AQA

ASSESSMENT and QUALIFICATIONS ALLIANCE

General Certificate in Education

AS History 5041

HS03 Course Essays

Mark Scheme

2008 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS UNIT 3: COURSE ESSAYS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's revised AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The revised specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the new specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options or alternatives offered by the Board.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Sections B and C) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

All of the Unit 3 Course Essays will be marked by reference to a common level of response mark scheme for AS for questions requiring an extended response without (explicit) reference to documents or sources. Details are provided on the following pages.

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS**

In marking Course Essays all examiners must, to decide on levels and placing of a response within a level, refer to:
- **the generic essay mark scheme and its descriptors for AS**
- **the exemplification of AS level descriptors**
- **the indicative content designated by the Principal Examiner**
- **additional content (i.e. not in the indicative content) which is relevant and targeted**
- **guidance on discriminating within a level.**

B: **Levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response *without* explicit reference to documents or sources.**

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: *Either*
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
Or
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-9**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance. **10-14**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **15-17**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **18-20**

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1: *1-4 Marks (Middle = 3)*

The answer is excessively generalised and undiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will
- be excessively generalised and undiscriminating, with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2: *5-9 Marks (Middle = 7)*

Either
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will
- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will
- offer a relevant, but outline only, description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically

Level 3:   *10-14 Marks (Middle = 12)*

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will
- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but be limited grammatically.

Level 4:   *15-17 Marks (Middle = 16)*

Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question, and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will
- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:   *18-20 Marks (Middle = 19)*

As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will
- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well-directed prose.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: "What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?". Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where that level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills**:
  - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
  - well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid "double jeopardy". Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark *positively*, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

Important Note

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from that lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

Summary of mark scheme for HS03

Marks	Understanding of question	Knowledge	Analysis	Balance & judgement	Quality of language and structure
1-4	Little understanding or reference to focus of question.	Lacking specific relevant factual information.	Generalised assertion.		Poorly structured. Limited grammatical accuracy.
5-9 **Either**	Some understanding – may be implicit.	Selects some relevant and accurate material.	Mostly narrative or descriptive with some links especially in introduction and/or conclusion.		Loose in structure. Some effective use of language but limited grammatically.
Or	Understands question, at least in part.	Some appropriate material but rather thin.	Some analysis but limited and/or addresses only part of question.		
10-14	Generally explicit understanding.	Selects appropriate material but may lack depth.	Shows some analysis with arguments and comments responding to the question but may lack weight.	Limited balance – not fully developed or convincing.	Coherent structure. Generally effective use of language. Some grammatical errors.
15-17	Explicit and aware of different approaches to question.	Generally precise and well selected.	Develops a focused argument for most of the answer.	Covers all parts of the question to provide a balanced explanation.	Coherent structure. Effective and mostly accurate language.
18-20	Explicit and sustained.	Precise selection of relevant and accurate material.	Maintains a consistent argument for the greater part of the answer. Good understanding.	Reasonably balanced and offering some convincing judgement.	Accurate, fluent and well structured. Shows some maturity and conceptual awareness.

Note that the actual mark awarded at each level will depend on how well the candidate matches the given criteria. Marks may go up for slightly better knowledge/analysis/balance or quality of language, and down when one or more of these is weaker. Examiners start in the middle of a level and then adjust up or down.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism

      A: **The Military Orders in the Latin East in the Twelfth Century**

            How important were the castles of the Military Orders to the defence of the Crusader states during the twelfth century?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will consider a range of ways in which the military orders contributed to the defence of the Crusader states in the 12th century. The focus should be on castles but their contribution will need to be balanced against other factors such as the geographical and manpower problems faced by the Crusader states.

The best answers will show understanding of the interaction of the various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned well-supported conclusion. They should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples and would be expected to refer to a range of supporting evidence.

- answers should show understanding of the defensive needs of the Crusader states after c1100 and the important role of the castles

- analysis of the key element in the question will focus on their holding and maintaining of castles in the east. Unlike much of the Frankish nobility, the Templars and Hospitallers were rich enough to build and maintain their own castles. They were also given or sold castles by rulers or nobles who lacked either the manpower or resources to keep their castle. The Hospitallers alone were responsible for 25 castles in the east, including Krak de Chevaliers acquired from the Count of Tripoli in 1144. The castle was of great importance as it was part of a 'great frontier' (Riley Smith) and was the centre of operations against the Muslims in the region. Castles were especially important in frontier regions; this reflected the key issue of castle cost and the wealth of the Orders. Even so the cost of the castle at Belvoir led to near

bankruptcy of the Hospitallers. Geographic issues may develop the role of Hospitaller castles in northern Syria including Bait Jibrin and Krak de Chevaliers on a strategically important section of the frontier with Islam; function may focus on castles such as the Templar castle at Bagras which commanded the Beylan pass, or Marqab which commanded the coast road, while evaluation may look at the survival of Hospitaller castles such as Margat, Krak de Chevaliers and Belvoir as footholds after the collapse of 1187–1188. Students may look at issues of scale and innovation as well as function; for example in the development of concentric castles such as Belvoir and Krak de Chevaliers

- the military orders themselves also contributed to the defence of the states. They were a permanent source of defence, unlike the crusading armies, and the knights, the Orders provided were an elite force. They were highly trained and disciplined soldiers, who would not desert in battle. Such was their bravery that William of Tyre described them as having 'the spirit of fury in their nostrils'. Furthermore, these orders added much needed manpower to the Kingdoms armies, and were free unlike mercenaries. They were also very well equipped in both armament and mounts, due to the large wealth within the Orders. An example of the success of the military Orders in battle was the Templar's rescuing of Baldwin IV and attacking and destroying Saladin's forces at Ascalon in 1177

- evaluation of the importance of the orders may focus on the limitations in their contribution, this could include; rivalry between Templar's and Hospitallers; their corporate independence and difficult relationship with secular and religious authority within Outremer, especially the Crown; their greed and their fanaticism and the Muslim response they provoked, also the role of Gerald de Ridefort at the Springs of Cresson and the battle of Hattin will be examined as this individual did much to bring on the virtual collapse of the Crusader states between 1187 and 1188.

Evaluative answers may either assess the strengths and weaknesses of castles or look at other factors contributing to the defence of the crusader states in order to demonstrate 'balance'.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism

      B: **The Development of New Monasticism in Twelfth Century Europe**

              Examine the relative importance of Stephen Harding and Bernard of Clairvaux to the success of the Cistercian order during the twelfth century.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will consider the contribution of two individuals to the growth of Cistercian monasticism in the 12th century.

The focus should be on the role of Stephen Harding and Bernard of Clairvaux. The question directs candidates to a comparison between the contribution of these two individuals although an approach which compares the contribution of these two men balanced against other factors is also acceptable.

- analysis could focus on the role of Stephen Harding as author of the Cistercians' answers to the causes of monastic laxity; the Carta Caritatis (Charter of Charity) and the impact of the organisation and the discipline it provided, including Harding's role as Abbot of Citeaux the Cistercian mother house, between 1109–1133 – a key period of expansion. Students may analyse the role of his Carta Caritatis in maintaining discipline, uniformity and austerity while expansion took place. This Monastic observance, outlined in the Carta Caritatis and Exordium Parvum, was a literal observance of the rule of St Benedict. Other elements will include mother houses, the annual general chapter, ties of love and mutual support to enforce collective discipline and a uniformity which extended to architecture

- in considering the role of Bernard as an inspirational figure students should mention his dynamism. By the time of his death in 1153 his abbey at Clairvaux had sent out monks to create 68 new abbeys. Issues will include topics such as the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, his charismatic personality and

personal example in austerity asceticism, his prestige and inspirational role. Also Bernard's 'golden eloquence' in articulating Cistercian ideals, especially his letters and debates with Peter the Venerable as a means of promoting the New Monasticism.

Other factors might also be cited:

- the role of Robert of Molesme, founder of the first Cistercian monastery, Citeaux, in 1098. Robert was an inspirational figure who did much to form the ideals of the Cistercians; for example the return to the original rule of St Benedict; their austerity and retreat to the wilderness. However, he was only at Citeaux for about one year and the expansion into monastic order took place under the influence of Stephen Harding, Abbot of Citeaux from 1109 to 1133 and Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux

- the social catholicity of its appeal also led to the spiritual success of the order, as did the impact of economic success; their focus on the wilderness; benefactors and uncultivated land; sheep farming and wool production; manual labour and the use of the conversi; the flood of endowments; papal privileges; and the economic context of European demographic and economic expansion.

However, there is no need for students to bring in other factors here as they should be comparing the relative importance of Stephen and Bernard.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion

    A: **The Origins of the French Wars of Religion**

        How important was the influence of Calvinism in explaining why the French Wars of Religion began?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should examine the relative importance of the growth and influence of Calvinism in France from 1550 onwards in generating the Wars of Religion which began in 1562. Please note that good answers should have some focus on why the wars actually 'began'.

Calvinism could be seen as a major influence because:

- the rapid growth in numbers of those becoming Calvinist in the 1550s and 1560s, e.g. by the late 1560s up to 10% of the population had converted; there were more than 2000 churches by 1562

- some members of the nobility converted; once they had declared themselves they influenced others/their supporters, e.g. Coligny, the Bourbon family; their motivation might have been purely personal or because it gave them a reason to oppose the monarchy

- Calvinism appealed to a large cross section – its organisation focused on people not priests – ordinary people, including women, the young and some professionals; this appeal may have been because these people were interested, e.g. in new trades (silk, printing etc.) and so were more open and receptive (Zemon Davis) or perhaps were rebellious against their superiors

- there was good communication/solidarity through the structures of Calvinism, e.g. the role of the elders; this gave the movement strength and attracted converts

- persecution strengthened them rather than the opposite of weakening them

- there was a national network of support through the structure of synods; this enabled good communication and an effective level of cohesion

- it had supporters in the towns and the countryside – noble families who converted, influenced those who lived/worked on and near their country estates and town houses

- persecution was sporadic and so the movement grew; monarchy may have felt it important not to alienate Huguenots (especially nobles) as they might benefit from their support against the Catholic Habsburgs.

However, all of these factors meant that there was a new and growing element in France which could cause instability. Alternatively, there were other factors which led to the conflict e.g.:

- the succession of 15 year old Francis II in 1559; Catherine de Medici feared he might fall under the influence of the Guise family and this may have influenced the publication of the Edict of Toleration in 1562

- the majority of the population would expect the king to fulfil his coronation oath and maintain/defend Catholicism

- the noble factions which existed, e.g. Bourbons/Montmorency v Guise were emphasised by religious difference and claims to the throne; neither side wished to see the other gain power and the Montmorency's particularly feared the Bourbon tendency to Huguenotism. Their struggles were not new but emphasised by the increasing importance of the religious divide

- the rapid growth in Calvinism and the persecution by the state, although sporadic, caused tension, e.g. the execution of Anne du Bourg in 1559 for insulting Henry II

- the weaknesses of the Catholic church and the failure of the monarchy to bring about compromise at Poissy 1561–1562

- a failure in the harvest of 1557 led to famine and rising prices over the next years; this coincided with troops returning from the Habsburg-Valois wars to find an economic crisis and limited work. Discontent/economic issues created 'private armies'

- the failed Huguenot plot to kidnap Francis II resulted in Huguenot executions and a hardening of attitudes between the two sides.

From these factors, candidates should be able to draw some conclusions about the importance of the role of Calvinism; undoubtedly the Massacre at Vassy suggests the causes were religious and the initiative came from the Catholics but more detailed analysis should enable some appreciation of the complexity of the situation.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS** **HS03**

Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion

B: **The Role of Individuals and Ideas in the French Wars of Religion, 1562–1598**

How important was the involvement of the Guise faction in the course and outcome of the French Wars of Religion?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should examine the role of the Guise faction and their impact on the causes and outcome of the French war of Religion.

They could be seen as important because:

- the Guise faction were Catholic with a power base in eastern France and one of the most powerful groups in France. If there was a weakness at the top, they were always likely to challenge the Crown

- the death of Henry II in 1559 catapulted Francis II, a young boy dominated by his mother, into a difficult situation. He was also frequently ill and faced issues of debt (largely generated by the Habsburg-Valois Wars), aristocratic faction and religious challenges in the form of the growth of Huguenotism; both of these issues were connected by the differing religious allegiance of the factions. In this period the Guise party stepped in to take control

- in 1560, instability continued with the death of Francis II and his replacement by an even younger monarch, Charles IX, and a regent, his mother, Catherine de Medici, leading to an attempt to free the monarchy from Guise influence (The Conspiracy of Amboise) by the Bourbon faction. This led to a continuing feud between the Bourbons and Guise to gain control over the Crown

- the Guise are seen as triggering the Wars of Religion through the Massacre at Vassy, 1562 when they killed attendees at an illegal Huguenot meeting

- in the 1570s Catherine de Medici was able to assert her authority more fully and the Guise faction fell from favour. However, tension increased between Catholics and Huguenots and the Guise were accused of attempting to assassinate Coligny. In 1572 tensions led to the Massacre of St Bartholomew and the growth of Catholic opposition

- the Guise set up revived the Catholic League in 1584 and opposition to the Huguenots was more open; this resulted in opposition also to Henry III and attempts to influence policy in favour of Catholics. From this point open war between Catholics and Huguenots was evident although not continuous.

Other factors which could be included:

- many ordinary Catholics were concerned about the development of Huguenotism and so supported the Guise faction in their actions; this explains the level of violence against them throughout the period

- other individuals played key roles, e.g. Catherine de Medici – her inexperience as regent for Charles IX, her position as a woman and a foreigner; her apparent deviousness and plotting; her attempts to marry her sons and daughters to the monarchs of Spain and England; her suspected involvement in the Massacre of St Bartholomew

- intervention by other states also influenced events and outcomes, e.g. England tried to regain Calais; Spain under Phillip II, supported the Catholic League; German troops and the forces of William of Orange invaded to support the Huguenots in the 1570s and 1580s; such interventions also lengthened the struggle

- the ideas about resistance to authority developed by Huguenot writers influenced the outcome through their ideas about the role of the state, the rights of rulers, e.g. Hotman

- Henry IV and the Edict of Nantes eventually ended the wars by creating what was essentially a compromise 'state within a state'

- the financial condition of the Crown made resolution urgent by the 1590s; there was a debt of approximately 200 000 million livres and an income of only 30 million livres.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743

    A: **The Regency, 1715–1723**

           Examine the extent to which the Regency's successes were due to the willingness of Orléans to compromise.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates can be expected to identify areas of success, with some establishment of criteria, across a range of domestic policies. Whilst most candidates will focus on the maintenance of royal authority, which was arguably the greatest area of achievement this was by no means the only area of success and candidates should at least mention a range of other areas even if a perfect balance is unlikely to be achieved. Some candidates may attempt to question the depth of accomplishment; however the clear focus should be the determination of reasons for any success. An apparent willingness to compromise can be balanced with a number of other factors in order to reach a reasoned conclusion, although most candidates will probably argue that much of Orléans willingness to compromise was a cloak for a clear set determination to resist fundamental change, especially in the area of the authority of the monarchy.

Areas of Success

- ensuring a period of domestic stability and avoiding the type of civil unrest commonly associated with minorities in France, such as the Frondes under Louis XIV

- maintaining the authority of the Crown despite the attempt of the nobility to wrestle back some of the role in government and political privileges apparently lost under the personal rule of Louis XIV

- maintaining the authority of the Crown despite attempts by the magistrates of the Paris Parlement to claim back some of the political authority lost by the removal of pre-registration remonstrance in 1673

- avoiding excessive spending and reducing the debt of the Crown

- achieving a period of religious calm, especially in the light of the Huguenot crisis and most significantly the issue of Jansenism and the question of the papal bull Unigenitus left unresolved on the death of Louis XIV in 1715.

Areas of possible compromise:

Orléans inherited a weak basis for an effective regency. Louis XIV's fears over the competency of Orléans had in part convinced Louis to place his two illegitimate sons, Maine and Toulouse, in the line of succession. In addition the will of Louis XIV had stipulated that Orléans should not be sole regent but should rule as head of a regency council. Orléans first actions upon the death of Louis XIV were directed towards rebutting this attempt by the dead king to direct affairs from beyond the grave. Orléans success in overturning Louis XIV's will required the co-operation of both nobility and also of Parlement:

1. through the creation of a series of government councils, the Polysynodie, Orléans apparently conceded to the demands of the nobility to be awarded a greater role in government

2. by returning the rights of pre-registration remonstrance he gained Parlement's co-operation in overturning legitimisation of Maine and Toulouse and also will of Louis XIV.

Hence the smooth transition of effective power from Louis XIV to Regent can be credited to Orléans' willingness to compromise:

- the stability of the regency up to 1718 can be in a large part attributed to Orléans' continued willingness to compromise with privileged groups. In 1717 Orléans appointed the Parlementaire d' Aguesseau as chancellor, in addition to granting a number of other parlementaire leading positions within the Polysnodie. The noblesse d' épée were mollified by their inclusion on the Polysnodie and also the regency council, apparently returning to them the central role in government lost under Louis XIV

- Orléans' skilful handling of religious controversy stemmed from his own lack of religious conviction and the lack of a dogmatic determination to impose uniformity. This was undoubtedly a factor in ensuring the registration of Unigenitus. In addition the Peace of the Church of 1720 was worded such that all complainants believed that they had gained the most from the compromise

- the quelling of unrest in Brittany, orchestrated by the Parlement of Rennes, was partly the result of compromise. Certainly the exploitation of their Gallican sympathies isolated the Rennes Parlement from potentially damaging noble support, and even ensured parlements support for the execution of Breton Nobles.

Other reasons for success:

- Orléans' initial success in satisfying the nobility and the Parlement, appears to have been a result of compromise and concession. However, it is reasonable to argue that this compromise was nothing of the sort. Orléans was determined to maintain the authority of the Crown, not least because he might inherit should Louis XIV die. The Polysnodie granted little real power to the nobility and was anyway abandoned in 1718. Likewise the council regency became an unwieldy amalgam of privileged interests which Orléans paid increasingly less attention to. Whilst his success in actually becoming regent relied on compromise, his success in maintaining authority had more to do with a ruthless determination and political skill

- Orléans proved himself capable of resolute action against Parlement. He ignored the remonstrance against the minting of coinage and Unigenitus, using the Lit de Justice to pass measures instead. The exile of the whole Parlement for six months in 1720 and the creation of new courts prove that it was Orléans' determination rather than compromise that ensured royal prerogative. Once his position as regent was secure, Orléans proved capable of ruthless action

- whilst the registration of Unigenitus was in part achieved by compromise the Parlement of Paris was under no illusion as to what was expected of them and what consequences would be of failure to conform to the wishes of Orléans

- financial success, and especially the reduction of the crown's debts under Law's system, had little to do with compromise. This might be seen as an unexpected consequence of the failure of the system, although Orléans should be credited both with the appointment of competent advisors such as Law and Dubois, and also the determination to address areas of the government that even Louis XIV had failed to

- Orléans also benefited from the weakening of the nobility during the long reign of Louis XIV. That the nobility were so easily satisfied by the Polsynodie suggests that they were perhaps in no position in 1715 to demand more. There was also a general feeling of financial exhaustion after the long period of warfare experienced under Louis XIV. The passing of Louis XIV was mourned by few who had been expected to finance the demands of an active foreign policy. The disunity of privileged groups, and especially the distinction between the noblesse d' epee and noblesse de robe further assisted Orléans

- a conclusion might suggest that Orléans' willingness to compromise was a key factor in securing the regency in 1715 and to this extent accounts for his personal success. However, it was other factors, and especially Orléans' own determination to maintain the status quo, despite giving the impression of compromise and concession, that made the accomplishments of the regency itself possible.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743

      B: **Cardinal Fleury, 1726–1743**

              Examine the extent to which Cardinal Fleury's success in dealing with the Paris Parlement explains the domestic stability in the years 1726 to 1743

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should provide some range of examples of domestic stability with supporting criteria. Whilst some candidates may try to challenge the level of success with which Fleury dealt with Parlement, there should be a clear focus on the degree to which his success explains domestic stability. In order to arrive at a reasoned judgement there should be consideration of a number of other factors that may account for stability.

Aspects of domestic stability

- the entire period 1726 to 1743 is often seen as one of intense conservatism and entrenchment rather than one of innovation or of radical change. Despite Cardinal Fleury's lack of monarchical authority he was successful in providing France with a period of peace if not also one of stagnation

- the authority of the monarch was maintained, despite the reluctance of Louis XV to become involved in government. The nobility were largely satisfied with their role in government, and Parlement proved ineffective in opposing the religious and financial policies of Fleury

- in religion the issue of Jansenism was not resolved; however there was no serious deterioration in the situation. Likewise, the Huguenots were largely left in peace under Fleury

- although not an explicit part of the specification, the peaceful foreign policy pursued by Fleury did have relevant domestic consequences, and especially the absence of permanent punitive tax collection, excessive conscription and foreign incursion

- economically the ministry represented a period of great prosperity and growth.

Success in dealing with Parlement and consequences for domestic stability

The major area of success was in the potentially explosive area of Jansenism:

1. Fleury dealt firmly with any opposition from Parlement, but also proved able to compromise. In 1730 all public appeals to Parlement on the issue of registration of Unigentus were expressly forbidden, and Fleury used a Lit de Justice to enforce this ruling. This subsequently caused such opposition that he forced the entire Parlement to exile, but allowed them to return to Paris the next year in return for agreements never to remonstrate over Unigenitus.

2. This firm action of 1730 was coupled by the exile of 139 magistrates in 1732 when they refused to conduct their Parlementary duties.

It is entirely reasonable to suggest that Fleury's firm handling of Parlement not only prevented a weakening of royal authority, but was a considerable factor in guaranteeing stability in religion, although it did little to solve the issue of Jansenism in the long term.

Other factors contributing to domestic stability:

- Fleury's age and lack of radical reform certainly accounted for some administrative stability. Few expected Fleury to last long in office and the ambitious felt that they simply had to bide their time

- Fleury was a fairly unassuming individual, never taking the title of chief minister and always ensuring that he appointed capable ministers who shared an administrative role. Indeed, it was the professional nature of these ministers that accounts in part for domestic success

- Fleury's pacific foreign policy prevented excessive demands on the domestic economy and finances. This in turn meant that no fundamental reform of the taxation system was needed, although this caused immense damage in the long term

- there was little civil disorder, largely because of the economic improvement, and also schemes of Orry to stabilise the currency and also to improve the infrastructure which allowed greater movement of grain in time of crisis, such as 1740. A period of economic well-being especially placated the middle classes

- Jansenism itself, certainly as a religious movement began to die down naturally especially after the excesses of the convulsionnarie phase. In addition, Fleury set about discretely removing Jansenists from positions of influence. The relative tranquillity over Protestantism can be credited in part to Fleury's reluctance to enforce Bourbons repressive decree of 1724, and in fact only 30 Huguenots were sent to the galleys under Fleury

Conclusion

Considering that religious calm was a major component of domestic stability, Fleury's capable handling of the Parlement was a significant factor in ensuring this success; however it is clear that, even in the area of religion, other factors played a role. It can also be argued that it was Fleury's generally cautious approach to administration, his age and lack of reforming zeal, the economic recovery and a policy of pacification abroad that contributed to a notable period of domestic calm.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS** **HS03**

Alternative D: Europe, 1825–1850

A: **European Diplomacy, 1825 to 1835**

Was the Spanish Crisis of 1830–1835 the most important factor in the breakdown of Great Power co operation in the years 1825–1835? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Mark as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative Content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Approaches

The Spanish crisis of 1830–1835 was a struggle between the absolutists and constitutionalists which was intensified by the death of King Ferdinand in September 1833. The crisis over the Spanish succession worried the liberal powers of France and Britain whose sympathies lay with the constitutionalists. Descriptions of the Spanish Crisis are not in themselves useful. Responses should focus on the impact of the Spanish Crisis on the ability of the Great Powers to co-operate. A range of other factors/events which led to the breakdown of Great Power co-operation in the years to 1835 should also be considered, e.g. the 1830–1831 Revolutions in Belgium, Italy, France and Poland, the Greek Revolt and the Eastern Crisis.

The Spanish Crisis and Great Power co-operation

Following Don Carlos' claim to the throne France offered to support Britain by assisting the constitutionalists cause. Palmerton complicated matters as he distrusted the French and believed France had territorial ambitions in the Iberian Peninsula. Palmerson wanted to create a 'western confederacy' to defend liberal institutions and to act as a counterbalance against the Holy Alliance who through the Troppau Protocol rejected any form of revolution and threat to the status quo. Therefore the Spanish Crisis reflected the ideological divisions within the Great Powers as well as the British distrust for the French. In the spring of 1834

the Quadruple Alliance was signed between Britain, France, Portugal and Spain in defence of liberal institutions, but France was in a subordinate position to Britain as she could not intervene in Spanish affairs unless invited to do so by the British. The British navy and Spanish army destroyed the absolutist force of Don Carlos in 1834, but he was able to return to Spain, renew his claim to the throne and raise a new army in the north of the country. The 'Carlists' joined forces with the Basques who were fighting for regional liberties which complicated matters for the British and French as they had no desire to get involved in a protracted, provincial civil war. They refused to send official military aid to Spain following Queen Maria Christina's appeals in 1835.

Other threats to the Great Power co-operation

1830–1831 Revolutions in Europe
These revolutions, particularly in Belgium and France, threatened the stability of Europe and were clear violations of the Vienna Settlement of 1815. The revolutions threatened to wedge a divide between the autocratic eastern powers, who through the Troppau Protocol of 1820 were resolved to defend the status quo and fight revolutionaries who threatened the legitimacy imposed by 1815, and the more liberal powers of Britain and France. Nicholas I refused to recognise Louis-Philippe as King of France until January 1831, souring relations between Russia and France for twenty years. The Belgian revolution almost led to armed conflict between France and Prussia, thus it threatened to plunge Europe into a major war.

The Greek Revolt
Austria's and Russia's relationship was strained over the Greek Revolt because of Russia's support for their co-religionists. British intervention in the Greek revolt deepened Anglo-Austrian hostility, whilst the creation of a independent Greece represented a crushing blow for Metternich and Austria found itself virtually excluded from the Concert of Europe in the final years of negotiation.

The Eastern Question – the Mehmet Ali Crisis of 1831–1833
Russian intervention in the Mehmet Ali crisis and the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi had a significant impact on the Concert of Europe. Austria and Prussia were determined to prevent Russia's independent action and the Münchengrätz Agreement reasserted the solidarity of the Eastern Powers. To counter balance this, Britain, France, Portugal and Spain signed the Quadruple Alliance of 1834.

Conclusions

As a result of the Spanish crisis of 1830–1835 Anglo-French co-operation sealed by the Quadruple Alliance of 1834 turned to hostile rivalry by 1836. The recriminations between France and Britain stemmed from Palmerston's reluctance to allow France to restore her influence at Madrid by lending more effective aid to the liberal cause. However, the Concert of Europe was not seriously threatened by the Spanish Crisis as France exercised national self restraint and respected the terms of the Quadruple Alliance. Despite the obvious ideological division between the forces of absolutism/conservatism and liberalism the members of the Holy Alliance (Austria, Russia and Prussia) did not involve themselves in Spanish affairs.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative D: Europe, 1825–1850

   B: **The Revolutions of 1848 and their Immediate Aftermath to 1850**

       How important were divisions amongst the revolutionaries in explaining the failure, by 1850, of the 1848–1849 revolutions in France and the German states?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Mark as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative Content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Divisions within the ranks of the revolutionaries were a significant factor leading to the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in France and the German states. More effective responses will try to define the nature and seriousness of the revolutionary divisions, e.g. ideological, social, and geographical. A range of other factors leading to the failure of the revolutions should also be considered in order to assess the importance of revolutionary divisions, e.g. the strength of the conservative counter-revolution, the role of individuals such as Louis Napoleon in France and Frederick William in Germany.

Revolutionary divisions

Ideological divisions
Radicals opposed conservative liberals: constitutional monarchists feared republicans. For example in France, Republican extremists (Red Republicans), led by Ledru Rollin, frightened moderate republicans who feared attacks on property, increased taxation and the admission of the potentially violent masses to the political arena. The 'National Workshops' became a focus of middle class resentment and the governments attempts to expel unmarried men from the workshops and to close them down caused a violent clash between the radicals and conservatives in the June Days. German revolutionaries were also divided upon the nature of the form of government, democratic/republican, federal, secular and also about the geographical extent of the new Germany *Kleindeutsch* or *Grossdeutsch*? The Frankfurt parliament could not heal the political divisions between the moderates, radicals and

conservatives. Created by a middle class franchise the parliament alienated the masses. Representatives were largely moderate and wanted a constitutional monarchy incorporating liberal ideas of limited democracy.

Social divisions
In both France and the German states the vocal, liberal revolutionaries were largely drawn from the middle classes and did not represent the peasant revolutionaries in the countryside or the working class revolutionaries in the growing urban areas. For Marxist historians, the June Days, where General Cavaignac led the defeat of the Parisian insurgents, represents a clear divide in French society between the bourgeoisie and the working classes.

Geographical divisions
In both France and the German states the revolutionaries took their greatest hold in urban areas. The French Second Republic was created by Paris, but was defeated by the rest of France in the December presidential elections of 1848. The Frankfurt Parliament failed to find a national figure to become the leader of their vision of a united Germany and the states of the Bund were very wary of the aim of the Frankfurt's Parliament to strengthen central control of the new, united Germany and dilute state power.

Other important factors which may be considered

Conservative counter-revolution
Both in France and the German states conservation was only temporarily overturned and soon made a swift recovery. In France Louis-Philippe and the monarchy may have been overthrown but the forces of conservatism survived in the forms of the Church, army and aristocracy. The constituent assembly elections of March 1848 produced an assembly with a monarchist majority which was evidence for the conservatism of the French peasant. In the presidential elections of December 1848 Ledru-Rollin received only 370 000 votes compared to the 1448 107 votes of General Cavaignac and the 5434 226 votes of Louis Napoleon, thus representing a triumph for the forces of conservatism. In the German states the recovery of royal authority in Berlin (and in Vienna) meant the end to the constitutional experiment.

Role of individuals
In the German states Frederick William's rejection of the Crown marked the end of the Frankfurt Assembly. He refused to become the emperor of a federal empire with a liberal constitution which would grant him limited powers. Other German princes followed Frederick's example and rejected proposed German constitution and abandoned the Frankfurt Parliament. In France, Louis Napoleon was able to draw upon the greatness of his uncle's legacy and so he came to represent order and stability. Louis Napoleon's election manifesto of December 1848 pledged the reduction of taxation, unemployment, the expansion of private enterprise, freedom of the press and the protection of the educational rights of the Catholic Church (*Loi Falloux*, March 1850), all of which appealed to the conservative elements in French society.

Conclusions
More sophisticated answers will consider the nature and extent of divisions within the revolutionaries of France and the German states and may discuss similarities and differences. Balanced responses should explain how revolutionary divisions led to failure ranged against at least one other factor in both France and Germany.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914

> **A:** **The Balkans, 1870–1890**
>
> Was the Bulgarian Crisis which started in 1885 the most important factor threatening peace in the Balkans in the years 1870 to 1890? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates will need to assess the importance of the Bulgarian Crisis from 1885, but also consider other threats to peace during the period 1870 to 1890, notably the Balkan crisis of 1875–1878. Note that the question is concerned with peace 'in the Balkans' – not the general peace of Europe.

Evidence supporting the importance of the Bulgarian Crisis:

- the crisis seemed likely to destroy the delicate diplomatic harmony of Bismarck's carefully balanced network of alliances, with rivalry resumed in the Balkans, predicting the further disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in Europe only 7 years after the Congress of Berlin

- problems began in September 1885 with a revolt in Eastern Rumelia for union with Bulgaria which contravened the Treaty of Berlin. The crisis marked a revival of antagonism between Austria-Hungary and Russia, with Austria openly threatening Russia with war. The attitude of the major powers ominously now seemed almost reversed from that of 1878 with Austria-Hungary and especially Britain regarding a stronger, bigger Bulgaria as an effective barrier against Russia

- Serbia, looking for compensation for Bulgarian gains, was soundly defeated, and a united Bulgaria was recognised internationally. This showed a new important nationalist dimension, with intra-Balkan rivalry between Serbia and Bulgaria

- the crisis in Bulgaria deteriorated further when Russia forced King Alexander to abdicate, replacing him with a Russian general

- Bismarck's attempts to reassure Russia by negotiating the Reinsurance Treaty in June 1887 seemed indicative of his diplomatic desperation. When the Bulgarians elected a German prince, Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, as their new sovereign, Russian suspicions seemed well founded. Bismarck's publication in February 1888 of the secret Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary failed to calm Russian resentment.

Evidence which could be set against this:

- the Crisis fizzled out in 1888 with no military conflict, and the repercussions were mainly diplomatic, as Russia found herself increasingly isolated

- in 1890, the Russians were still eager to renew the Reinsurance Treaty rather than ally with France, and it was Kaiser Wilhelm II, not Bismarck, who rejected this

- for the next 15 years or so, the Balkans saw a period of relative calm, as Austria-Hungary seemed the dominant power in the Balkans, and Russia turned towards Asia and the Far East.

Evidence emphasising the importance of the Balkan crisis of 1875–1878:

- the uprisings and rebellions from 1875 signified a dramatic revival of the Eastern Question which would involve all the major powers

- the threat of an emerging nationalism, which would no longer be easily controlled, was evident as revolts escalated across the Balkans. In 1875, the oppressed Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina rose in rebellion, and in 1876, the revolt spread to Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro

- this crisis marked a further step towards the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire which would fuel the ambitions of some of the major powers, with little sign of reform within Turkey and an internal power struggle. The Bulgarian atrocities of 1876 marked an escalation in the situation and forced the crisis onto the European stage

- the Russo-Turkish war (April 1877 – January 1878) increased the likelihood of European interference; there is no equivalent degree of military conflict during the Bulgarian Crisis

- the Treaty of San Stefano was clearly unacceptable to Austria-Hungary and Britain, with the latter mobilizing troops and moving her fleet into the Straits

- YET, the importance of this crisis can also be played down, as the diplomatic approach continued to dominate, with the Andrassy Note, the Berlin Memorandum, Russia's negotiated neutrality with Austria-Hungary on the eve of war with Turkey and the Congress and Treaty of Berlin in 1878.

Candidates might conclude that issues rather than events posed the most important threat to peace in the Balkans during this period, in terms of the power vacuum left by the misrule and corruption of the disintegrating Ottoman Empire, the rival ambitions of the major powers, and the emerging nationalism of the Christian Balkan states determined to win independence.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914

      B: **The Balkans, 1890–1914**

               Examine the degree to which the ambitions of Russia explain the growth of international tension in the Balkans in the years 1908 to 1914.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The main events which reflected the growth of international tension in the Balkans between 1908 and 1914 are the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, the two Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, and the July Crisis following the assassination in Sarajevo in 1914. Russian Pan-Slav ambitions certainly provided a provocative undercurrent in the growth of international tension. However, other factors are also important, such as the desire of Austria-Hungary to resist the spread of nationalism to her own multi-racial empire, the nationalist ambitions of the Balkan states, and the increasing threat from two competing European alliances.
Note that the question is focused on the Balkans and not wider aspects of international tension.

Factors stressing the importance of Russia's ambitions in the growth of international tension:

- Russia was the expansionist force in the Balkans, not Austria-Hungary. She was unwilling, or perhaps unable, to restrain or control Slav nationalism, even though it was an explosive force, endangering peace and stability in Europe. This enabled Russia to promote and sponsor Serbia

- the Bosnian Crisis of 1908 shocked the major powers and created much alarm in Europe. The crisis ended Austro-Russian co-operation in the Balkans and angered Serbia who looked to Russia for support. Most significantly, Russia was left humiliated and embittered, blaming the crisis on Iswolsky's unorthodox diplomacy and accelerating Russia's military reforms. The annexation of Bosnia would provide

an ominous forewarning of the July crisis in 1914, provoking an over-reaction from Russia

- Russian agents with strong Pan-Slavist sympathies played an important part in creating the Balkan League (Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece and Montenegro) which fought in the Wars of 1912 and 1913 – 'a Russian war fought by proxy'. Russia did rather well out of the Balkan Wars at little cost to herself. Serbia, practically speaking a Russian province, was much enlarged, now with an army of 200 000 men. If Austria-Hungary had been the dominant power in the Balkans after the Bosnian Crisis, the Balkan Wars changed the situation in Russia's favour

- following the assassination in Sarajevo in 1914, Russian promises of support for Serbia seem to have influenced the decision not to accept the Austrian ultimatum, leading to the Austrian declaration of war. This time, after their climb-down in 1908, the Russian government was not going to give way and initiated military preparations. Russia was the first of the great powers to mobilise, despite the implications of this, especially for Germany.

Other factors to explain the growth of international tension:

- Serb ambitions also clearly threatened peace in the Balkans as she sought to unite all Serbs into a Greater Serbia. This would prove a deadly threat to the Habsburg Empire. The situation was aggravated by the Serbian government's inadequate control over the nationalistic secret societies. Serbia's humiliating climb-down after the Bosnian Crisis in 1908, provoked resentment and a sense of grievance. Serbia took the initiative in 1912 by helping to form the Balkan League with Bulgaria, Greece and Montenegro, with the ambition of driving Turkey out of Europe. The impact of Serb nationalist ambitions reached its climax in 1914 with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo by a member of a Serbian terrorist group. The complicity of the Serbian government could not be allowed to pass unpunished, and led to a chain of events which provoked European war

- Austria-Hungary also developed an over-confident gambling spirit, with reliance on German support, significantly in 1908 and 1914. Austria's annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 marked an important turning point in the growth of international tension. Following the two Balkan Wars, Austria-Hungary now looked for a military opportunity to eliminate Serbia, which the assassination in Sarajevo would provide. In 1914, the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia on 23rd July seemed deliberately framed so that no self-respecting state could accept. Austria's declaration of war on Serbia marked the start of military conflict

- German ambitions of Weltpolitik impinged on events in the Balkans at several crucial stages. Instead of exercising a significant moderating influence on Austria-Hungary, she chose the opposite path, notably with the ultimatum during the Bosnian Crisis and with the 'blank cheque' of unqualified support in 1914. Some historians believe that Germany was prepared to start the First World War to achieve hegemony

- the continued disintegration of the Ottoman Empire provided the context for international tension and for the ambitions of several major powers in the Balkans. However, the Bosnian crisis was triggered by the Young Turk movement which aimed to overthrow the reactionary regime of the Sultan Abdul Hamid II, achieve a more liberal and efficient regime and restore Bosnia to full Turkish rule. This had

serious implications for Austria-Hungary, provoking her pre-emptive annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina

- Italian aggression over Tripoli in 1911 encouraged the formation of the Balkan League, and Bulgaria instigated the Second Balkan war by attacking Serbia

- the rivalry of the two competing alliances increased the prospects of international tension and conflict.

Higher level responses should include a balanced range of factors to explain the growth of international tension in the Balkans and should present a convincing and well-argued evaluation. Some may conclude that Russia's over-reaction to her humiliation in 1908, her open-ended support for Serbia and her decisive full mobilisation on 30th July 1914 were all important factors in explaining the growth of international tension.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917–1929

     A: **Lenin and the consolidation of the Bolshevik state, 1917–1924**

           Examine the degree to which the New Economic Policy contributed to the Bolsheviks' success in securing their power inside Russia by 1924.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The NEP, introduced in 1921, was certainly a key factor in ensuring Bolshevik/communist control in the USSR by 1924, although it was not the only factor.

Between the 1917 Revolution and 1921 the Bolsheviks (or 'Reds') faced major problems in establishing their power. They had come to power in a coup in October 1917, controlling only a relatively small part of Russia, and facing opposition from a wide variety of groups. There were the Whites, made up of various groups, and individuals who opposed the coup or everything the Reds stood for – including dispossessed landowners and businessmen, Tsarist generals, a few supporters of the deposed Tsar, the Church. There were other groups on the Left like Mensheviks and some Socialist revolutionaries who resented the Bolshevik coup, especially after the Reds closed down the Constituent Assembly in January 1918. There were those patriots who resented the concessionary peace of Brest Litovsk which granted huge areas of resources and land to the Germans. There were anti communists who feared the doctrine of world revolution. There were foreign armies from Britain, France, the USA and several other countries, anxious to get a pro-war government in power, although they soon became part of the general anti-Bolshevik crusade.

The Reds won the civil war by 1921 for several reasons, to do with their ruthlessness, their control of key urban areas and resources, Lenin's and Trotsky's leadership, and major weaknesses in White unity and the divided White war effort. Meanwhile, the exigencies of the war situation led to rapid centralisation of power away from local soviets into the central apparatus of the Communist Party. The ruthless policy of War Communism, which nationalised industry and requisitioned grain from the peasantry to feed the Red army and

the workers, did help the Bolsheviks to win the war. However, it also alienated the peasantry, which was not a natural ally of the Reds in any case. There were also problems with workers, control in factories and the workers opposition objected to the growing centralisation of power. Revolts such as Tambov and the 1921 Kronstadt Rising showed the danger to the Bolsheviks and economic production had drastically declined.

Hence Lenin's introduction of the NEP, a strategic 'retreat' to secure a breathing space for the country and the Communist Party. In 1921 private enterprise was permitted again, except in large, basic industries like coal and the railways, which remained nationalised. The peasants were now taxed instead of suffering requisition and were allowed to sell their surplus on the private market.

These economic measures were certainly important in helping the Bolsheviks to survive. Production quickly grew, and the prospect of more peasant and other rebellions rapidly diminished. In this sense the NEP may well have been crucial in both helping Russia to recover, and in doing so, ensuring Communist control.

However there were other important factors at work also. Economic concessions were accompanied by a further political clampdown. Remnants of the opposition (Mensheviks and SRs) were destroyed. The 1921 Party Congress saw a clampdown on dissent within the Party itself.

Nor could the Party regard itself as totally secure. There was considerable unease within the Party about the 'unsocialist' concessions of NEP, seen as a partial return to capitalism. Whilst Lenin was alive he was not challenged, but an ailing Lenin was losing his grip. There were still economic problems, caused by the more rapid recovery of agriculture, which caused a disparity of prices between agriculture and industry (The 'Scissors crisis'). The Party was still mainly urban-based and there were fears that the peasantry might one day hold the regime to ransom.

In many ways Bolshevik power was secure by 1924. Most internal and external enemies had been defeated, at least for the time being. The ending of the war in 1921 automatically gave breathing space and a chance to regroup. But the NEP was undoubtedly a key factor: had War Communism continued, the regime would have faced major revolts. Although other factors described above were also important, the NEP, for all the qualms of many Bolsheviks, probably made them more secure, at least in the short term.

Note that while some answers may address the whole period 1917–1924, others may legitimately focus on the 1921–1924 period only.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917–1929

        B: **Stalin's rise to power, 1922–1929**

                  Examine the degree to which arguments about economic policy influenced the outcome of the struggle for power in the USSR between 1924 and 1929.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The struggle for power continued throughout this period. On the Left were Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev. Trotsky in particular represented the hard-line view; labour should be militarised, with harsh discipline; the Communists should focus on world revolution. The Right increasingly represented by Bukharin supported NEP because it appeared to be benefiting the Russian economy. There were other shades of opinion; for example, whereas early in the period, Stalin was seen as a man of the centre, not firmly committing himself to one view, later he became the ultimate hard liner, adopting some of Trotsky's policies.

NEP undoubtedly led to the economic progress, in the sense that the semi-privatised economy witnessed considerable rises in output. It was also a time of relative freedom culturally, in the sense that although there was a lot of propaganda, there were also opportunities to experiment culturally and socially.

However, the NEP also posed problems. Those Communists on the Left despised it. They saw it as an unholy alliance with capitalism. By allowing some peasants to enrich themselves, and speculators and 'Nepmen' to prosper, class differences were being reborn. There were also economic problems. The nationalised heavy industry sector was heavily subsidised and inefficient. There was a lack of modern technology. There was a disparity between agricultural and industrial prices, causing peasants to withhold supplies when food prices became cheaper. Therefore there was plenty for Communists to debate. All agreed that Russia must industrialise for the pre-requisite for socialism but the issue was, how? The Left wanted to end NEP and forcibly industrialise, making the peasants pay and using many of them for an industrial workforce. Those on the Right believed that instead of squeezing

the peasantry, they should be encouraged to enrich themselves – a prosperous peasantry would buy goods and kick start the economy by promoting demand and encouraging a more sedate industrialisation.

These arguments were certainly important in the struggle for power after Lenin's death in 1924, because there was no blueprint or previous model for the Communists to use and therefore it was scarcely surprising that arguments took place. However, it was more complex than that, because the struggle for power was also bound up with personalities and personal ambition and the whole debate about what a socialist state should be. It was not always easy to separate arguments about NEP from personal manoeuvring for power and influence, particularly when views seemed to shift. Before 1921 Bukharin had been a hard-liner, after 1921 he loyally supported Lenin's NEP and became the spokesman of the 'moderate approach' to socialism. Trotsky began as an opponent of Zinoviev and Kamenev, but by 1925 they were allies against Stalin – these were opportunistic moves as much as alliances based on economic strategy. Stalin appeared to be a relative moderate in opposing Trotsky, but following Trotsky's removal from influence by 1926/7, Stalin took over his rigorous approach to the economy – following a shortage of grain in 1927, the regime resorted to requisitioning ('the Urals-Siberian method') followed by the decision to forcibly collectivise and industrialise the USSR. Finally Stalin turned on his erstwhile allies on the Right, such as Bukharin, and as a result he was the virtually undisputed leader by 1929.

Because of the personalities and rivalries involved, and because Lenin had left no clear message about the succession to the leadership (appearing in his Testament to be suggesting some sort of coalition, since he regarded all contenders as having faults) there was always bound to be some sort of struggle for power. But undoubtedly attitudes towards NEP gave the leadership struggle a particular twist, whether the argument about the NEP were genuinely held (as they were for many Communists, both on economic and ideological ground), or whether they were being used for propaganda purposes or to support a particular platform.

Note that the focus of this question is on economic policy and whilst this needs to be contrasted against other factors, it does need due consideration for a good answer.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938

> **A:**   **The Weimar Republic, c1925–1933**
>
>   Examine the extent to which President Hindenburg was responsible for the political breakdown in Germany between 1930 and January 1933.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will be expected to focus on the political breakdown of 1930–1932 and in particular, the part played by Hindenburg. In order to offer a balanced answer, however, candidates will need to consider other relevant factors which contributed to the political problems.

Relevant material on the the importance of Hindenburg may include:

- his right-wing, anti-parliamentarian and conservative values which increased right-wing expectations

- his links to the army and aristocratic elite (e.g. Schleicher was a member of his old regiment and a friend of his son Oskar) which influenced his choice of chancellors

- Hindenburg had already contemplated forming a 'Presidential cabinet' (anti-parliamentarian and anti-Marxist) which would exclude the SPD, in 1929. Brüning supported this idea and formed a cabinet without the SPD in March 1930 knowing he would have to rely on Article 48

- Hindenburg was willing to allow his chosen chancellors to use Article 48 and deliberately subverted the democratic process. The power was used extensively by Brüning and accelerated under Papen and Schleicher. This action, backed by Hindenburg's right wing associates and the army, was a deliberate move to undermine the Weimar Republic

- when the Reichstag tried to restrict the use of Article 48, Hindenburg used his power to dissolve the Reichstag and call new elections. The first occasion was in 1930 and it produced a swing to the right but he was again forced to resort to the same tactics twice in 1932 which increased the strength of the anti-republican forces

- since Hindenburg was obliged under the terms of the constituion to call an election within 60 days if he dissolved the Reichstag, he resorted to devious measures to subvert the Republic, within the bounds of the law. Hence his willingness to engage in intrigue – e.g. dismissing Schleicher on Papen's request and appointing Hitler as Chancellor against his better judgement in January 1933.

For a balanced answer, candidates will also need to examine other factors which led to political breakdown in this period:

- economic problems stemming from the Wall Street Crash. High unemployment

- the problems of coalition governments. The economic crisis and disputes over unemployment benefits broke Müller's grand coalition

- the middle ground SPD, DDP lost influence while the centre moved increasingly to the right. Moderate government became difficult and the extremist parties grew

- the appeal of the Nazi party which was able to get away with political violence and the use of the SA against the communists.

Longer term:

- the anti-republican attitudes of the elites-industrialists, landed aristocracy, army, judges and civil servants

- the continuation of reparations and hostility to the Treaty of Versailles which provided a rallying cry for Nationalists

- the alienation of the middle class – in part stemming from the economic troubles of 1923

- cultural changes which encouraged a traditionalist hostility to the Republic and may have helped polarise political attitudes.

Answers are likely to conclude that Hindenburg was placed in a very difficult position by 1930. Any president would have had difficulites but Hindenburg deliberately used his power to undermine the Weimar Republic. He also underestimated Hitler and had unwittingly undermined his own position by January 1933.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938

    B: **The Nazi consolidation of power, 1930–1938**

        Explain why the Night of the Long Knives in June 1934 was so important in the consolidation of Hitler's power in Germany in the years 1933 to 1938.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers will be expected to focus on Hitler's consolidation of power from 1933 with a particular appraisal of the part played by the Night of the Long Knives. This will need to be balanced against other factors which enabled Hitler to extend his control.

Material on the importance of the Night of the Long Knives might include:

- it satisfied the demands of the army and helped win over the only group with sufficient power to unseat Hitler

- it satisfied the conservative elites (especially the businessmen) whose positions were threatened by the street violence and the SA demands for social change

- it was welcomed by members of the public who sought order and had viewed the SA as 'rabble'

- it increased Hitler's personal prestige and control at the head of the Nazi government and eliminated the potential challenge from Röhm

In the longer term:

- by eliminating a rival to the Reichswehr, it enabled Hitler to assume the Presidency (accepted by plebiscite) on Hindenburg's death in August 1934 and become Commander in Chief of the armed forces

- it provided political stability and enabled Hitler to extend Nazi power in co-operation with the army and business 1934–1938 until strong enough to force the resignations of Blomberg and Fritsch in 1938.

To balance the answer candidates will need to refer to other factors which enabled Hitler to consolidate his power. These may include:

- the Enabling Act; the destruction of the Trade Unions; the destruction of other political parties; the abolition of independent state governments; the restructuring of government; the purge of the civil service; the Concordat with Rome

- the use of the Gestapo – terror – the Nuremberg laws (1935) and action against the Communists and Jews

- propaganda and indoctrination – education and youth movements and control of the media

- control over the workplace and the Reich Labour Front

- control over the churches and the establishment of the Reich church

- the extension of the Enabling Act, 1937, permitting extension of political control.

Answers are likely to conclude that Hitler used a variety of means to extend Nazi control and destroy opposition and potential for opposition; thus consolidating his power. The Night of the Long Knives might be deemed particularly significant in that it appeased his political opponents in the army, showed the lengths to which Hitler was prepared to go and removed the troublemakers among his own followers. However, it could be argued that Hitler was already well-established before the purge took place and that the Enabling Act was of far greater importance. It could also be argued that Hitler had the power to take the Presidency and consolidate his hold on it without the purge of the SA and that his decision to carry through this event was, in fact, more a sign of weakness. He had been unable to control his own followers and the incident showed how beholden he was to the army and right wing elites. Furthermore the SA were not completely eliminated and opponents never fully removed (hence the use of the SS to root out further trouble).

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

> **A:**   **Britain and Kenyan Independence, 1953 to 1964**
>
> Examine the extent to which Britain's determination to protect its economic interests led to the decision to grant Kenya's independence in 1963.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The main focus of this question lies in determining the primary motive which underpinned Britain's decision to grant Kenya its independence. The proposition in the question suggests that Britain's attitudes changed because British interests were not being met by the retention of Kenya as an imperial possession.

Britain's economic interests
Candidates may consider the economic relationship that Britain had wanted to develop with colonies, and particularly with Kenya. The priority was to use Kenya as part of the process of post war economic reconstruction and to strengthen the British economy in order to heighten Britain's role as an international power. The Colonial Economic Development Programme was introduced to encourage investment in order to make the policy work. One of Macmillan's early actions was to assess the economic advantages for Britain of holding on to Kenya. This analysis came to the conclusion that the economic costs outweighed the gains. It was also apparent by 1960 that Britain's economic future lay in Europe and trade with the USA rather than through a dependency on colonies such as Kenya.

The Impact of Mau Mau and Nationalisation
Candidates may illustrate the negative economic and political impact of Mau Mau terrorism on Britain's interests. It forced Britain to maintain a significant, and costly, military force and security system to counter the terrorism. Candidates may suggest that Mau Mau had been beaten by 1959 therefore Mau Mau was not behind the decision to grant independence. Although, by about 1959, the terrorist threat had been neutralised Mau Mau was still a damaging force to the British government. The 1959 Hola Camp crisis is a classic example

of Britain's political establishment being endangered by the domestic and international political 'fall out' of this embarrassing event. The wider context of nationalism across Africa was also gaining greater international support, particularly from the USA and it was becoming clear that Britain's relationship with the USA was not being served by maintaining the traditional stand against nationalism. This was recognised when Macmillan made his 'Wind of Change' speech in 1960. Candidates could usefully examine the motives behind the speech and apply them to the situation in Kenya.

The Role of Macmillan
Candidates may suggest that Macmillan's new pragmatic speech was driven by a realisation that Britain's national interests were not being met by retaining Kenya. Macmillan's whole approach was founded on a new acceptance that imperial possessions were not relevant to Britain's future in the post-war world. Empire was seen, potentially, as a burden economically and politically rather than as an asset.

Other factors
In order to balance answers and address the issue of the extent to which British interests drove policy in Kenya candidates may consider the following by way of countering the approach referred to above.

- Britain had failed to establish any acceptable alternative to independence for Kenya. Attempts at limited power sharing such as the Lyttleton Constitution had failed. Nationalism in Kenya was getting stronger and as attempts to neutralise it by partial compromises failed it became even stronger. Candidates may suggest that independence was almost an inevitable outcome and not directly the result of Britain trying to protect its own national interests.

- Pan-African nationalism may be seen as a powerful force in aiding independence for Kenya. Candidates may suggest that as the tide of nationalism grew it became almost impossible for Britain to resist granting Kenya independence, irrespective of any question of protecting national interests.

- The principle of decolonisation had already been firmly established and was not necessarily driven by national interest. References may be made to India and more pointedly to Ghana.

- Some may consider the impact of the Suez Crisis of 1956 on the approach Britain adopted towards Kenya. Suez may not necessarily have led Britain to measure its control of empire over its own interests but it may have made Britain reconsider the value of empire and assess its own capacity to maintain an empire. This was particularly so when international status was measured in terms of nuclear capability and alliances with superpowers – in Britain's case the USA.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

      B: **France and Algerian Independence, 1954 to 1962**

            Examine the extent to which the actions of the FLN contributed to the achievement of Algerian independence in 1962.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The focus of this question is on the impact of FLN terrorism in terms of its contribution to the achievement of independence for Algeria by 1962. In order to evaluate the impact of FLN it would be necessary to consider the other factors which also contributed. These include a particular focus on the importance of Charles de Gaulle from 1958. Candidates may suggest that his role was of central importance and assess whether his attitudes were a direct consequence of FLN terrorism or whether the terror was of marginal importance in influencing de Gaulle. Another important area is the role of the French army during the crisis. This may be examined in terms of its negative and positive contributions towards the achievement of independence. The context of the French Military and political experiences in Indo-China may also be considered. Inevitably French public opinion also had some impact on the outcomes.

The FLN
Candidates may suggest that the tactics of the FLN were particularly effective in developing the support base amongst 'ordinary' Algerians. The focus was very much on provoking an aggressive response from the French army and this was often directed against innocent Algerians. The organisation of the FLN became more developed and turned it into a very effective terrorist movement from 1956. However, candidates may explore the limitations of the FLN after the Battle of Algiers. The French army had been very successful in neutralising the FLN and by the time de Gaulle came into office the FLN was already struggling to challenge French imperialism. Another limitation was that it was not as developed politically as it had been militarily. Despite this it was represented at the Evian talks and did play a political role in the negotiations with de Gaulle.

De Gaulle's Role
Candidates may explore the significance of the collapse of the fourth French Republic and the emergence of de Gaulle as France's new leader. He moved away from the weak governmental position which had characterised his predecessors and adopted a much more focused and pragmatic stance in terms of France's national interests and how they could be achieved. He was a skilled political strategist and aimed at developing his own power and popularity as much as protecting France. He visited Europe as the Heartland of France's future both economically and politically. These positions and his motives are important in the development of an evaluation of the contribution of the FLN. Some candidates may argue that de Gaulle was the catalyst and the influence exerted upon him by FLN terrorism by 1958 was relatively marginal. The FLN did contribute to growing frustration within the French army in their desire to retain Algeria as a colony and one that they had preserved as such. This could be established as the link between the FLN and de Gaulle.

The Army
The army's response to the FLN could be considered in the context of the loss of Indo-China and the secondary humiliation of the Suez crisis. The army used a form of state terrorism against the Algerian people and this served to strengthen the FLN's power. However, the army also succeeded in almost destroying the FLN from 1958. Candidates may go on to consider the developments within the army's position and how these influenced de Gaulle's views. Most importantly was the development of OAS and the threat it posed not only to de Gaulle but to the stability of the Republic as a whole. By removing Algerian nationalism as an issue, de Gaulle could also undermine the raision d' être for the existence of the OAS.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915–1924

    A: **The accession to power of the Bolsheviks and Lenin's regime**

             How important are the promises of 'Peace, Bread and Land' in Lenin's April Theses in explaining the Bolsheviks' successful seizure of power in October/ November 1917?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Lenin's 'April Theses' outlined his demands for peace and the transfer of power to the Soviets.

The 'April Theses' are usually summarised as 'Peace, Bread and Land'. Candidates may well separate out the three elements and assess how they contributed to the Bolshevik seizure of power, or they may consider the three elements together. Either approach is equally valid. The April Theses link to the Bolshevik seizure of power because they included the need to overthrow capitalism (now the middle class Provisional Government) and hand power to the proletariat and the peasants. In this way there are clear links from the April Theses to the Bolshevik seizure of power; Lenin changed the Bolshevik position and moved away from agreement with the Mensheviks.

- Peace; the need to end involvement in the Great War regarded as a 'predatory imperialist war'
- Bread; the need to set up a system whereby goods were produced and distributed by the Soviets, particularly bread
- Land; the need to nationalise all land by confiscating all privately owned estates and handing them over to the local Soviets for reallocation.

Candidates may well show understanding that Lenin made these promises in April 1917 immediately after his return from exile. At this time the Bolsheviks were not tightly organised and disciplined and Lenin's leadership was disputed. Any assessment of the Bolshevik

seizure of power needs to bear this context in mind. On the other hand, the role of Lenin was key to the events April-November 1917. No other Bolshevik leader was prepared to risk an uprising but from the July Days it is clear Lenin thought it possible to seize power.

Kamenev and Zinoviev resisted to the end. Trotsky, a key ally of Lenin and Stalin, was persuaded to back the seizure. He did not make his promises on the back of careful and agreed Bolshevik analysis of the situation, and there are many other factors to take into account.

- from the start the Provisional Government had to share power with the Petrograd Soviet

- the Provisional Government decided to stay in the war and launched the disastrous Kerensky offensive. Bolsheviks and sailors from Kronstadt swarmed into Petrograd on 3-4 July (the July Days) demanding the Petrograd soviet take power, but eventually pulled back. This showed growing support for Bolshevism and that they had few political allies. It undermined the PG as they ordered troops to suppress the demonstrators

- the Provisional Government was slow to set up the elections for the constituent Assembly, but this was probably less damaging than the decision to stay in the war

- the SRs (largest party with peasant support base) and Mensheviks decided to support the Provisional Government. They were then held responsible for all the grievances and offered a great political advantage to the only party not to co-operate, the Bolsheviks

- Prince Lvov, and later, Kerensky were not able to hold the Provisional Government together. They underestimated the threat from Bolshevism and over rated the power of their weak coalition government

- the Kornilov Coup empowered the Bolsheviks. It gave credibility to Lenin's stated fears that the Provisional Government was vulnerable to a counter revolution from the right, and by arming the Petrograd Soviet to resist Kornilov, the Provisional Government armed the Bolsheviks

- economic and social grievance grew worse. Rising inflation and food shortages especially in Petrograd played into the Bolsheviks hands by September.

Many candidates will balance and link these factors effectively.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915–1924

   B: **The establishment of the Weimar Republic**

      Was the Versailles *Diktat* the most important reason for political extremism in Germany in the years 1919 to 1923? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The Treaty of Versailles was condemned by many Germans. They had not been able to negotiate the terms, had no right of appeal, and the blockade was kept in place to force the new German government to sign. German complaints included:

- it was a dictated peace – Diktat

- it contradicted the 14 points

- war, guilt, and later reparations fixed from 1921

- exclusion from the League of Nations

- disarmament.

Recent historical analysis of the Treaty has considered it less punitive and judged the terms as not excessively burdensome. The Treaty though became an enormous propaganda weapon for any anti-Weimar political group from the extreme LW or RW to beat the new republic.

Candidates will need to recognise the different sources of political extremism – the left wing and the right wing. Many answers, especially good ones, will find different causes for political extremism at different times within the four year period.

- Right wing opposition focused on the terms of the Treaty of Versailles signed by the Weimar government in June 1919. Army leaders developed and perpetuated the 'stab in the back' myth blaming socialists and Jews for defeat, the Kaiser abdication and political upheaval 1918–1919. They objected to the dictated peace, the variance with the 14 points, especially national self determination, the guilt clause and demilitarisation. The Freikorps and the Kapp Putsch were particularly incensed by the terms, assassinations of signatories such as Erzberger and Rathenau by RW opponents, and eventually the emergence of the NSDAP committed to revoking Versailles are all evidence of political instability caused by the Treaty.

- Left wing opposition began in December 1918, some three weeks after the transition of power from the Kaiserreich to the new republic, with demonstrations. The Spartacists broke from the USPD to form the KPD in January 1918 led by Karl Liebnecht and Rosa Luxemberg. They were motivated by internal difficulties within the USPD, their revolutionary links with Bolshevism in Russia, and by social and economic grievances in the German towns and cities. The Spartacist revolt was crushed but strikes were common across Germany and workers attempted to set up independent socialist republics. In the spring of 1921 the KDP was encouraged by Comintern to try to seize power in Saxony, but failed. They were only successful in Bavaria.

Candidates will need to examine other reasons for political extremism:

- some Germans opposed the new democratic constitution and expressed this opposition by supporting the extreme political parties. Democracy was new to Germany and alien to its authoritarian history, e.g. the system of Proportional Representation led to a succession of coalition governments. The argument that unpopular coalition governments led to support for extreme politics is less popular with modern historians than it once was

- government action fanned the political extremism in different ways at different times. Reliance on the Freikorps aggravated the left wing, leniency towards right wing opposition, e.g. the soft sentence handed out to Hitler after the 1923 Putsch, and the government role in the Ruhr crisis all bear investigation

- reparations and the Ruhr crisis will form a key part of the essay. Candidates will need to explain that the crisis did spawn some extremism, but eventually democratic government survived

- LW opposition – in October 1923 the KPD tried to seize power in Saxony and Thuringia. The army crushed the uprising

- RW opposition – an attempted Putsch under Major Buchrucker in North Germany was put down by the army

- RW opposition – Hitler tried to take advantage of Stresemann's unpopularity after the decision to end passive resistance (and apparently capitulate to the French and Belgians) by starting the Munich Putsch.

Candidates may well conclude that the Treaty of Versailles itself was unpopular among many Germans, but conditions in Germany were so strained and the political culture so anti-democratic, that it was difficult to prevent political extremism.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915–1924

C: **'Mutilated Victory': Italy and the First World War, 1915–1920**

Examine the extent to which Italian involvement in the First World War explains the emergence of the fascist movement in Italy by the end of 1920.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The answers will need to show knowledge and understanding about Italian involvement in the First World War. This might open up a range of investigations including the impact of military defeat, and appeal to those who believed the war had been mismanaged by the liberal governments, those who were disillusioned by the peace terms and the men who lived and fought in the war, hence 'trenchocracy'. Any, or all, or another approach is valid.

Military defeat: especially Caparetto in 1917.

Management of the war: the Italian government was divided about entry into the war in 1915 and struggled to achieve efficient war organisation. Pay for workers in war-related industries rose, food shortages led to riots, military defeats, especially Caporetto. Mussolini was able to play on the apparent weakness of the Liberal governments.

Terms of the Peace: Treaty of St Germaine was known as the 'mutilated victory' – Italy not get Dalmatia, part of the Italian Irredenta, given to the new state Yugoslavia as part of national self-determination. The fascists could, and did, play on this feeling of national grievance.

Trenchocracy: particularly effective among the young middle class volunteer and conscripted junior officer, rather than among the peasant infantrymen, who were disgusted by the normality, and the profiteering, on the Home Front; and compared it to the 'community' of the trenches. Fascism appealed to these young men who believed they had fought in the war to make Italy 'great, free, strong' (Turati). Mussolini claimed he would

represent and empower the wartime class whose struggle and sacrifice entitled them to reshape Italy as anti-Marxist and national socialist.

Answers would be expected to consider the events in Italia Irrendenta linking to the emergence of fascism. The nationalist poet, D' Annunzio, seized Fiume and held it for a year as it had not been given to Italy in the Peace Settlement. The seizure gave a great deal to the emergence of fascism, especially in terms of ideology and symbols. D'Annunzio made heroic speeches, developed recognisable salutes and uniforms and spoke of 'Mare Nostrum' Mussolini learned a lot from these developments.

- other factors might include post war political, social and economic crises in Italy that explain the emergence of fascism, e.g. weakness of the liberal government, socialism, peasant unrest, unemployment and economic distress. Italian society had been divided before the war, but by 1919 was much more divided

- the liberal government was under attack from the right and left wings. Socialists (the PSI, the Italian Socialist Party) inspired by the revolution in Russia organised a wave of strikes for two years, the Biennio Rosso, with factory and land occupations. They were also successful in local elections, and their newspaper, 'Avanti', was widely read. The threat from the socialists drove many to back the fascists. Some candidates may well lay great stress on the apparent threat from the left wing as a key explanation for the emergence of fascism as a political force arguing fascism grew into a mass movement in both the north and centre of Italy where socialism was strongest, riding on middle class and patriotic fears

- another relevant line of investigation could be the role of Mussolini himself. Mussolini changed from his earlier socialist identity to Fascism. He was able to draw support from the elites, especially the petty bourgeoisie, the industrial and agricultural elites, and the King and the Pope. Fascism had organisation through the Ras, and historians stress the importance of this, and an identifiable leader in Mussolini.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870–1950

  A: Population change in Britain, 1870–1945

            Examine the extent to which the fall in the birth rate in the years 1870 to 1945
            was the result of the emancipation of women.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an
extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative
relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

The emancipation of women contributed to the fall in the birth rate as:

- more opportunities for work in offices, schools, shops and hospitals became
  available. This helped force some re-evaluation of the social and economic role of
  women in an industrial society

- more education for women encouraged them to put careers before families

- more education enabled them to understand and practise birth control.

Other reasons for the decline in birth rate:

1. 1870 Education Act
    stronger trade unions
    changing requirements of the labour market

    all diminished the economic value of children's labour.

2. A more calculating attitude to family size – beginning in upper ranks permeated
    downwards. This encouraged the adoption of birth-control devices which were
    beginning to appear – partly because it became technically possible to manufacture a
    cheap and reliable product and partly because of the demand.

3. Increasing living standards from the last quarter of the 19th century among workers encouraged a choice between large families and modest comfort.

4. Middle classes 'squeezed' by the Great Depression – which diminished profits, rents and interest rates, limited families to give children a more advantageous start in an increasingly competitive and education-orientated world.

5. A high proportion of young males left as a result of emigration from the 1880s and were killed in the war 1914–18 (and again 1939–45). This created a surplus of unmarried and unreproductive females.

6. In the 20th century greater understanding, born of the growth of education and rising incomes have continued the trend.

7. Birth control has become more reliable and more readily available.

8. Two world wars and the depression of the 1930s have made the world appear a less favourable environment for large families.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870–1950

> **B: The Cotton Industry in Britain, 1870–1950**
>
> Was overseas competition the most important factor in the decline of the cotton industry in Britain in the years 1870 to 1939? Explain your answer.
>
> In your answer you need not refer to the period 1914 to 1918.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Reasons why overseas competition could be seen as critical:

- competition from overseas producers increased in the 1870s

- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany, the United States and France had introduced protective Tariffs prior to 1914

- Japanese competition grew post the First World War with two thirds of lost British sales going to Japanese manufacturers in the 1920s

- the growth of the US cotton industry in the 1920s which saw its own domestic market boom behind the protective wall of tariffs created by Congress

- Britain also lost markets to overseas competitors due to wars.

Evidence of other reasons for the decline of the cotton industry:

- union pressure to maintain employment rather than innovation and the more powerful role of the trade unions in the UK compared to the USA and Japan

- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton

- the low investment in the 1920s due to low profits and high interest rates

- the Great Depression in the years 1929–1939

- the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936

- the growth of alternative fabrics such as Rayon in the 1930s (which was also developed by Courtaulds).

HISTORY

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS** **HS03**

Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941

A: **America, 1919 to 1929**

Were the Republican administrations the most important factor in bringing about an economic boom in the 1920s? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 **L2: 5-9** **L3: 10-14** **L4: 15-17** **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers are expected to cover a range of factors for the boom between 1919 and 1929.
The Republican administrations of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover all played an important part in the creation of a boom. They set the tone for the 1920s through their economic policies. Harding helped the USA out of the post-war depression through encouragement of industry. Harding announced a return to normalcy. They encouraged trade in a number of ways by putting tariffs on imported goods. They helped the Europeans to pay back their debts. The administrations saw business as the most important part of the economy. Hoover was known as the 'engineer' because of the work he did before. He even became president. The dominant philosophy was laissez faire. They supported employers and not the workers.

There are several other reasons for the boom which need to be balanced against the role of the administrations.

- the development of easier credit has a significant role to play. People were able to borrow more money. Money supply had been tighter before the progressive era. People were able to get larger loans and more easily as banks and insurance companies gave consumers, farmers and industrialists credit. They were seeking to grow their business during the 1920s. It was much easier to borrow with the development of hire purchase agreements. This allowed repayments over a period of time. For industrialists it allowed them to borrow against the expectation of profits in the future

- consumers were able to buy more goods such as cars and luxury goods (Hoovers, radios etc.) with credit which stimulated factory production

- consumers created demand

- industrialists borrowed money to expand which then created a cycle of prosperity

- easier credit allowed stock market gambling to increase as people bought shares on the margin which drove stock prices up

- mass production is most commonly associated with Henry Ford and the Model T. This was arguably one of the most important developments because it cut the cost of the car or other consumer goods. Demand was further stimulated once it became cheaper

- mass production of the car in particular led to booms in associated industries, e.g. rubber, gas, glass etc.

- more roads were developed to accommodate cars and hence suburbs developed. People wanted more consumer durables for their new homes

- development of electricity allowed consumers to use labour saving devices and home radios and of course the production line

- development of advertising encouraged people to buy goods and developed as an important industry in its own right

- cheap immigrant labour helped to keep industry costs down and was easily exploited by long working hours

- role of big business and entrepreneurs, e.g. shares were driven up, inventors created new products and people like Ford took risks

- expansion of industry and overseas markets helped to create a boom because the US could sell its products abroad and take over European companies and so expand even more.

The Republican administrations underpinned the boom with very business friendly policies. They kept the USA out of European entanglements as much as possible and it was this that allowed the economy to thrive and grow. However, candidates could argue that without industry to take up the opportunities that were presented there could not have been a boom. Some candidates may bring in the fact that the farmers did not really have such a boom period and so perhaps the Republican administrations were not that successful.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941

> **B:**   **The New Deal, 1933–1941**
>
>   How effective was opposition to the New Deal in changing its direction in the years 1934 to 1941?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates will need to consider a range of opposition and the change in direction that the New Deal took under Roosevelt, particularly in the second New Deal. The change of direction involved much tighter legislation and pushing the New Deal more to the left in terms of economic and political interference. This led to interventionism on a deeper scale.
Opposition included internal opposition from members of the democrat parties who didn't think the New Deal went far enough before a change in direction. They may talk in terms of opposition from the left and right.

Left
Huey Long (the kingfish) wanted more done for the poor, e.g. 'share our wealth'. He was potentially a threat because he was popular but was assassinated. No evidence to show he caused a significant shift in policy.
Father Coughlin was a Roman Catholic priest who wanted more done for the poor and was quite a strong opponent because of his radio show. Also he formed an alliance with Long and Francis Townsend.
Francis Townsend did have an impact because he campaigned for pensions for the over 60s and this idea was eventually taken up by Roosevelt. This was introduced in the second New Deal of 1935–37 through the Social Security Act although it did not go as far as Townsend wanted it to go.
Socialists felt the economic system should be completely changed and not just slightly altered by Roosevelt. They had minority support and no real effect.
Upton Sinclair was a critic but localised to California and no real effect.

Right

The opposition here came from business and the Liberty Leaguers who were founded in 1934. They attacked Roosevelt throughout the New Deal period. They were both Democrats and Republicans. Their chipping away did affect Roosevelt and led to some measures being watered down since he did not want to be seen as socialist. Arguably this is why he did not change the economic system and also measures to help workers and unions were late in arriving.

Institutional opposition

The most effective opposition in making Roosevelt change direction were the Supreme Court and Congress.

The Supreme Court in 1935 declared part of the New Deal unconstitutional, that is, the NIRA through the sick chicken case and later they threw out the AAA as unconstitutional. Hence their opposition was effective.

Roosevelt changed tack and tried to pack the court in 1937. He proposed the Judicial Reform Bill and this was stopped by Congress. However, he was forced to replace the previous acts of the first New Deal.

Therefore Roosevelt was much more cautious about the second New Deal and it became more about long term recovery. Also he cut down on the amount of money being spent on the New Deal to ease criticism which led to a depression.

He changed the emphasis in the WPA so that the work was more meaningful and not 'boon doogling'.

There were other reasons for a change in direction that may be mentioned:

- the influence of his wife

- failure of First New Deal to eliminate unemployment

- mini depression of 1937

- missed areas in the first New Deal such as labour issues

- World War II on the horizon.

Therefore it is arguable as to how effective the opposition was in causing change of direction. Some opposition was more effective than others such as the Supreme Court.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1135

    A: **The Introduction of Norman Military Feudalism, 1066–1087**

        Was the most important function of a castle, in the years 1066 to 1087, its use as a base for military operations? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should be focused on the role of castles to maintain and extend the conquest. However, the range of functions that they fulfilled was not as narrow as is suggested here and it is expected that at the highest levels answers will show understanding of the range of relevant factors and will arrive at a reasoned, well-supported conclusion. This range of factors includes defending frontiers and establishing control in areas of strategic importance, as centres of colonisation, as residences and administrative centres, acting as police posts and barracks. Answers should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples.

1.   A base for military operations

        •   secured borders and quietened troublesome frontiers, e.g. Durham, Welsh marches, strategic sea links secured by Sussex rapes castles

        •   held new ground, e.g. Sequence of motte & bailey in advance on London post-Hastings (Hastings-Dover-Canterbury-Winchester-Wallingford-Berkhamstead)

        •   supported each other through the construction of castleries, e.g. Arundel-Bramber-Lewes

        •   as a base for further conquest, e.g. Chester, Shrewsbury, Hereford

- as a base for operations and a means of intimidating potential unrest, e.g. Southwest, Welsh marches, the north – Warwick, Nottingham, York, Lincoln.

The dates of the building of castles and the siting of castleries also indicates the progress of the conquest – the south east (Hastings, Pevensey, Lewes, Bramber, Arundel) in the 1060s; the midlands (Shrewsbury, Tutbury, the Peak) in the 1070s; the north (Pontefract, Richmond, Conisborough) in the 1080s.

2.   Role of castellans

- gave the tenant the power to control the surrounding district

- income derived supported his personal needs and enabled him to discharge his feudal obligations

- given to men of proven military skill and administrative abilities, e.g. Robert of Eu, Roger of Montgomery, and William of Mortain.

Castles were used for both offence and defence; they were the outward and visible signs of Norman domination and the psychological aspect is attested to by the chronicles. They were also paramount agencies of settlement and colonisation. Royal castellans and vassals were responsible for the military subjection and economic exploitation of the conquered lands.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS** **HS03**

Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1135

 B: **Developments in Monasticism, 1066–1135**

Examine the extent to which Norman kings influenced the development of monasticism in the years 1066 to 1135.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 **L2: 5-9** **L3: 10-14** **L4: 15-17** **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates would need some familiarity with the nature of English monasticism before the conquest but it is not envisaged that any depth of knowledge would be required pre-1066.
Answers should be focused on the condition of monasticism in England in 1066, the degree of change and continuity afforded by the nature of patronage and the influence of monastic reform in Europe generally at this time.
The range of relevant factors includes the effects of Normanisation, of increased patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, the degree of continuity afforded up to 1135 and the beneficial effects of the new Orders, bringing England into the mainstream of continental reform.

- **Royal patronage**
  There were not a great number of monastic foundations in England as a result of the conquest. It was not until the second half of the reign of Henry I that royal patronage really took hold. Battle Abbey was endowed by the Conqueror but it was unusual in that it was under the special protection of the ducal house; it was treated as the personal territorial church of the Conqueror, his profitable act of penitence for Hastings.
  Cluniac influence was not strong in the first place as its strong monarchical constitution did not fit well to the needs of the Conqueror but William Rufus was to endow the Cluniacs house at Bermondsey
  Henry I's main endowments came after the death of his son William (1120) and he patronised fashionable movements. There was some rebuilding by the Benedictines, settlement of Augustinian priories and new communities of Cistercians. Reasons for

his endowments ranged from the political – organising tracts of land of uncertain loyalty (Carlisle, South Wales, Selby to the penitential (Reading).

Other influences on the development of monasticism include:

- **Aristocratic patronage**
  The monasteries made much greater progress due to their patrons among the aristocracy. The first Cluniac house was that of Lewes, founded by William de Warenne (1077); others such as Roger of Shrewsbury and William of Mortain followed so that by 1100, there were 8 Cluniac foundations in England.
  Foundations were often used to mark a rise in social standing (Robert d'Oilly at Osney) – or to consolidate estates granted by royal patronage (Picot in Cambridge, de Clinton at Kenilworth).
  When the reformed orders became fashionable, many of the nobles of Henry I's court followed the King's lead (Count Stephen, Furness). The Cistercian order in particular benefited because of their preference for 'desert' sites; such poor land was of little use to the barons but could be traded in for spiritual reward (Waverley, Garendon, Tintern, Rievaulx, Fountains).
  Monasteries were also used as mausolea. In an age where violence was largely the norm, they eased a warrior's way to salvation.

- **English patronage**
  There was a native element to the founding of religious houses after the conquest. Monks went north after the harrying and refounded several houses (Jarrow, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Whitby, York, Melrose).
  One of the most important foundations after Battle was that of Bermondsey founded by Alwine Cild with the assistance of William Rufus.

Not all developments were beneficial and candidates may refer to:

- the spoliation of English abbeys, imposition of servitia, the violence and culture clash caused by the introduction of new liturgies.

Effective answers will balance the patronage and influence of Norman kings against other factors to reach a well-supported conclusion.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529

A: Pretenders and Protest in the Reign of Henry VII

With what success did Henry VII neutralise the dangers of foreign support for Yorkist Pretenders in the years 1486 to 1497?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The focus of this question is the dangers represented by foreign support between the emergence of Simnel's challenge in 1486 and the defeat of Perkin Warbeck and the Scots in 1497. Answers will be expected to explain a range of factors in relation to the degree of threat from foreign support – and the effectiveness or otherwise of Henry VII's counter measures. The assumption that foreign support was a serious threat can, of course, be challenged. Many answers may argue that Henry was able to secure diplomatic security with relative ease, especially after the early years. On the other hand there were many potential dangers from abroad, Margaret of Burgundy, the Empire, Brittany, France and Spain. Henry himself had gained vital foreign support in his challenge to Richard III; he knew that foreign support would make any pretender dangerous, even if the basis of his claim to the throne was weak.

Answers should be based on a balanced assessment of how well Henry VII dealt with actual and potential foreign backing for pretenders. Many adequate answers will assemble their arguments rather as a chronological outline, supported by suitable evidence relating to the main events but lacking in assessment. Higher quality answers will show more evaluation and differentiation selecting perhaps fewer factors and making a discriminating choice of those that were more dangerous for Henry and those of lesser significance. There is a wide range of possibilities:

- the whole context of the reign made Henry seem vulnerable; he was never free of anxieties about legitimacy and recognition

- the Simnel Rebellion involved a range of foreign policy and military support culminating in invasion and pitched battle at Stoke

- Margaret of Burgundy was highly motivated, very persistent and in a position to give financial help and diplomatic support to pretenders

- Warbeck's backing from Ireland and Scotland caused great concern for Henry, especially in 1496–97

- Henry was afraid of Warbeck gaining support from Spain – for many years the Spanish monarchs delayed finalising the marriage agreed in 1489.

Some answers may argue that Henry dealt with these problems with great skill. He avoided war and kept good relations with Spain and the Empire. His security was enhanced by several treaties. Against this, other answers may argue that Henry was never safe until the late 1490s and that he was threatened by a dangerous coalition of enemies in 1497. One feature of good answers may be a differentiated assessment, arguing that Henry faced very serious problems at the beginning but overcame them swiftly – if not by 1487 then certainly by 1489.
It cannot be expected that answers will be comprehensive or give all factors equal weight. The key requirement is for a balanced argument supported by selective evidence.

*Note that the question is focused on Yorkist Pretenders. It will be legitimate for answers to see this purely in terms of Simnel and Warbeck – though credit should be given for relevant coverage of other aspects such as Warwick and de la Pole. On the other hand, it would not be appropriate to re-cycle here material relating to wider 'threats' to Henry VII's security, such as Yorkshire 1489 or Cornwall 1497, except with specific connections to Yorkist claimants.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529

     B: **The Career of Thomas Wolsey**

             Examine the extent to which Wolsey was personally responsible for the failure to achieve the annulment of Henry VIII's marriage to Catherine of Aragon.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The focus of this question is on Wolsey's role in how things went wrong in the pursuit of the royal divorce. There is also the related question of the relative importance of the contributions of Wolsey and Henry VIII – how far was Wolsey in control of the aims and conduct of diplomatic relations with foreign powers? Or was he constrained by the dominance of the King? Or was he commissioned to do an impossible job – so that nobody can be personally responsible to blame for not achieving the unachievable?

The timescale of the answers may vary. Many answers will focus on the final stages of the negotiations and on their collapse. Other answers may look more deeply into the origins of Henry's campaign for an annulment; and into the longer term relationships with the Papacy. Narrative description for its own sake would have little value. Better answers will define what the obstacles were blocking Henry's path and what, if any, were the consistent aims of Wolsey and Henry in pursuing their policy; and how near to success Wolsey came in carrying them through.

Comprehensive coverage of all the events and twists of the attempts to gain an annulment during the late 1520s cannot be expected – but key aspects might include:

- the theological basis of Henry's case for an annulment – and the previous precedents for such annulments being granted

- the rise of Anne Boleyn and Wolsey's attitude towards her – it can be argued that Henry (and Anne) took the lead in devising the legal strategy for obtaining the divorce and that Wolsey was unable to follow through his own way of going about it

- Wolsey's role as Cardinal and the (perhaps unrealistic) expectations that he would succeed in the diplomatic negotiations because of his status

- the 'Secret Trial' in 1527 and the distractions caused by Wolsey's Embassy to France

- political rivalries and infighting at court between 'radicals' and 'conservatives'

- setbacks in 1527–1528 when the Pope, Clement VII became virtually a political prisoner of Emperor Charles V, a relative of Catherine of Aragon

- the negotiations for a papal dispensation and the reasons for their failure

- the downfall of Wolsey.

Note that the question of the divorce continued after Wolsey had left the scene. Some answers may follow through these later stages, explaining the 'other factors' involved in failure apart from Wolsey. Such an approach could be relevant and effective but is by no means essential. Many good answers will end with Wolsey himself.

A selective approach based on critical evaluation will be more productive than a detailed narrative account. One feature of high quality answers may be the ability to provide a differentiated assessment – contrasting times of near success with other occasions of muddle and failure; or analysing the precise relationship between Wolsey and the King in apportioning responsibility for policy and responsibility.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 COURSE ESSAYS **HS03**

Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640

A: **The Nature of Puritanism and its Threat to the Crown, 1603–1625**

How effective were Bancroft's Canons for James I in dealing with the problems posed by Puritanism in the years 1603 to 1611?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates do not need to approach this question by dealing with Bancroft's Canons first. Indeed many will naturally choose to address the question chronologically as Bancroft's Canons were in the context of the Millenary Petition and Hampton Court Conference. Candidates may show an appreciation of how all three were linked or that the Canons were only effective because of what James saw in the Millenary Petition and at Hampton Court.

The Nature of Puritanism
Candidates are likely to attempt some definition of Puritanism – extreme protestants who sought the further reformation of the church; the 'godly' or 'elect' who through predestination could perceive themselves as better than others. Collinson has provided the most accepted definition of puritans as 'the hotter sort of Protestants'. A definition allows candidates to appreciate the problems they posed.

From their definitions candidates can illustrate that the essential problem of Puritanism for James was their desire to reform the church and thus, no matter how James responded, Puritans would always be a potential threat for James as their desire to reform and depth of belief could undermine his religious authority. As James was only Supreme Governor, as monarch the religious problem of Puritanism was also a political threat.

Stronger responses will explain however, that the majority of English Puritans were essentially moderate and James's swift recognition of this, coupled with his own pragmatism, shaped his actions. The Millenary Petition was important in shaping James's response as its moderate nature quickly made clear to James the difference between English Puritans and

the Presbyterianism of Scotland and therefore that the threat could be dealt with, hence the importance of Bancroft's Canons. Candidates may well point out that Bancroft's Canons were only effective because James shaped them in the context of the nature of Puritanism and the Millenary Petition.

James's Response

James was a Calvinist and thus had some sympathy with some of the Puritan agenda. James aimed to maintain a broad church in which moderate Puritans, the vast majority, felt they could conform and thus would not pose an overt threat.

James wished to deal with the moderate Millenary Petition but also outline his general religious position; he did this through the Hampton Court Conference. This would then be reinforced by Bancroft's Canons. Thus both should be seen as part of the same process – establishing a broad church but with the machinery to remove those who could really pose a threat. In this context candidates may stress that Bancroft's Canons were the key method by which James could enforce his general religious policy and general response to Puritanism.

Bancroft's Canons

This must be central to all answers. As a response to Puritans, James was determined to separate the radicals from the moderates. Bancroft as a proto-Arminian was chosen deliberately as the means to do this. The key measure was Canon 36 which enforced the 39 Articles. By this 1% of ministers were removed from the church. This illustrates that most Puritans were moderate but also that James's church was so broad that they felt they could conform. That many of this 'silenced brethren' removed themselves to America or the Netherlands lessened the problem of Puritanism for James. As the measure to deal with all Puritans and a form of enforcement candidates can justifiably argue that Bancroft's Canons were the most important part of James's response to the threat of Puritanism in this period. The maintenance of a broad church and the removal of radicals was at the heart of James's approach to religion and Puritanism. Bancroft's Canons through their persecution and moderation ensured that James maintained a 'Jacobethan balance' in the church that encouraged the conformity of the majority. Candidates should therefore comment on this in relation to the effectiveness of Bancroft's Canons. Some may point out the limits but generally Bancroft's Canons were very effective in the context of what James wanted to achieve. Bancroft's Canons removed radicals but was broad enough to allow most to conform to the broad church that Hampton Court, the appointment of Abbot and, more fundamentally, James's general approach were all part of.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640

> **B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603–1641**
>
>   Examine the extent to which Charles I's problems in Scotland to 1641 were
>   not of his own making.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an
extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

**This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative
relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.**

Candidates should outline how Charles created problems for himself but also other factors.
The key themes are therefore:

- Charles I's aims

- Charles I's kingship

- his policies, particularly attention paid to religious policies

- impact of his policies, in particular discontent

- other reasons for discontent.

Charles's aims

- uniformity and conformity across the kingdoms – part of a 'British' policy, less to
  Anglicize or unite the three kingdoms as to impose his will

- absentee kingship – Charles was to rule through others – e.g. Menteith, Lennox and
  Hamilton

Charles's kingship

- regarded as English king

- Scottish Privy Council with nine non-resident English members

- Scots restricted from patronage

- Act of Revocation, 1625

- role of Hamilton

Religion

- 1626 issued proclamation commanding observation of the Articles of Perth, including personal instructions for kneeling at communion.

- 1633 visit – prayer book announced. Coronation in Laudian style

- 1634 Reconstruction of the Court of High Commission

- 1634 Baron Balmerino

- 1635 upgrading of St Giles to a cathedral, Edinburgh a new bishopric

- 1636 Canons

- 1637 rebellion following imposition of Prayer Book
  Arrival back in Scotland of Presbyterian ministers driven out of Ireland by Wentworth

- 1640 Canons

Some may well argue that policies were not as important as Charles' style of kingship. Smith has argued that 'the conflict with the Scots was thus the outcome of the reforming policies and authoritarian style of government that were the very essence of the regime'.

Other factors

- candidates can consider the problems of absentee kingship from the context of a problem beyond Charles's control

- the nature of power within Scotland may also be considered, in that the elite were able to have much more influence and many were determined to assert their authority at the expense of the Crown

- in a similar vein the nature of the Presbyterian Church and its relationship with the Crown can be considered

- the extent to which the problems caused by policies was due to Charles or his ministers in Scotland

- economic problems as a result of harvest failures in the 1630s. Led to emigration and discontent, especially at Charles's taxation.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714–1802

A: **The Nature, Extent and Threat of Jacobitism, 1714–1746**

Was the lack of foreign support the most important factor in the failure of the Jacobite movement in the years 1714 to 1746? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

In 1715 the Old Pretender was based in Paris, and there were definite indications that Louis XIV might be willing to grant at least unofficial support to the Stuart cause, if only because of the bad feeling remaining from the War of Spanish Succession. This undoubtedly encouraged the Old Pretender and his supporters to make preparations for an invasion. However, the death of Louis XIV in September 1715 and the rise of the Orléans regency altered the situation substantially as a Hanoverian Britain might well provide support for the Duke of Orléans in any possible future conflict with Philip V of Spain over succession to the French throne; anticipated support for the Jacobites, therefore, did not materialise.

After 1715, there was some active support for Jacobitism from both Sweden and Spain. Anglo-Swedish tensions over Britain's role in the Baltic during the later stages of the Great Northern War led Charles XII to consider giving support to the Jacobites, and the Swedish ambassador in London, Count Gyllenborg, was arrested for conspiracy with the Jacobites (1716). Spain hoped to build a pro-Jacobite alliance, including Sweden but ran out of allies and launched a very ineffective attempted invasion of Britain in 1719. The establishment of a British alliance with France in 1716 effectively cut the Jacobites off from French support, and the Old Pretender was forced to leave France. During the 1720s and 1730s there was virtually no foreign support for the Jacobites.

In 1745, despite Anglo-French hostilities in the War of Austrian Succession, France made no real attempt to support the Young Pretender; the French had made an abortive attempt to cross the English Channel in the spring of 1744, foiled by bad weather, and the Jacobites might well have expected that they would at least have supplied some diversionary focus in 1745.

Candidates should then contrast this with various other reasons for Jacobite defeat between 1715 and 1746. The Old Pretender's role in 1715 was less than impressive, both in terms of his belated arrival in Scotland and his stubborn refusal to renounce Catholicism. Jacobitism was never popular in England, where the Tories were discredited throughout the entire period as the Whigs worked hard to ensure the survival of the Hanoverian regime; growing prosperity and complacency served to limit Jacobite prospects south of the border. the British army coped well with the threat both in 1715 and 1745, despite initial slowness in 1715, and the Young Pretender's leadership in 1745, whilst at times inspirational, was flawed by indecision.

Lack of foreign support:

- 1715 – French help expected, not given

- 1716 – ineffective Swedish conspiracy

- 1719 – Spanish attempted invasion

- 1744 – French invasion fleet decimated by storms

- 1745 – no French support received

Other factors:

1715

- limited role of Old Pretender

- Tory unpopularity in England

- lack of Jacobite support in England

- adequate performance by British army

- weak leadership by Earl of Mar

- very limited/ineffective Jacobite activity between 1715 and 1745

1745

- Hanoverian regime/Whig domination more securely established

- widespread prosperity in England

- indecisive role of Young Pretender

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714–1802

    B: **The British in India, c1757–c1802**

        How important was the role of the East India Company in the expansion of British influence within India in the years 1757 to 1784?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates should be able to identify the nature of the mercantile, military and political impact of the East Indian Company during this period. The primary objectives of the Company were mercantile, but in order to protect these interests from the threat from both the native Indian princes and the French rivals, the Company found itself obliged to develop a military role. In order to safeguard gains made in the various wars, the development of a quite sophisticated political structure was necessary. To a considerable extent all this was necessary because the British government was content to leave the initiative in the Company's hands. There was a gradual shift of opinion in Britain, however as there was a growing awareness of both the responsibilities of the mother country for the excesses at times carried out by the Company, and the considerable commercial and financial importance of the areas left in the Company's control. This shift in opinion manifested itself in the Regulating Acts of 1773 and 1784 and in the attempt to impeach Warren Hastings.

Much of the growth of Company influence was due to the roles played by Clive and Hastings. Clive initially went to India as a clerk with the Company and throughout his career very much remained a servant of the Company, although he came to regard the extension of British power in India as being of greater importance than considerations of trade. Hastings also went to India initially as a company servant in 1750. Although he soon came to realise the nature and extent of corruption by company officials, and the danger which this posed to long term British interests in India, and later served in government office as Governor and later Governor-General of Bengal, he retained the belief that the Company had a vital role to play in the continuing British control of India.

Candidates should contrast the role of the Company with other factors in the development of British influence in India: the roles and determination of both Clive and Hastings to expand British control, the rivalries of Indian princes which created a power vacuum for the British to fill and the international scene which gave Britain the opportunity to drive the French out of India.

East India Company objectives

- mercantile – prime aim

- military – necessary to defend mercantile interests

- political – necessary to defend mercantile interests, and in response to pressure from successive British Governments.

Main agents of East India Company

- Clive

- Hastings

Limitations of East India Company impact

- corruption – affecting EIC image/reputation, both with India and, more importantly, in Britain

- increasing interference by British governments in Indian affairs.

Other Factors

- roles of Clive/Hastings – personal motivations

- rivalries/weaknesses of native princes

- international scene/French weakness.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841

     A: **Government Response to Poverty**

           Examine the extent to which the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act had achieved its aims by 1841.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Please note that candidates may interpret 'aims' in different ways. Some may look at the aims of those that promoted the act and/or called for Poor Law Reform, others may look at the terms of the Act and consider whether these were carried out as intended.

Ways in which it achieved its aims include:

- it was cheaper than the old system for some years after 1834

- it discouraged the poor from having larger families just to claim more relief

- it discouraged the practice of paying low wages

- it was a national system (Benthamites) which met the greatest good of the greatest number.

Ways in which it failed to achieve its aims include:

- the workhouse system failed to work in the northern cities where the poor faced cyclical unemployment

- the system was not fully implemented so the objective of a uniform system was not met

- it damaged the Whigs' reputation as reformers, e.g. 'Whig Bastilles' and caused resentment and unrest – e.g. Anti-Poor Law Union

- by 1839 costs had risen to the level of 1832 so in longer term had not reduced costs
- it was a major cause of Chartist unrest as it underlined the gulf between the middle and the working classes.

Candidates should provide a relevant and supported conclusion which links aims to achievement. Please take care to ensure that stated 'aims' were indeed 'aims' and that the evaluation is not simply an overall appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the Act.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841

> **B:**   **Religion and Politics in England and Ireland c1820–c1841**
>
> With what success did the Church of England meet the religious and political challenges it faced in the years c1820 to c1841?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The main points supporting the idea that it was successful are:

- although the issue of Catholic emancipation up to 1829 divided progressive Tories such as Canning from 'Protestants' such as Peel it only led to the Catholic gentry becoming integrated with the rest of the upper class, e.g. the Lord Lieutenant of Lancashire in 1834 was a Catholic so the social pre-eminence of Anglicanism remained

- the success of the Ecclesiastical Commission

- the success the Anglican Church continued to enjoy in attracting high quality undergraduates to the ministry.

The main points against the idea that it was successful are:

- the growth of towns such as Birmingham focused around dissenting church communities

- the Anglican revival and the Oxford Movement reflected controversy within Anglicanism

- the Catholic revival and Irish immigration

- the issue of slavery.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921

      A: **The Nature and Impact of New Liberalism, 1906–1915**

              Was New Liberalism the most important factor behind the Liberal governments' welfare reforms in the years 1906 to 1914? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   **L2: 5-9**   **L3: 10-14**   **L4: 15-17**   **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should weigh the importance of New Liberalism against that of other factors in the governments' introduction of welfare reforms during their terms in office before the First World War. Although there should be illustrative reference to the welfare reforms and particularly the major measures of the Liberals, the focus of responses should be on explanation of the relative importance of New Liberalism and other factors. Answers should consider and assess the significance of humanitarian, economic and political factors as well as the impact of New Liberalism and its supporters and the best answers will see links between factors.

Responses may refer to some of the following points in assessing the importance of New Liberalism.

- the genuine humanitarian views seeing the need for compassion and social justice held by many 'New Liberals'. Poverty had to be reduced, or at the very least alleviated. The Poor Law and its workhouses were no longer the only means of doing this. Government and state action had to supplement at the very least individual and charity provision to combat poverty and the existing Poor Law

- in terms of New Liberalism ideology Hobson and Hobhouse advocated not socialism, but to 'supply all workers at cost price with all the economic conditions requisite to the education and employment of their powers for their personal advantage and enjoyment'. These included a right to work and to a living wage. Individual liberty for

the working classes had not been fully achieved and was limited by the extent of social and economic deprivation. New Liberalism was not, and was different from socialism, but recognised the importance of using state power to bring about welfare reform

- the most effective supporters of such views in terms of government action were Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, and also Asquith

- reference to the influence of Joseph Chamberlain as the leading politician in implementing 'new radicalism'. His concept of state and local government action to tackle poverty and unemployment remained with many who had stayed in the Liberal Party.

Other factors which influenced the Liberal governments included:

- the need for action following the findings of Booth and Rowntree in their studies of London and York respectively and the revelations of poor health and fitness of the recruits for the Boer war. The last was followed up by the official 1904 'Report on Physical Deterioration'. The main causes of poverty were unemployment and old age

- the need for a healthy and fit working class for economic and military reasons especially in the context of economic and military rivalry notably from Germany. Much emphasis was put on achieving national efficiency by the Liberal governments

- problems were identified and then dealt with by way of welfare reforms in a piecemeal manner. In 1906 the Liberals had no overall scheme for welfare reform and did not produce one. The reforms were indeed piecemeal from 1906–14. They were focused mainly on children, the elderly, the unemployed and conditions at work

- a desire to tackle the problems of poverty and at least ameliorate them, certainly from one part of the Liberal Party (including but not confined to 'New Liberals') following the lack of welfare reform by the Unionists during the previous 20 years

- the need to maintain clear differences with the Unionists'/Conservatives' record in Government (1900–1905) was seen as important in electoral terms

- the Liberals were also trying to enhance their appeal to the working class electorate and were conscious of rivalry from the new Labour Party.

Responses are not expected to give lengthy detail of the Liberals' welfare reforms, but should use relevant evidence by reference to some of those reforms. The most important were:

- Workmen's Compensation Act
- Old Age Pensions
- National Insurance

Measures for children included:

- school meals

- school medical inspections

- Children's Charter including health and care of children, juvenile courts and borstals, ban on sale of tobacco to those under 16.

Other reforms were:

- improved conditions of work for merchant seamen, miners, shop workers and those in the sweated trades (e.g. tailoring, lace spinning and box making)

- introduction of labour exchanges to bring employers and potential employees together effectively

- increases in taxation of the wealthy in Lloyd George's 1909 'People's Budget' which were aimed at providing revenue partly to pay for the welfare reforms especially pensions through a fairer system of taxes.

Overall debate about the factors influencing the Liberal governments should remain central. Responses should evaluate the relative importance of various factors. For example, there may be debate about whether rivalry for the working class vote from the new Labour Party or action on welfare following Unionist neglect was more important than the humanitarian or economic arguments of New Liberalism to alleviate the effects of poverty through state action. There may be reference to reasons for the welfare reforms in the context of the historiographical debate about the decline of the Liberal Party, e.g. the views of Dangerfield, Wilson, Morgan, Searle or Adelman.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921

> **B:**   **Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland, c1895–1921**
>
> How important was the election of Liberal governments in Britain in 1906 and 1910 in explaining the emergence of militant Ulster Unionism in the years 1906 to 1914?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers should assess the importance of Liberal governments coming into power in 1906 and especially following the two general elections in 1910 with a changed parliamentary situation, against the importance of other factors in explaining the emergence of militant Ulster Unionism in the period.

Points relating to the election of Liberal governments include the following:

- election of a Liberal government with a huge majority in 1906 was regarded as a threat in itself. Militancy was of a different scale from that of Ulster opposition before 1906 and particularly so from 1911–1912. There could be another attempt at Home Rule by the Liberals following the defeat of the Bills in 1886 and 1893

- the threat became much more of a reality as a result of the constitutional crisis, the 1910 election results and the Parliament Act. After January 1910 the Liberal government was in fact weaker in the Commons with no overall majority and then had a parliamentary dependency on Redmond and the Irish Nationalists. The price of support was a renewed Liberal commitment to Home Rule. The Second Home Rule Bill (1893) had been defeated only in the Lords. Now that obstacle could be overcome in a period of a few years following the Parliament Act of 1911

- the reality of Home Rule being 'imposed' led to extreme Unionist/Protestant resistance. The delayed passage of the Home Rule Bill through the Lords provided a period for the Unionists to become even stronger in terms of ability to resist

- the Home Rule Bill introduced in April 1912 (like the previous Bills) was moderate in that some Irish MPs would still sit at Westminster and though the Irish had responsibility for most internal affairs, the British government retained considerable control. The Irish Nationalists were enthusiastic but the 'moderate' provisions did not go near satisfying the Unionists and strong militant opposition emerged in Ulster. Opposition became stronger and increasingly armed with the Third Home Rule Bill due to be implemented in 1914.

Other factors explaining the emergence of militant Ulster unionism include the following:

- Unionism had developed from the late 19th century, but became much more militant faced with the real prospect of the Home Rule from 1912 under the 'extremist' leadership of Carson and Craig. They wished to maintain the Union but threatened to establish an Ulster government if necessary

- they set up the armed Ulster Volunteers and instituted the Solemn League and Covenant. The latter meant for Carson an imposition of discipline amongst the Protestant Unionists and demonstrated complete determination to resist Home Rule in any form of 'Rome Rule from Dublin'

- support of Bonar Law and much of the Conservative Party even for armed insurrection if Home Rule were passed (under the terms of the Parliament Act) by the British Parliament

- the prospect of civil war with the arming of the Irish Volunteers as well as of the Ulster Volunteers which looked likely especially after gun-running which the Liberal government failed to prevent

- rejection of the Asquith proposed compromise of exclusion of Ulster for six years by Ulster Unionists (and Conservatives)

- the Curragh Mutiny by British Army officers threatening to resign rather than having to implement or impose Home Rule.

The best answers will explain the reasons (with development) explicitly for the emergence of militant Ulster Unionism in the period with assessment of the importance of the election of Liberal governments in a context of the importance of other factors. In essence the reasons were the real prospect of Home Rule being introduced by the British government after 1906 and particularly from 1910, Ulster Unionist and Protestant resistance to the point of using arms, strong and determined leadership, support to an extent of both the Conservative opposition (especially Bonar Law as leader) and British Army officers, and the Unionist fear of opposition to them from the emergence of more extreme (and armed) Irish nationalism which openly rejected just Home Rule for Ireland and went much further in demanding complete independence.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750–1830

   A: Britain's Economy in 1750

   Examine the extent to which Britain's economy was regionally specialised by 1750.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Focus of the question

The question asks candidates to examine the extent to which Britain was regionally specialised by 1750 rather than a country based on local markets with little monetary exchange, little development of infrastructure, which would facilitate investment and movement of goods. The better candidates may state that the individual regions were developing partial and limited infrastructure but there was little evidence of this developing on a national scale. Note that candidates are not expected to have a detailed knowledge of developments before 1750.

Elements which suggest Britain was regionally specialised by 1750:

- there is evidence of a development of regional specialisation in Britain by 1750. This can be identified through the growth of proto-industrial organisation. The main areas of production which were affected were textiles, hosiery, lace making, small arms and metal toys/buttons and straw plaiting. This production was organised in regions: namely Lancashire, Yorkshire, Devon, East Midlands, West Midlands and the Bedfordshire area. These areas were very defined

- whilst a large element of production was carried out by small independent producers utilising family members there is evidence of putting out and the development of a workforce with specialised skills

- the development of a market for goods and the increasing number of families which were wage dependent, or income dependent, resulted in a growth in the market for food. The regional specialisation of industry led through enclosure to specialisation of agricultural production, although this was very limited by 1750 and most formal parliamentary enclosure took place afterwards

- the markets for the products of proto-industry were extra regional. Merchants organised the sale of goods both nationally and to export markets overseas. Such transportation of goods increasingly required improved road and canal links. Legislation was passed on six occasions to improve the state of roads for wagons and the transport of heavy goods and from 1706 a number of private turnpike acts were passed to improve the quality of roads, principally around London

- there is evidence of an increase in the institutionalising of capital accumulation and investment, which was necessary to underpin the development of agriculture and industry. The London and country banks were critical in facilitating short-term loans and discounting bills of exchange for merchants. For specialisation to take place there had to be an increase in money in circulation. The amount of specie increased from £10 million to £15 million between 1688 and 1750 and bank notes increased from £2 million to £5 million

- there was significant specialisation in and around London to provide specialist goods for the wealthier elements in society and the export market to colonies. The employment of Labour in London required the growth of specialist Markets gardening in Home Counties to provide necessary food.

Elements which suggest Britain was not regionally specialised by 1750:

- the majority of agricultural production was bought and sold in local markets with the exception of the London Market. The majority of the population was employed in agriculture. Output per person was insufficient to sustain a labour force not engaged in the production of food. Although enclosure by Act of Parliament began to increase from 1740 there was limited evidence of the widespread regional specialisation into either arable/pasture/dairy witnessed after 1750

- many of the items bought by people such as furniture and broom at the local fairs and markets were made within the local community and were not products transported out of the region

- where specialisation in agriculture occurred, it was mainly financed by major landowners investing in their own property. Even where money was borrowed to improve land the transaction was often undertaken by local attorneys acting as intermediaries for individuals who wished to lend money to secure an annuity

- the road network was extremely limited. Only roads around London and the major centres of commerce were able to sustain the bulk transport of goods. The main phase of turnpike construction came between 1750 and 1800 when 1600 trusts were formed. Water transport was used for long distance haulage for bulky goods as it had been since the Middle Ages.

Overall

Whilst the work of Pat Hudson, Franklin Mendels, Kreidte, Medick and Schlumbohm would suggest that this was a key period for the development of industry before the industrial revolution, their work also suggests that this specialisation was limited in 1750 and its impact on the wider experience of Britain at this time was limited. There was regional specialisation but only in certain regions of the country.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750–1830

        B: **The Standard of Living of the Working Classes, 1780–1830**

                     Examine the extent to which historians have failed to agree about an improvement in the quality of life of the working classes between 1780 and 1830.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Focus of the question

This question focuses on the wider issue of the standard of living debate, that of the quality of life. Originally both pessimists and optimists focused on the issue of real wages and this has continued to be a key element in the debate about the quality of life. Eric Hobsbawn extended the debate by arguing that it was insufficient to argue that real wages were sufficient and that employment/unemployment patterns should also be included. More recently historians have considered not only living conditions in urban and rural areas but also women's employment and the contribution of the black economy. Much depends on what are viewed as the key determinants of the 'quality of life'.

The quality of life of the working classes did improve:

- the optimists such as Ashton and Hartwell focus on increases in real wages, to argue for an improvement in the standard of living during the period of industrialisation. The optimists select a wide time frame until 1850 to demonstrate that the majority of the population whether rural or urban were beneficiaries in material terms of the process of industrialisation

- it is argued that spending power and therefore consumption is the main determinant of the standard of living; whether a male bread-winner has sufficient income to support his family. The national significance in terms of economic growth cannot be

underestimated as in 1800 wages accounted for about 45% of the national income. Hartwell argues that even during the Hungry Forties there was an increase in per-capita consumption

- optimists argue that the pessimists base their view on the false construct of a 'golden age' a rural idyll when agricultural employment was secure and domestic production was carried by family units which allowed for socialisation

- those who argue for an improvement in the quality of life also point to the improving life expectancy experienced by those living in the period 1780 to 1830. The increased birth rate can also be used to demonstrate that mothers were more fecund due to better diets and family formation was aided by higher wages.

The quality of life did not improve:

- the starting point for Hobsbawn was the experience of those whose material conditions worsened because of the impact of factory production and the growth of the market economy. Handloom weavers were de skilled by the power loom frame-work knitters reduced to abject poverty by the introduction of cut ups. These workers tried to protect their status by remaining in their own homes and carrying out industrial production for ever decreasing wages

- recently, historians, for example Jane Humphries have suggested that rather than focusing on male income the family income needs to be taken into account. The experience of women who may have supplemented the family income through taking in washing, skivvying and minding children suggests a decline in the quality of life as does the more extreme elements of the black economy: poaching, prostitution and theft, all of which were rife

- pessimists also placed greater emphasis on the quality of life, which examines not just the hard data but patterns of unemployment and housing/sanitation. Accounts made by Chadwick and others in the 1840s demonstrate squalid living conditions in towns; the outbreaks of cholera and other water borne illnesses confirm that for the majority of urban workers, those at the forefront of industrialisation, these elements worsened

- conditions in the countryside did not improve following the introduction of new agricultural methods and the Poor Law Amendment Act. Families who were a burden on the parish were either forced to move to areas where there was work available, that is to say the industrial towns. For those who remained, income was very low and was rarely compensated for by the tied cottage, plus there was decreasing access to produce for them.

Overall historians have failed to agree because they have focused on different issues and have taken different approaches. The optimists focus almost exclusively on the hard quantitative data of wages, consumption and life expectancy to extrapolate an improvement in the quality of life. Pessimists and recent social-economic historians have looked at qualitative material to argue that the overall experience was for a decline in the quality of life.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848

      A: **The Significance of the 1832 Reform Act**

            With what success did the Whig reforms of the 1830s meet the aims of the Utilitarian movement?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Answers need to show an understanding of utilitarianism. The Utilitarian movement contained the followers of Jeremy Bentham who argued that the test for institutions and laws should be their utility to society; in particular he advocated that actions should provide the greatest good to the greatest number. Success can be measured by assessing each act, by assessing aims or by assessing successes and failures. Reference should be made to the three Whig reforms of the 1830s identified in the specification, the 1833 Factory Act, the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act and the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act.

Success in meeting utilitarian aims:

- Benthamites judged actions by their efficiency and accountability. They believed in investigations to gather information to provide the evidence on which action could be based, a 'scientific' test. The Poor Law Amendment Act was based on the report of the 1832 Poor Law Commission. The inclusion of factory inspectors in the 1833 Factory Act was part of this belief

- government should impose uniform systems, hence the national system of poor relief and the Municipal Corporations Act which reformed local government. Local government became uniform, accountable and benefited all men of property instead of being a 'Tory dining club'. The extension of the franchise to the property owning middle-classes brought the greatest good to the greatest number

- actions should then benefit the greatest number of citizens, though their view of a citizen meant a man of property and means – those responsible enough to have a say in society. Therefore the Poor Law Amendment Act was meant to discourage the acceptance of relief and therefore reduce the burden of taxation on the majority. The principle of 'less eligibility' was put into place and workhouses were clearly deeply unattractive, resulting in the cost of indoor relief falling from £7 million to £4.5 million.

Failure to meet Utilitarian Aims:

- the Factory Act did not serve the greatest good, in terms of serving men of property. Instead it introduced restrictions on those who the nation relied on to create the greatest good. It was a victory for **humanitarian thinkers and campaigners** both inside and outside parliament

- children under nine were banned from working in the factories, those aged between nine and thirteen had their hours limited and two hours of compulsory schooling had to be provided. Utilitarians were concerned at the impact this might have on the poor who relied on their children earning a wage

- furthermore, the reality of the 1833 Factory Act was that unscrupulous owners easily circumvented the Act, as there were only four unpaid overseers for the whole country. This lack of uniformity undermined a key utilitarian principle.

Judgement may involve arguing that utilitarian principles were seen most clearly in the Poor Law Amendment Act and the Municipal Corporations Act. Alternatively they may look at which principles were mainly upheld and which were mainly disregarded.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848

    B: **Chartism and other Radical Movements, 1838–1848**

        Was the geographical spread of Chartism the most important factor in explaining why governments felt so threatened by the Chartist campaigns of 1839 to 1848? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

The Chartist campaign peaked in 1838/9 with meetings and a petition to parliament, in 1842 with a second petition, the rejection of which led to strikes and riots, including the Plug riots in Lancashire and finally in 1848 with a third petition following a rally at Kennington Common in London.

Candidates should assess the relative importance of the reasons why the Chartist campaign was threatening to the government. Answers should do so within an appreciation that Chartism ultimately failed and that the threat was dealt with by successive governments. Given that the government felt compelled to introduce legislation to alleviate social and economic grievances, introduced urban police forces, employed special constables, used the army and tried conspirators for treason, there was clearly a feeling there was a serious threat.
Given that the government felt compelled to introduce legislation to alleviate social and economic grievances, introduced urban police forces, employed special constables, used the army and tried conspirators for treason, there was clearly a sense there was a serious threat.

Evidence the geographical extent of Chartism was the key factor in the threat:

- geographical extent of Chartist support – Lanarkshire, West Riding, Midlands, South Wales, Black Country, North East, the Potteries, London

- the fact that these regions were the important industrial centres, and the possibility of industrial conflict, notably in the sabotage of the Plug Plots during the 'second phase' of Chartism

- the limit to government forces available in any given region, e.g. no more than 300 soldiers in the whole of South Wales, illustrating the severity of the threat of any co-ordinated uprisings to match the Newport action

- possibilities of national planning; pressure of northern agitators in South Wales in the month before the Newport Uprising; National Conventions

- sheer scale of those signing the charter, attending meetings, e.g. Kennington Common in 1848.

Balance may be offered by arguing that the geographical spread was not significant:

- the governments were able to deal with regional insurrection because there was little co-ordination of efforts and because the railways were used to transport troops quickly to trouble spots

- regionalism was also evident in leadership and tactics. It was always likely Chartism would implode – the divisions in the movement between physical and moral forces and between different leaders (e.g. O'Conner, Lovett, Frost).

Alternatively/further balance may be offered by considering other reasons the government felt threatened:

- the way Chartism tapped into the radicalism of pre-1832, and drew on existing radicals, Journals, organisations, leaders. The language of the movement drew on the radical tradition of both Britain and Europe. The *Commonwealthsmen* newspaper ran articles in praise of Oliver Cromwell, whilst posters advertising meeting in Leicester in 1842 talked of liberty, equality and fraternity. Both therefore had sinister connotations of regicide

- strength of the Chartist culture – the network of schools, libraries, churches and discussion groups where politics were debated and Chartism gained mass support

- the way Chartism drew strength from the economic problems of the period

- the diverse nature of the movement which incorporated other movements agitating for factory reform etc.

- the dynamism of O'Conner and other leaders

- the violence of the Newport Rising, 1839 and the severity of the sentences for Frost and Williams suggest a government running scared.

Candidates need to reach a judgement. One approach might be to consider whether the scale and extent of the threat was more significant than the nature of the threat; however, this is not prescriptive and any case that is made clearly and supported by evidence would represent acceptable judgement.

HISTORY

UNIT 3   **COURSE ESSAYS**   **HS03**

Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951

> **A: The Making of the Welfare State, 1942–1951**
>
> Examine the extent to which the inadequacies of welfare provision in 1942 had been overcome by 1951.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4   L2: 5-9   L3: 10-14   L4: 15-17   L5: 18-20

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates need to give some attention to the failings of welfare provision in the early years of the Second World War but focus on how far these failings had been corrected by the end of the post-war Labour governments. Amongst the inadequacies of welfare provision candidates might consider, perhaps by reference to Beveridge's 'Five Giants', would be:

- lack of universal, free secondary education

- insufficient support to enable bright youngsters from poor backgrounds to go to university

- school leaving age nationally still 14

- many working class wives and children not covered through National Insurance for health care including care of teeth and eyes

- inadequate provision and funding of hospitals

- uneven distribution of medical facilities

- state not committed to trying to maintain full employment

- lack of regional policy

- lack of decent housing for all, a situation worsened by the effects of enemy bombing

- lack of planning for land use allowing ribbon development and creeping suburbanisation

- National Insurance still not covering all workers or their families

- the Poor Law, though more humane, still in existence with 0.25 million claiming poor relief in 1940

- overall, welfare provision, despite the advances made between the wars was neither comprehensive nor universal. In many ways it was still arbitrary and inadequate. Wide variations existed between different regions and social classes in the provision of all forms of welfare.

In considering how far these faults had been corrected by 1951 candidates may well differentiate between changes of attitude as expressed in the various reports and legislation of the 1940s, and the effectiveness of these in practice. Various reports and legislation which might be referred to by candidates as showing greater state commitment to dealing with pre-war welfare defects could include:

- the setting up of committees on Reconstruction in 1941

- Medical Planning Committee's report on a national health service in 1942 and the White Paper 1944

- The Beveridge Report December 1942 with its aim of providing a minimum standard of living and comprehensive welfare for all through compulsory social insurance

- The 1946 National insurance Act which extended NI to all workers and provided a wide range of benefits in return for weekly contributions

- The National Assistance Act 1948 designed to provide help to those who fell through the safety net of other provisions

- Town and County Planning Acts of 1944 and 1947 greatly extending the powers of local authorities over land and urban development

- The Norwood Report 1943

- The 1944 Butler Education Act raising the school leaving age and providing some form of free secondary education for all

- The Family Allowances Act 1945 providing a state benefit to help parents meet the costs of bringing up children

- The 1944 White Paper on Employment which accepted as one of the aims of future governments – 'the maintenance of a high and stable level of employment'

- The 1946 National Health Service Act which set up the NHS as from July 1948 providing universal, comprehensive health care free at the point of need

Candidates may well argue that these measures show a real desire to plug all the gaps in welfare provision which still existed at the outbreak of the Second World War. They may also provide evidence to suggest that these measures did make a real difference by the end of the 1940s. Evidence for this might include:

- the raising of the school leaving age to 15 and an extra 25 000 teachers trained

- many bright, working class children were now able to get an academic secondary education

- LEA's began to provide grants for tutoring and maintenance for all those qualified to enter university

- the building of over one million new council houses with improved specifications by 1951

- the building of new towns such as Stevenage and Harlow

- full employment despite the severe financial and economic problems facing the country

- The Poor Law was finally abolished

- old age pensions were increased – in case of single persons for the first time since 1920

- The Rowntree Survey 1951 found 3% living in poverty compared to over 20%, 20 years earlier and over 30%, 50 years before

- The NHS did meet a huge suppressed demanded for medical treatment of all kinds particularly amongst women, children and the elderly, e.g. 5 million pairs of spectacles were given out by opticians in 1948–1949; over 8 million dental patients were treated and 187 000 free prescriptions dispensed

However there were limits to how far the inadequacies of 1942 had been effectively tackled by 1951:

- the new education system did separate children at 11 and many talented children did not get the type of education which they needed

- benefits remained small and some were still based on a personal means test

- absolute poverty may have declined but great differences remained between the social classes and real deprivation still existed especially in the countryside and in the cities

- the cost of the NHS led to the introduction of prescription charges by 1951

- many hospitals remained in old and inadequate buildings

- the housing stock remained inadequate and housing remained a major social and political issue throughout the 1950s

- not all the improvement in social conditions was due to government reforms. Much was due to the high employment and low inflation of the post-war period as well as to American aid especially from 1948.

Given the wide field of this question, answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive rather candidates need to produce a relevant and balanced argument incorporating key issues backed by selective evidence. Some answers may focus on particular areas such as welfare benefits and health, others may take a broader approach and include employment and housing. It is not essential for candidates to address health and education and they may adopt a more narrow interpretation of 'welfare' provision.

HISTORY

UNIT 3 **COURSE ESSAYS** **HS03**

Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951

    B: **Winston Churchill in opposition and government, 1929–1945**

        Examine the extent to which it was Winston Churchill's criticisms of government policy on rearmament which changed attitudes towards him between 1935 and May 1940.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

Mark using the generic AS levels of response mark scheme for questions requiring an extended response without reference to sources.

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-4 **L2: 5-9** **L3: 10-14** **L4: 15-17** **L5: 18-20**

Indicative content

This content is not prescriptive and examiners must give credit for alternative relevant material and relevant ways of approaching the question.

Candidates would need to identify the public's view of Churchill in the mid-1930s.
Candidates might consider how he was viewed by the progressive middle class, by trade unionists and Labour Party supporters, by Conservatives loyal to Baldwin and Chamberlain, by Liberals and by those desperate to maintain peace. The widespread view of Churchill in this period was a negative one. Before 1938–1939, at least, he was seen as out of step with virtually everyone else.

- Churchill was seen as a reactionary, e.g. over his opposition to the India Bill

- Churchill was seen as anti-trade union and anti-working class, e.g. memories of his role in the General Strike and sponsoring the 1927 Trades Disputes Act

- Churchill was seen as politically unstable, e.g. the way he had switched parties, opposing the leadership of his own party throughout the 1930s on India, rearmament, Germany

- Churchill was seen as a warmonger, e.g. his demands for rearmament, warnings of impending war with Germany and advocating an anti-German alliance

- Churchill was seen as emotionally unstable, e.g. his ability to consume prodigious quantities of alcohol, his support for Edward VIII during the Abdication Crisis, his attacks on Baldwin and Chamberlain

- Churchill was seen as at the end of his career, e.g. in his mid 60's, not held government office since 1929, his 'wilderness years'.

Candidates may then look at how far this negative view of Churchill had already changed even before he formed his War Cabinet in May 1940.

- growing pressure after Munich 1938 even from Liberal newspapers like the Manchester Guardian for Churchill to be included in the Cabinet

- public opinion polls by 1939 wanted Chamberlain to bring Churchill into his Cabinet

- variety of Conservative, Liberal and even Labour newspapers began to advocate his entry into government from the middle of 1939

- on 3 September 1939 Chamberlain did invite Churchill into his government as First Lord of the Admiralty

- once obvious that Chamberlain would resign, the succession in May 1940 was between Lord Halifax and Winston Churchill

- by May 1940 even the Labour Party, once his great opponent was prepared to support and serve in a War Cabinet led by Churchill and this was crucial to his becoming Prime Minister on 10 May 1940

- so began a period of immense popularity with the public.

Candidates need to consider how far this changed perception of him was a result of his attacks on government policy on rearmament.

- Churchill's basic criticism from 1935 onwards was that the governments of Baldwin and Chamberlain were rearming too slowly

- from 1935 onwards in speeches in the Commons and in newspaper articles he drew attention to the rapid growth of the German armed forces

- using classified material smuggled out of Whitehall he was able to show apparently detailed knowledge of the growth of the Luftwaffe and provide an informed critique of National Government policy

- his criticisms seemed vindicated during the Sudeten crisis in the autumn of 1938 and the Czech Crisis in early 1939 when Chamberlain at last ordered all-out rearmament

- the success of the Nazi blitzkrieg in Poland in autumn 1939 further convinced public opinion that he had been right all along and led to widespread support for him as a potential wartime leader.

However, good candidates might also challenge this view in various ways, e.g.:

- they might point out that not all Churchill's figures were accurate and that had Britain rearmed the RAF too early it might have invested in obsolete aircraft

- there was not much public interest in his criticisms in the mid-1930s and some criticisms, e.g. of the Anglo-German naval treaty reinforced his image as an out of date warmonger

- Chamberlain did speed up rearmament considerably from 1938 onwards and government decisions taken in the late 1930s e.g. over the development of radar and the commissioning of new fighter aircraft were to prove vital in the Battle of Britain.

To achieve balance, candidates also need to consider other factors which changed attitudes towards Churchill. Amongst these might be:

- Churchill's criticism of Nazi Germany's internal tyranny especially against trade unionists, members of other political parties, Jews and other groups, as well as its foreign policy

- his alliance with Socialist and Liberal groups such as Focus campaigning for a firmer stand against the fascist power

- his criticism of broader National Government foreign policy, e.g. over Abyssinia, the Rhineland, the Anschluss, as well as the Munich agreement

- his association through his position at the Admiralty, with action against Germany during the Phoney war period, e.g. battle of the river Plate, the Norwegian adventure

- his newspaper articles and radio broadcasts on the progress of the war during the autumn of 1939

- his public loyalty to Chamberlain during his time in Chamberlain's administration.

Candidates might also consider the wider factors which were forcing the public to reassess Churchill:

- the change in public opinion towards Hitler and towards Appeasement following the Munich agreement in the autumn of 1938

- further change in public opinion against Hitler following the German annexation of the rest of Czechoslovakia in spring 1939 and then Hitler's claims on Danzig and the Polish Corridor in summer 1939

- Chamberlain's guarantee to Poland and military mission to Soviet Russia led to public recognition by the summer of 1939 of just how close Britain and Germany were to war

- Hitler's invasion of Poland on 1 September 1939

- public suspicion that Chamberlain and some of his colleagues had not entirely abandoned appeasement and that they were not wholeheartedly committed to war

- Nazi invasion of Denmark and Norway and the failure of the Norwegian expedition undermined Chamberlain's position as PM and, ironically, encouraged popular demands for Churchill to replace him

- Nazi invasion of the Netherlands, Belgium and northern France in May 1940.

Candidates will reach different conclusions. Some may decide that Churchill's informed criticism of rearmament policy, even if not wholly justified, seemed by 1939–1940 to have been correct and therefore won him public support. Others may conclude that whilst Churchill's criticisms kept him in the public eye during his 'wilderness years', it was external events which proved the key factor in his rehabilitation. Still others may take the Churchillian 'walking with destiny' line and see the 'wilderness years' as but a preparation for his war premiership. As always coherent, well-supported, balanced and thoughtful answers will gain the highest marks.

Candidates may divide the period to reflect changes in attitudes over the period, e.g. 1935–1938/1939–1940 and they may choose to concentrate on politicians' attitudes or broaden the answer to include the general public or other specific groups.