples gained benefits from Soviet rule, for example in the sphere of education.

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

- 23 **'Reluctant reformers.'** How far do you agree with this view of the rulers of Russia in the period from 1855 to 1956? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the nature of Russian government in the period from 1855 to 1956, and of the extent to which the rulers in this period only reformed reluctantly.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should evaluate the assertion that the rulers of Russia were 'reluctant reformers' in this period. Candidates should argue both for and against the assertion in the question. When arguing in favour, examples may be drawn from across the period, from Alexander III's imposition of the Reaction from 1881 and the influence of Pobedonostsev to the repression of Lenin (e.g. Red Terror) and Stalin (e.g. Gulags, purges and Show Trials). Candidates may argue that some of the rulers only introduced reform under duress, for example Nicholas II in 1905 and Lenin in 1921. Candidates may also argue that rulers were at times forced into the adoption of repressive policies because of adverse circumstance, or to ensure their regime's survival (e.g. Lenin during the Civil War). However, when arguing against the assertion candidates can also draw on a wide range of evidence; examples could include Alexander II's intention to introduce 'reform from above' from 1856, Lenin's post-revolutionary reforms and the reforms initiated by Khrushchev towards the end of this period. Some candidates may well challenge the assertion by reference to such events as the Emancipation of the serfs and Witte's 'Great Spurt'. Stalin may have valued repression but was arguably equally determined to impose change on the USSR. Candidates may well cite various examples of Stalin (perhaps with particular reference to the Five Year Plans) doing much to change Russia.

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

- 24 Assess the reasons why opponents of Russian governments were rarely successful in the period from 1855 to 1956. [60]**

Focus: An assessment of the reasons why opponents of the regime were rarely successful in the period from 1855 to 1956.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on why the opponents of the regime were rarely successful in this period. Candidates should consider the effectiveness of opposition throughout the period, for example showing awareness of the reasons why opposition was so often unsuccessful rather than concentrating only on 1917 and suggesting simplistically that opposition was successful. Candidates may focus on the abdication of Nicholas II in 1917 and the reasons why the Romanov dynasty fell when considering 'rarely successful'. Candidates are likely to be more successful if their answers identify factors that help to explain why opposition was often unsuccessful: these factors might include their divisions in terms of aims and methods, the limited intellectual appeal of some opposition groups and factions (and their consequent inability to win mass support), the autocratic and dictatorial nature of government, repression, terror and the role of the secret police. A comparative approach is liable to be more successful than a chronological one. Candidates may successfully draw their examples from throughout the period. Good examples might include the failure of the Narodniks in the reign of Alexander II, the reasons why his assassination by the People's Will had outcomes entirely in contrast to the intent of his assassins, the reasons why rulers like Alexander III and Stalin were significantly successful in silencing their opponents and why Lenin was able to win the Russian Civil War. Why the opponents of the Stalinist regime, even from within the Communist Party, were so unsuccessful may well be discussed. Comparisons may be made between the relative effectiveness of the individual rulers e.g. why opposition to Nicholas II was much more successful than under Alexander III or Lenin or Stalin. The fact that the opponents of the communist regime lacked a populist ideology for people to unite behind may be discussed.

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

**Struggle for the Constitution**

- 25 How far were constitutional changes a result of developments in US society in the period from 1763 to 1877? [60]**

Focus: The role of social change in the development of constitutional changes.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess the importance of social change as a catalyst for constitutional change. Candidates may mention that the social development of the American colonies was an important factor behind the Revolutionary War (1776-1783) and the creation of the USA (1787). Others may state that in assessing the reasons behind the Amendments to the US Constitution social change was only one factor. They may mention factors such as the constitutional clash over 'taxation and representation'; the mishandling of American affairs by successive British government from the early 1760s but mainly by Lord North from 1770 (Stamp Act, Quebec Act, Declaratory Act). The bulk of amendments were in the Bill of Rights of 1791 (the first 10 amendments to the Constitution). The bulk of the amendments dealt with civil rights issues (1-9) and the divisions of authority between federal and state government (Amendment 10). Also amendments 11 and 12 dealt with technical issues. Amendment 11, ratified in 1798 stated that :-the judicial power of the US could not extend to any case involving a US citizen and citizens of other states. Amendment 12 (1804) ensured that the election of President and Vice President should take place separately.

The 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments (1865-1870) were all passed as a result of the Civil War. These changes clearly were linked to the social changes involved in the growing opposition to slavery and its extension into the western territories. The 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment abolished slavery; the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment (1868) guaranteed all US citizens equal protection of the law and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment (1870) outlawed racial discrimination.

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



- 26 To what extent did the US Constitution contribute to sectional conflict within the USA from 1787 to 1877? [60]

Focus: The significance of the US Constitution in causing sectional strife.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Candidates should assess the role of the Constitution and Bill of Rights as the cause of sectional conflict. The issue of slavery was not addressed directly in the Constitution; the Federal nature of the political system created the potential for conflict. The 10<sup>th</sup> amendment of the Constitution, in 1791, elaborated on this issue when it stated that powers not expressly given to the Federal government were reserved for the States. This created tensions, particularly in the 1830s about interposition and the role of States' Rights. In the defence of their position in 1861-5 the Confederate States claimed they were defending States' Rights as enunciated in the Constitution. The expansion of the USA westward strained the federal nature of the Constitution with the attempted balance between Free and Slave states as shown in the Missouri Compromise of 1820. However, candidates could offer a counter-argument. They may state that slavery rather than the Constitution was the main cause of tension. They may link this with westward expansion.

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

- 27 Assess the view that the presidency gained political power at the expense of both Congress and Supreme Court from 1789 to 1877. [60]**

Focus: The relative importance of the three branches of Federal Government in constitutional development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to assess the role of the president. They may mention that over the period, as Commander in chief the President became more important within the Federal Government. They may mention the roles of Jackson, Polk and Lincoln in this respect. They may also mention as both the size of the Federal government increased and political parties developed, these also increased the power of the President. However, candidates may mention that Congress still had considerable power. Financial power, mainly vested in the House of Representatives and the power of advice and consent in the Senate over executive appointment and international treaties were also important. Finally, the US Supreme Court gained power over the period. Under Chief Justice Marshall the court acquired power to declare actions by Congress, President and the States unconstitutional.

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

- 28 Assess the view that the actions of White supremacist groups were the main reason why African Americans were denied their civil rights from 1865 to 1980. [60]**

Focus:- Assessment of the role of White supremacist groups on African American civil rights.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates could mention organisations such as the Ku Klux Klan. Less likely are their reference to the Knights of the White Camelia, a group similar too and operating at the time of the KKK. They may also mention White Citizens' Councils created in the wake of the US Supreme Court Decision on segregated education in 1954/5.

Some candidates may refer to the white dominated State governments which developed in the South following the end of Reconstruction in 1877. These State governments introduced segregation. These groups used intimidation, terrorism and State Law to deny African Americans their civil rights. African Americans were segregated in housing, schools and transportation; the vast majority of Southern Blacks were prevented from registering as voters etc.

Therefore, these groups were central to the denial of civil rights to African Americans, primarily from the 1880s to the 1960s. Candidates may also mention that with the end of Reconstruction, in 1877, the Federal Government in Washington DC turned a blind eye to the actions of these groups. Attempts to make lynching a federal offence failed consistently from the 1890s to the 1940s. Also, until 1948 the US military was segregated on racial lines, thereby reinforcing concept of segregation from State to Federal level. Candidates may also state that it took Federal action, in the form of Supreme Court decisions, Congressional legislation and presidential action to end segregation in the South in the 1950s to 1970s.

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

- 29 To what extent were Asian and Hispanic Americans denied their full civil rights from 1865 to 1980? [60]

Focus: Assessment of the civil rights of two ethnic groups within the USA.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period. Candidates have the opportunity to assess the extent to which these two groups were denied their civil rights.

A) Asian Americans - These were predominantly Chinese and Japanese Americans. Some candidates may mention (for the 1970-1980 period Vietnamese and Korean Americans). Asian Americans were discriminated against in work and housing from the moment they arrived in USA, mainly on West Coast. Chinatown and Japantown became ghettos in cities such as San Francisco. Asian Americans were discriminated in work. Most Chinese were labourers, many building the Trans-Continental Railroad in 1860s and 1870s. In 1882 Congress passed the Asian or Chinese Exclusion Act limiting Asian immigration. States such as California, Oregon and Washington State all passed legislation discriminating against Asians in housing and transportation in 1890s and early 1900s. In Second World War Japanese Americans were interned in camps in western desert. Finally, the development of Asian American rights mirrored the acquisition of African American rights. The Civil Rights Act 1964 and Voting Rights Act 1965 removed official discrimination.

B) The plight of Hispanic Americans mirrored those of Asian Americans in terms of housing and work discrimination from 1865. In period 1865 to 1940s most Hispanics lived in states bordering Mexico. From 1940s ghettos such as Spanish Harlem, in New York City and in other Northern cities developed. Like Asians Hispanics were discriminated against in immigration policy. This changed under the Johnson Administration in 1965 which lifted restrictions. Also the Cuban Revolution of 1959 allowed thousands of exiled Cubans to reside in USA, mainly in Miami area of south Florida. Discrimination in work was addressed in late 1960s in California by Cesar Chavez who led Hispanic agricultural workers in their demand for better pay and conditions.

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

- 30 How far was the Inter-War Period (1919-1941) the most important turning-point in the development of Native American rights? [60]**

Focus: Study of the development of civil rights of Native Americans

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to study the development of Native American Rights and to assess the Inter-War Years as a possible turning-point. Candidates may state that majority of NAs before 1919 were regarded as members of separate nations outside the jurisdiction of the USA and therefore outside the protection of their civil rights through the US Constitution. In the Dawes Act, 1887 some Plains Indians ( Oglala Sioux) were given opportunity to be US citizens. Also descendants of the Five Civilised Tribes and other tribes from the Mid-West were 'self-governing' in Indian Territory, which became the state of Oklahoma, in 1907.

Before 1919 NAs were characterised by living in abject poverty, mainly on reservations, with an inferior education system which attempted to eradicate NA traditional customs and culture. In Inter-War period many changes occurred. In 1924 all NA became full US citizens. NAs could fight in armed forces alongside Whites. In 1934 Indian Reorganisation Act gave back to NAs many rights lost in pre-1917 period. Also NAs benefited along with other Americans from New Deal legislation on jobs and welfare. However, after 1945 NAs still faced cycle of poverty and exclusion. It wasn't until 1960s that Civil Rights legislation benefited all Americans. The creation of the militant American Indian Movement in late 1960s is reflection of alienation, in particular by many Plains Indians.

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

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE (Subject) (Aggregation Code(s))  
January 2009 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2580	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2581	Raw	60	43	38	33	29	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2582	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2583	Raw	45	35	30	26	22	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2584	Raw	45	34	30	26	22	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2585	Raw	45	33	29	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2586	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2587	Raw	90	66	59	53	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2588	Raw	90	66	59	53	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2589	Raw	90	66	59	53	47	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2590	Raw	120	86	77	68	59	51	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2591	Raw	120	86	77	68	59	51	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3835	300	240	210	180	150	120	
7835	600	480	420	360	300	240	

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Total Number of Candidates</b>
<b>3835</b>	18.1	46.5	77.1	94.3	98.9	100.0	1322
<b>7835</b>	17.4	60.5	86.7	98.5	100.0	100.0	196

**1518 candidates aggregated this series**

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**