



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme January 2003

---

## GCE

### History

## Unit HS03: Course essays

---

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334  
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ  
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

[www.theallpapers.com](http://www.theallpapers.com)

## 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.

In marking Coursework 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. **1-6**
- 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. **7-11**
- 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. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **19-20**

**C: Exemplification of AS Level Descriptors****Level 1: 1-6 marks (middle = 4)**

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, 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 indiscriminating, 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: 7-11 marks (middle = 9)**

*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: 12-15 marks (middle = 14)**

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: 16-18 marks (middle = 17)**

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: 19-20 marks**

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.

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

How successful were the military orders in their defence of the Crusader states, c1130 to 1192?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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, including castles' manpower and dedication. Students will analyse the contribution of the military orders within the context of the geographical and manpower problems faced by the Crusader states, and also the shortcomings of crusade as a means of supporting the states. Positive material will focus on the military abilities/martial spirit of the orders, their elite status and numerical contribution. Also their popularity in western Europe, forming an important channel for funds to Outremer, the link between their corporate wealth and the development of their role into castle building in particular, their inspirational role and the manner in which they made permanent the crusading ideal and expressed the martial/religious ethos of the period. Evaluation of their success will focus on their place in the increasing weakness and near collapse of the states in the 1180s, the rivalry, 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. The role of Gerald de Ridefort at the springs of Cresson and the battle of Hattin will be examined.

**Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism****B: The Development of new Monasticism in Twelfth Century Europe**

How important a role did Bernard of Clairvaux play in the growth of the Cistercian order?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 likely to consider a range of reasons for the growth of the Cistercian order, in particular the role of Bernard of Clairvaux. This may include the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, his charismatic personality and personal example in austerity and asceticism and his prestige and inspirational role. Evaluation may focus on decline after his death, the impact of Clairvaux as a mother-house and 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. There may also be discussion of alternative reasons for growth; the wider context of the new demographic and economic expansion, the issue of the wilderness and the use of conversi. Other elements of attraction to the order may include its constitution and organisation, especially visitations as a means of preserving Cistercian ideals, the role of other key individuals such as Stephen Harding. The period after Bernard's death in 1153 may also be discussed, with the growth of criticism and dilution of the order an indication of Bernard's true impact. Candidates may question Bernard of Clairvaux's importance and suggest his reputation has been unfairly exaggerated by Cistercian mythologising and hagiography.

## Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion

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

Was the authority of the Crown threatened more by political than by religious issues in the years leading up to the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### 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 define the political and religious issues in this period and then examine and compare their threat to the Crown.

Political issues may be identified as: the instability created by the death of Henry II and the accession of firstly, Francis II, then Charles IX, a minor; the rule of Francis II was dominated by the Guise faction and the reign of Charles IX required a Regent, his mother Catherine de Medici. These circumstances alone generated instability when placed against a background of noble faction, vying for control (Guise, Bourbon, Montmorency), the ending of the Habsburg-Valois rivalry in 1559 which brought many nobles and their clients back to France with limited opportunities for advancement other than through the favour of the monarch; the condition of the royal finances, one result of which was the reduction of the army and the raising of forced loans. The control exercised by the Guise enabled Catherine de Medici to exert more influence. However, as a woman, and a foreigner whose political skills and religious allegiance lacked definition, this only provoked more uncertainty and lack of respect for the Crown.

Religious issues concerned the growth of Calvinism in France; they had been severely persecuted under Henry II and looked for change under his successors. They had significant support in specific areas of the country, particularly the south, amongst the nobility and their clients e.g. the Bourbons, and in the towns amongst the prosperous middle classes. The structure of the Calvinist church (through synods etc) gave them strength and by 1560 they were prepared to pressurise the monarchy for recognition. After the Tumult (Conspiracy) of Amboise, the Huguenot cause was saved by the accession of Charles IX as Catherine de Medici, as regent, initiated discussions between the Catholics and Huguenots (Fontainebleau and Poissy) culminating in the Edict of January 1562. The consequent massacre of Vassy resulted in the first of the armed conflicts which were the Wars of Religion. The Crown found itself caught between religious strife heightened by the existing political and economic affiliations of the major feuding noble groupings and their ambitions for power.

By 1562, the crown was in a weak position because of the rule of a minor; nobles competed for influence but their challenges were sharpened by their religious affiliations. This threatened to bring in interested foreign powers who represented a major political threat. It is possible for answers to argue either that the political or the religious threat was the greater, because of the linkage between the political and religious issues. Tension existed between the two faiths and provided the context. However, the particular weaknesses of the crown provided the opportunity for the religious challenge to develop; Catherine de Medici's response played into the hands of the stronger Catholic faction.

## Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion

### B: The Role of Individuals and Ideas in the French Wars of Religion

Examine the extent to which the Catholic League was motivated by religion rather than politics in the period 1576-1598.

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### 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 define the religious and political motivations. Good answers will also demonstrate linkages. Consideration of the foundation of the League is important. The Catholic League was formed after the death of Anjou. It was created by the Guise with the express aim of preventing Navarre from gaining the throne; the motivation appears political, support gained from Philip II of Spain also suggests this. The League, however, claimed to be the defender of the Catholic faith and aimed at removing Protestantism from France and the Netherlands. The heir to the French throne was named as the Catholic Cardinal of Bourbon. In generating strife over the succession, between two men of the same faith, politics once again came to the fore.

Answers should consider the early propaganda of the League which played on religious fears, e.g. the threat of persecution of Catholics if a Protestant should become king. However, many of its actions appeared politically motivated, e.g. attempts to control the king and demands for rewards such as governorships for aiding Henry III against the German protestants. Henry III appears to have thought of it as a political group and planned to have the leaders assassinated. Ultimately the League gained control of Paris in 1588, governed through the Sixteen and planned to attack Henry III. This was forestalled by Henry who had the Cardinal of Guise murdered; this only caused renewed support for the League in Paris and other towns. The situation was only resolved by Henry III and Navarre as King when he reconverted to Catholicism and ended the domination of the League. Here the crucial factor was probably Henry IV's conversion, showing how much the religious and political issues were connected.

Answers could also explore the writings of the League, some of which demonstrate political motivation e.g. their manifesto spoke of the restoration of ancient rights and privileges. There were lengthy discussions in print about 'fundamental laws' e.g. that it was a fundamental law that the monarchy of France was Catholic and the laws of succession were thoroughly researched. Some argued in favour of tyrannicide on the basis that kingship was a contract between king and people with the people having sovereign power. Alternatively, it was stated that a king should rule in a Christian manner and that heretics could not fulfil this demand. More radical Leaguers proposed forms of democracy, the abolition of the nobility, etc.

In practice, the majority of the League accepted Henry IV as the legitimate King suggesting that his conversion to Catholicism had been the key. Most responses are likely to appreciate the difficulties of discriminating between religious and political issues when the whole of France was convulsed by the Huguenot challenge to the Catholic values inherent in the law of the land. However, in view of the fact that religion was always the stumbling block when it came to compromise, religious motives may well be seen as uppermost.

## Alternative C : The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1688-1789

### A: The Regency, 1715-1723

How important are the nobility in explaining the increasingly authoritarian rule of the Duke of Orleans, 1715-23?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### Indicative content

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

The introductory section will probably show how Orleans was forced to adopt a moderate stance at first in view of

- his weak position – the need to gain acceptance and respect and support for his position as regent, e.g. against rival Maine.
- The need to dismantle the authoritarian policies of Louis XIV

But the policies of moderation and calculation gradually changed.

The question should primarily focus on the importance of the nobility in explaining the change.

- The nobles having regained some power now demanded more, e.g. the right to veto legislation
- Discontent amongst certain groups made them appear menacing
- They were challenging Orleans' policies e.g. 1717 Financial reforms
- They were increasingly allying with the noblesse de la robe and upholding the interests of old and new nobles through the Paris Parlement
- The use of the noblesse d'epée in the Councils of the Polysynodie had proved a failure but when the Polysynodie came to an end, the noblesse d'epée had no intention of returning to obscurity.

Therefore recognising the need to protect the King's absolute position and to keep the system together Orleans adopted a more authoritarian stance. The signs were:

- The Parlement was exiled
- The Councils suppressed and a return made to Louis XIV's system
- The nobles were confronted
- Orleans was prepared to use force

Clearly however the nobles were not the only determining factor in this change

- Orleans was in a strange position – the honeymoon period was over, e.g. with the nobles and with the Parlements.
- Orleans saw the situation with growing realism and recognised the factors of change. The old Louis XIV court faction was humiliated – the Regent's party now had its grip on the lever of power.

A profound social change took place involving finance, religion, diplomacy and cultural affairs and also the questions of social rank, dynastic affairs and the structure of government.

The months of August and September 1718 are usually seen as marking this great change.

## Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1688-1789

### B: Cardinal Fleury, 1726-1743

How successful was Cardinal Fleury in overcoming the domestic problems facing France in the period 1726-1743?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

### 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 show that Fleury's domestic policies are known, that his achievements/success has been assessed in the light of circumstances and of knowledge of the actual policies and their outcome so that a balanced answer can be achieved. The question requires identification of where the policies were successful and an explanation of their success and, by implication where they were limited. Arguably some achievements have been exaggerated. Modern historical research is more critical of Fleury and well aware of some of the limitations.

It might be argued that success was achieved:

- Through a sound financial policy (with the help of Orry) which avoided experimentalism and restored confidence
- Through a successful economics policy which developed overseas trade, achieved moderate prosperity and stimulated economic growth
- Through the re-establishment of harmony in the conciliar system which was achieved by effective leadership and the employment of the best personnel, e.g. Orry, Maurepas, D'Aguesseau with Fleury as co-ordinator
- Jansenist acquisition was appeased for a time
- Stable government meant rebellion was avoided – Fleury handled the Paris Parlement well

The analysis of the limitations in the policies might include

- The need for stable government and the avoidance of anything which might provoke trouble
- The nature of many problems which were long term and tended to defy solution e.g. finance
- The long term and difficult problems which were constant and flared up from time to time e.g. dealings with the Jansenists and the Parlements
- The need to restore confidence in the economy meant avoiding innovatory policies in finance and to aim only for moderate prosperity
- The use of short term measures which led to solutions which were cosmetic, the Parlements were left defenceless and sore, the Jansenists were bitter and resentful
- Fleury's age, position and growing infirmity.

Given these circumstances could Fleury be expected to solve France's problems successfully? It may be argued that Fleury was not successful in solving France's domestic problems, with the tax system, the Parlements, the army and navy, the Jansenists being cited as examples, but he did provide a period of stability which allowed for retrenchment and reform.

## Alternative D: Europe, 1825-1850

### A: European Diplomacy, 1825-1835

With what success did the Greek Revolt promote Great Power co-operation in the years 1825 to 1830?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### Indicative content

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

The Greek Revolt is part of the ‘Eastern Question’. The weaknesses of the Ottoman Empire encouraged its subject peoples to revolt: the Greek uprising began in 1821. Despite this assault on legitimacy, Russia supported the Greeks because the area was of economic, strategic and religious importance. The Balkans allowed access to warm water and an increased Russian presence increased its influence in Europe. Also the Greeks were co-religionists (Orthodox) and support would heighten Russian influence with the Porte. The Greek revolt was led by Ypsilanti and supported by Russian Foreign Minister Capodistrias. Yet the focus is its international impact in the later 1820s and early 1830s. Britain valued its interests in the Mediterranean and the route to the Indian Empire: the actions of any Power here (France too had a traditional interest) were a threat. In 1827 Britain, France and Russia (Treaty of London) threatened Turkey with naval action unless an armistice was signed with the Greek rebels. This was refused as Mehmet Ali and Ibrahim Pasha (Turkey’s Egyptian vassals) were close to defeating the Greeks. At Navarino the British-French-Russian force destroyed Ibrahim’s fleet. All three Powers had co-operated but suspicion remained. In 1828 Russia declared war on Turkey but the opposition of Britain, France, Prussia and Austria, and military difficulties, brought an early peace (Adrianople, 1829). Russia gained Moldavia and Wallachia as protectorates. Britain, France and Russia declared Greece independent (Treaty of London 1830) and the crown was taken by a Bavarian Prince.

The Greek affair showed that Britain, France and Russia could co-operate to the point of ignoring the legitimacy proclaimed at Vienna in 1815 and reaffirmed at Troppau in 1820. Yet international relations suffered. Support for the Greeks challenged Metternich’s conservatism, stained the Holy Alliance and unnerved conservative powers (Austria and Prussia) upset at Russia’s unorthodox support for liberal revolution. This destroyed an already weakened Congress System: the diplomacy of the crisis was a reversion to traditional summitry. Austro-French relations were damaged. Metternich feared France as the source of revolution following its support for the revolt. Britain (and Austria) remained suspicious of Russian designs in the Balkans and this soured relations in later Eastern Question crisis. The episode was rather an exercise in Great Power mutual suspicion than co-operation.

**Alternative D: Europe, 1825-1850****B: The Revolutions of 1848 and their immediate aftermath to 1850**

How important was the weakness of the leadership of the Habsburg Empire in explaining the early success of the revolutionaries in the Empire in the years 1848 to 1849?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

The weaknesses of the Empire partially explain the early success of revolution in 1848. There were both problems of leadership and other factors. Ferdinand I was a half-witted Emperor incapable of leadership. Metternich (Foreign Minister) and Kolowrat (Internal Policy) hated each other and the Empire was ill-organised. Government was in disarray at a time when economic crisis (financial crash, unemployment, inflation, poor wages) was reinforced by harvest failure and falling standards of living. Vienna was an over-populated city with immense social problems. Court intrigue further debilitated the regime. As well as poverty-stricken peasants and urban workers, opposition included students, intellectuals and lawyers. Another factor explaining the early success was the nationalism of the Empire's subject peoples. Austria was a multi-national empire (Magyars, Slavs, Italians, Germans for example). Liberal-national ideas strengthened since 1815 and the weakening of the Empire meant subversive literature circulated increasingly in the years before 1848. When Vienna received news of the French Revolution there was uproar and demands for political change.

## Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870-1914

### A: The Balkans, 1870-1890

How important was nationalism in explaining the rivalry and conflict in the Balkans in the years 1870 to 1890?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

### Indicative content

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

The question focuses on the emerging nationalism of the Christian Balkan population determined to win independence, but candidates will also need to assess other factors such as the power vacuum left by the misrule and corruption of the disintegrating Ottoman Empire, and also the broader international context – the Eastern Question had dominated European politics in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century and highlighted international divisions, especially the rival ambitions of Austria-Hungary and Russia.

Two major crises dominate this period. In the Near-Eastern Crisis of 1875-78, candidates need to explain the causes and development of unrest, leading to the Russo-Turkish War, The Treaty of San Stefano, and the Congress and Treaty of Berlin. Explanations should emphasise the lack of solutions and the seeds of future trouble – further Ottoman disintegration, enhanced Balkan nationalism and international dissatisfaction – Austro Hungarian/Russian relations seemed bound to deteriorate. The second crisis occurred in Bulgaria from 1885, arising from a recent anti-Russian nationalist movement, and from the union of Eastern Rumelia with Bulgaria which contravened the Treaty of Berlin. There was a new dimension of intra-Balkan rivalry between Serbia and Bulgaria. The crisis marked the further deterioration of international co-operation as Germany lost diplomatic control and Russia turned towards France, initially for financial links. By 1890, there had been no large-scale conflict and there was relative peace in the Balkans, but no long-term solution was in sight to the ongoing international rivalry, or the increasing Balkan nationalism in a dwindling Ottoman Empire in Europe.

Higher level answers should provide both range over the 20 year period and some analytical balance, appreciating the rivalry and conflict on both the nationalist and international levels, and the dynamic nature of international diplomacy, with few easy answers to the persistent Eastern Question as Balkan nationalism continued to develop and escalate. Less effective responses may tend to be over-descriptive with limited specific explanation or assessment, and with uneven coverage of the period in question.

## Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870-1914

### B: The Balkans, 1890-1914

With what success were the major powers able to control events in the Balkans in the years 1890 to 1914?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### Indicative content

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

The outbreak of the First World War would seem to suggest little success in controlling events, but the 1914 crisis of course cannot be seen in isolation. Candidates should show some awareness of the political and international contexts in the Balkans, and the increasing hostility and suspicion, especially after 1900. The upsurge in Balkan nationalism, especially from Serbia, threatened the stability of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and enabled Russia, after defeat in the Far East, to sponsor Serb nationalism. With Germany, pursuing *Weltpolitik*, as no longer a moderating influence in Europe, the attempts of Britain and France to control events and maintain peace were made more difficult as the two European alliances hardened. Balkan nationalism could not be separated from the increasing confrontation and ultimate conflict between the two competing alliances. Rivalry between the Balkan states themselves was a further complication.

In the 1890s, the Balkans were relatively quiet with Russia's diversion to the Far East and the 1897 Austro-Russian agreement, putting conflict 'on ice' for a decade. The change of leadership in Serbia in 1903 marked a sharp decline in Austro-Serb relations and an upsurge in Balkan nationalism. In 1908, despite the 'deal' between Aehrenthal and Iswolsky, the annexation of Bosnia caused diplomatic turmoil, with serious implications for the future. Conflict was avoided, but hardly through diplomatic control, when, faced with a German ultimatum, Russia and Serbia backed down; but these states were left humiliated and embittered, provoking an over-reaction in the July crisis of 1914. The First Balkan War of 1912 revealed the major powers successfully trying to control events and maintain the status quo, as Germany and Britain defused the situation. However, after the Second Balkan War, initiated by Bulgaria, the military balance had changed. Once Austria decided to 'eliminate Serbia', it would be difficult to prevent events escalating out of control. Political assassinations rarely lead to war, but after the murders in Sarajevo in 1914, a chain reaction occurred involving the major powers 'blank cheque', ultimatum, alliance commitments and the accrued suspicions over *Weltpolitik*, naval rivalry etc, as events ran out of control with calculated risks replacing attempts at conciliation.

Higher level answers should provide range and balance over the period, although the years 1908 to 1914 will dominate. They will make some attempt to gauge success and link Balkan events with the international context, perhaps appreciating that not all the major powers wanted to avert conflict. Less effective responses may be narrative based with limited explanation or assessment, providing largely a chronological description of the events leading to the outbreak of war in 1914.

**Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917 - 1929****A: Lenin and the consolidation of the Bolshevik State 1917-1924**

How successful was the Communist Party in imposing its control over Russia between 1918 and Lenin's death in 1924?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 focus on the whole period 1918-24, and not treat the question, for example, purely as a "Civil War" essay. It is not an essay about "Why did the Reds win the Civil War", although this could come into the equation. At the beginning of 1918 the Communist Party had relatively little influence in Russia, since the November Revolution had been essentially a coup in Moscow and Petrograd. Early in 1918 Lenin closed down the Constituent Assembly because the Bolsheviks failed to secure a majority. The Cheka was already active against real or suspected opponents, and a series of decrees showed the Bolshevik determination to transform Russia, e.g. the separation of Church and state and decrees on nationalisation and workers control.

There were two main aspects to the establishment of Communist control from 1918. The Civil War (which may be treated by candidates as a war between Reds and Whites, or also include the war of foreign intervention) was won by the Reds for several reasons: the unified command and determination of the Communists; the military leadership of Trotsky and the activities of the Red Army; the Reds' control of the main centres of population, industrial centres and communications; the crude success of War Communism in feeding the Army; the disparate nature of the Whites; the strategic and other disadvantages of the Whites; the reluctance of the peasants to support the Whites; the victory of the Reds in the propaganda war. At the same time there was a process of centralisation taking place within the Communist Party.

Partly because of the exigencies of war, there was an impulse towards centralisation, which was reflected in the basic structure of the Party: for example, the local soviets, which had played an important part in the initial Bolshevik takeovers of local areas, found their freedom increasingly lost to the centre, and organs like the Politburo, the Orgburo and Secretariat assumed more and more importance. The Party became militarised, particularly in outlook – it had to be ruthless to survive. The process of centralisation within the Party undoubtedly assisted the Party as a whole in its efforts to secure control over the whole country.

Lenin's leadership was also an important factor in securing Communist control. He was widely respected, and ruthless in his treatment of opposition (although other left wing parties were tolerated after 1917 provided they were not openly hostile to the Bolsheviks, this relative freedom disappeared by the early 1920s.)

By 1921 the Communists had survived a series of revolts such as the Tambov Revolt and the Kronstadt Rebellion, events which showed that the regime was still not secure, particularly since conditions were poor, there was considerable dissatisfaction with War communism, and there was disquiet at the apparently increasingly authoritarian nature of the regime. Lenin's compromise of the NEP helped to alleviate the

economic situation, but at the Tenth Party Congress a ban on factions was announced, and the Party elite consolidated its hold on the rank and file as well as the country at large. Opposition groups within the Party were effectively silenced, along with non-Bolshevik groups. The Party was in overall control of the USSR, particularly whilst Lenin was alive. However, although there were no more overt acts of rebellion against the regime, the Party was less secure in its control of the countryside: it was still essentially urban-based, despite the growth in party membership. Nevertheless, the Party's authority was reinforced by the secret police and extensive propaganda. The arguments that were emerging at the time of Lenin's death were important in that they had a bearing on the leadership and the future direction of Russia, but they were essentially debates within the higher reaches of the Party and did not signify any slackening of control over the country at large. Although Communist control was not as pervasive as under Stalin in the 1930s, the USSR was still in essence a police state in 1924.

## Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia 1917-1929

### B: Stalin's rise to power 1922-1929

How important are Stalin's skills in explaining why Stalin's opponents on both the Left and the Right were unable to prevent his rise to power in the 1920s?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### 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 Stalin's rise to power by 1929, by when he had secured virtually dictatorial powers, and should deal with both Left and Right, although not necessarily to the same extent. Stalin was already very powerful in the USSR before Lenin's death. From 1922, as General Secretary of the Party, and also a member of other important organisations such as Orgburo and the Secretariat, he had great influence in the Party and therefore effectively over the country. Lenin recognised the threat in his Testament, which called for the removal of Stalin as a leader likely to abuse power.

However, there were other leading Bolsheviks of influence, and none was the clear successor to Lenin, partly because he himself would not nominate one. Trotsky seemed to many to be in the best position, given his prominent role in the Revolution and the Civil War which followed. However, he suffered certain disadvantages, some self-inflicted. He was seen as intellectually arrogant and dismissive of colleagues, and was distrusted by many as a recent convert to Bolshevism in 1917. Many feared Trotsky as a potential Bonaparte, capable of carrying out a military coup, although in fact he was not widely popular within the Red Army. Trotsky had no power base within the Party. He felt that he suffered from anti-Semitic prejudice. He was highly-strung and suffered from bouts of indecision and psychosomatic disorders at critical moments throughout the next decade.

Lenin's Testament was not made public after his death because his colleagues felt that it would discredit the Party and encourage factionalism. The failure to publish it almost certainly helped Stalin at the time. He had already formed an alliance with Kamenev and Zinoviev in order to keep out Trotsky, but Stalin came into his own at Lenin's funeral which he organised and used as an opportunity to assume the mantle of Leninism, in the eyes of ordinary Party members. Stalin continued to use his influence in the Party machine to advance his own supporters, particularly in the congresses. However, he also showed considerable skills in Party infighting, despite the charges of "mediocrity" made by superficially cleverer colleagues. Stalin appealed to ordinary Party members with his espousal of Socialism in One Country, with its emphasis on Russia's ability to pull itself up by its own resources. He also presented himself as a moderate man of the centre, whilst more vitriolic colleagues argued around him; and he also used the Leninist legacy to support his own position, claiming that his ideas were in line with Lenin's.

In contrast, Stalin's rivals appeared inconsistent and opportunistic. Trotsky offended many with his attack on the "bureaucratic old guard" in his "New Course" of December 1923, leading to his isolation. Stalin sided with Bukharin and the more moderate Right during the economic debates of the mid 1920s when Zinoviev and Kamenev attacked Socialism in One Country. In 1925 Stalin used his influence at the 1925 Congress to defeat both men, and in 1926 Stalin got allies like Molotov and Voroshilov into the Politburo. In 1926 Kamenev and Zinoviev teamed up with their further enemy Trotsky in the United Opposition, but this seemed like opportunism, and Stalin and the Right got them sacked from their posts and even the Party. Soon Bukharin became worried by Stalin and in late 1927 sought an accommodation, unsuccessfully with Kamenev.

In 1928 Stalin and his supporters began to demand collectivisation and industrialisation, the policies originally associated with the defeated Left. Bukharin and the Right supporters wanting a gradual approach to socialism based on the support of the peasants, were opposed to this, but it was too late – isolated, the Right was defeated when Stalin turned on them in 1929, expelling them from the Party and effectively becoming dictator.

Candidates will probably debate the extent to which Stalin's skills or his opponent's mistakes were primarily the cause of Stalin's rise to power. They may debate issues such as Stalin's ambition: was he always set on power, or did he take advantage of opportunities as they arose? How much was due to personal rivalry, how much to genuine disagreements over policy, and how much was due to the nature of the Party machine? There is no right or wrong answer to these questions, but the issue should certainly be analysed as much more than a "Stalin versus Trotsky" issue.

## Alternative G : Germany, c1925-1938

### A: The Weimar Republic c1925-1933

Assess the extent of the success of the Weimar Republic in political and economic affairs between 1925 and 1928.

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

### 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 political and economic developments and the policies of the Weimar Republic during the years 1925-1928. Whilst there is likely to be some explanation of the reasons for success (or otherwise), candidates are primarily required to evaluate the degree of success and answers should contain some measured criticism of the Republic's achievements. Most are likely to argue that stability and recovery were only superficial and that the apparent success of the Republic in these years was only in comparison with 1918-1923 (and what followed).

An examination of the Republic's political successes might be expected to include;

- The role of Gustav Stresemann in securing international respectability (e.g. Locarno Oct 1925; membership of League of Nations –Sept. 1926)
- The greater stability of governments with more support for mainstream democratic parties in elections Dec.1924-May 1928 (% of vote for pro-Weimar parties rose from 52%, May 1924 to 73%, May 1928)
- The reduction of political violence. (No attempted coups since 1923 and no major political assassinations. The Nazi movement was only a fringe movement by 1928.)
- Hindenburg's election as president (1925). (This gave respectability and reassured some conservatives, reconciling them to republic.)

An examination of the Republic's economic successes might be expected to include;

- The improved position in 1925 (the policies of Stresemann and Dr. Schacht (1923/4) had helped stabilise the currency, secure foreign assistance, reorganise reparations (Dawes Plan), end hyper-inflation and impart renewed confidence)
- The influx of foreign loans 1925-1928 (This boosted industrial expansion and social expenditure as more entered than left in reparations.)
- The recovery of business – rationalisation and cartelisation – modernisation of industry
- Rising living standards. (steadier prices – money wages doubled 1924-1928, value of currency maintained, unemployment comparatively low at under a million, welfare schemes extended e.g. unemployment insurance extended to over 17 million workers)

The extent of success might be criticised by referring to;

- The basic flaws in the constitution and operation of politics (proportional representation/party lists/coalitions)
- The anti-Republican attitudes in influential sectors of society.
  - i) LW and RW parties still opposed the republic. (In 1928 elections the KPD gained over 10% of vote and the Nazis, although polling only 2.6% of vote, made significant gains in northern rural areas.)
  - ii) Elites harboured resentment. (Industrialists resented the burdens of the welfare state and the trade unions' demands; landed aristocracy resented loss of influence; the army considered themselves "above politics"; judges and civil servants were not reconciled to democracy.)
- Political violence was still present (especially Nazi/Communist street fighting).
- The decline of the middle-ground liberal party (DDP), support for special interest parties and the move of the Centre party to the right made moderate government difficult. (There were 5 Weimar governments 1925-8, each a short lived coalition and only 2 had a majority in the reichstag.)
- Although he upheld the constitution, the president, Hindenburg was a traditionalist of the right and was not committed to democracy
- Economic stability was based on external loans, particularly from America creating a dangerous dependence on the U.S. economy
- Short term credit was being used for long term industrial projects
- Economic growth rates were unsteady (1925 saw a downturn and growth of unemployment. Thereafter a recovery brought growth back to 1913 levels by 1927, but there was a growing trade deficit and Germany's share of world production fell from 14.3% in 1913 to 11.6%, 1926-1929).
- Workers only made modest gains (unemployment around 1 million and began to rise in 1928. Tension between employers/workers e.g. 1928 Ruhr lockout.)
- Urban mittelstand (state employees, tradesmen/savers lost out in comparison to workers and felt resentful. Bitterness over earlier hyper inflation remained with unsatisfactory schemes of compensation.)
- Agriculture fell into depression. (the world surplus of grain affected large and small farms [peasants and junkers] and there was a lack of agricultural modernisation. Prices fell from 1927. By 1928 over a third of all farms were running at a loss.)
- The welfare state schemes were unrealistic. (Resources were insufficient to finance ambitious projects [higher taxes but continuing budget deficit] and the high taxation of the elites reinforced their hostility to the regime.)
- Although Stresemann enhanced Germany's international position, this did not increase domestic support ("Fulfilment" was regarded as capitulation and reparations continued to be resented.)
- Cultural changes encouraged traditional hostility to new modernist values. (The association of the Weimar republic with laxer morals and standards of culture may have helped to polarise attitudes to the regime.)

**Alternative G: Germany, c1925-1938****B: The Nazi consolidation of power 1930-1938**

How important was the S.A. in Hitler's rise to and consolidation of power between 1930 and 1934?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 place and activities of the SA in Hitler's rise to and consolidation of power 1930-1934. The importance of the SA can be assessed both by balancing those areas in which their role was important against the limitations on their influence and by comparing the part of the SA with other factors which helped establish Hitler in power. Candidates may legitimately adopt either approach, or a mixture of the two, so long as the focus of the answer is on the importance of the SA.

An examination of the SA's importance might be expected to include;

- Its image as an action squad. (It helped to develop a desire for action-winning over the youth and the dissatisfied working classes – it appeared able to “get things done”.)
- It reinforced the idea of a “communist threat”. (So won supporters and gave the impression law and order were breaking down and only Nazis could restore it.)
- It protected Nazi meetings while disrupting other parties' (contribution to Nazi electoral success.)
- Through propagandist work, it stressed the Nazi message and Hitler's leadership (distributing leaflets; impressive military formation in displays).
- Marches gave impression of Nazi power and order. (Image of single minded tough, committed force whose discipline suggested the Nazis would offer firm government and the restoration of law and order.)
- The power of numbers was intimidating (400,000 members in 1932 [four times larger than Reichswehr and around half the total party membership] nearly 3 million by 1934. Gave the impression of irresistible power.)
- The fear they created among the elites, made the conservatives more inclined to give Hitler a role in government because he could control the SA.
- The SA were directly involved in Hitler's appointment as Chancellor because politicians feared and did not know how to deal with them. (Bruning tried to ban them but to Schleicher, this was a surrender to the communists. He contrived to have Bruning replaced by the right wing Papen who lifted the ban, June 1932. The growth of SA violence, helping Hitler to win a third of the total vote in July 1932, persuaded Hindenburg to replace Papen with Schleicher himself. This provoked Papen's subsequent intrigue with Hitler whereby Hitler became Chancellor with Von Papen as Vice Chancellor in January 1933.)
- After January 1933, the SA led the take over of town halls, police headquarters and newspaper offices which led to establishment of Nazi rule at a local level. Old officials were often replaced by SA members. They were also active in the suppression of the trade unions and the boycott of Jewish shops April 1 1933.

An examination of the SA's limitations might be expected to include;

- Its activities creating discord in the party. (some were wary of the SA's unruly behaviour. The types of recruits- "drop outs", ex soldiers and the unemployed with large numbers from the working class (60%) made the SA an unpredictable force.)
- Among the SA there was a lack of commitment to electioneering. (After the failure of the Munich Putsch, Hitler chose to use the democratic process. He was happy to condone SA lawlessness and use it when it suited him, but he always retained the initiative.)
- Hitler's attitude to the SA afforded it no special importance. (Hitler regarded it as a subordinate institution, whereas Rohm believed it was the key body for seizing and retaining power. Hitler took action to curb wilder Nazi enthusiasts after Jan. 1933 when changes in the "town hall revolution" were more sweeping than Hitler had intended.
- The SA's position was weakened as its leadership and many of its rank and file, were not entirely supportive of Hitler's pragmatic policies post January 1933. (Rohm and the Strasser brothers were attracted by LW socialist ideas. Rohm wanted to replace or merge the regular army with the SA; Gregor Strasser opposed Hitler's anti-semitism and the courting of big business and resigned Dec.1932. The tension between Hitler's and Rohm's views of the SA's role made the SA more of a liability than an asset after January 1933.)
- Once Hitler was in power the SA was less important to him than the support of the elites. (Hitler was wary of antagonising army as he foresaw Hindenburg's death and wanted to become president. By 1934 Hitler had more to gain from a reduction in SA power. By acting against the SA in the Night of the Long Knives in June, Hitler reassured his conservative supporters as well as intimidating his conservative critics.)

Himmler's personal ambitions for the SS coincided with Hitler's decision to dispense with the SA (Himmler understood the need to retain the support of the old elites and sought racial revolution – more in harmony with Hitler's own views.)

Other factors which helped establish Hitler's power might include:

- Hitler's own leadership qualities (the Fuhrerprinzip; Hitler's ability as a speaker; his emotional appeal).
- Nazi strategy (the reorganisation of the party after the failure of the Munich Putsch and the decision to work through the democratic system).
- Nazi propaganda and policies (nationalism; anti-communism; economic promises and promises of a brighter future and the restoration of national pride).
- The context of the depression (1928, a fringe party, but after the slump, 1930, the second largest party.)
- The disenchanted who were ready to become Nazi supporters (especially the petty bourgeoisie, rural interests and some of the elites).
- The failings of the Weimar Parliamentary government (the position of the President, the failure of government; the breakdown of parliamentary democracy in the face of the depression; political intrigue.)
- The destruction of opposition 1933-34 through a "legal revolution" (made possible by the Enabling Act. By June 1934, Hitler was strong enough to act without the SA).

## Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

### A: Britain and Kenyan Independence, 1953 to 1964

How important was the part played by Harold Macmillan in the process of Kenya's independence?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### Indicative content

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

Candidates are likely to develop some contextual detail, e.g. the position Kenya was in by 1957 – the State of Emergency, the impact of Mau Mau terror, the inability of the authorities to establish a compromise solution. This may form the basis of a linkage to the other factors which contributed to independence. The impact of Mau Mau is significant in that it generated considerable costs for the British and it destabilised the Kenyan state and British rule. In addition it kept the theme of Kenyan independence alive in the international community. It also contributed to the inability of the British authorities, pre-Macmillan, to find a compromise solution. This was attempted through the Lyttleton Constitution but the results were unsatisfactory from the British point of view. It was clear that even beyond the Mau Mau group there was a real demand for independence and the half way solution of Lyttleton was not enough. The indigenous black population, although not wholly behind the Mau Mau, wanted more than Lyttleton was offering. Macmillan came into office with a new agenda for Britain. He perceived Britain's interests as being served through a strong alliance with the USA. He also realised that the possession of empire was no longer a measure of great power status. Macmillan was above all a pragmatist and a realist. He knew that the empire was economically unviable and that it offended our closest ally. He also knew that Britain's interests would not be served by holding on to the empire. Macmillan was not a traditional Conservative and an unbending imperialist and this is illustrated through his commitment to a 'profit and loss' approach to whether Britain should hold on to Kenya and his willingness to appoint men whom he regarded as like-minded. Men such as Macleod were brought in to drive independence through. The 'Winds of Change' speech in 1960 is important in suggesting Macmillan's wider view of Britain's role in Africa and the pan-African nature of nationalism. Consideration of the limitations of Macmillan's contribution may also be included by reference to his determination to appear to want to please all sides e.g. his political allies in Britain and the nationalists in Kenya. Macmillan played a pivotal role in organising the Lancaster House Conferences which ultimately led to independence.

## Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

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

How important was the contribution of Algerian nationalism to the success of Algeria's struggle for independence 1954-1962?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### Indicative content

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

Answers may consider the role of the FLN and its fighting arm, the ALN. The impact of the terror campaign is important in terms of its effects on the French government and the French army. The role of the army may be considered as a central factor which the nationalist movement stimulated and used for its own purposes. The aim of the nationalists was to provoke the army into creating martyrs, and it succeeded. Candidates may develop this theme to great effect in order to illustrate the impact of nationalist strategies. The nationalist movement became considerably more dangerous to the French after 1956 when it established a coherent structure that was designed to operate on a military and a political basis. The tactics of the FLN were consistent and maintained throughout the period. Internal divisions within the FLN were also dealt with by the organisation, making it a stronger force. Other factors include the very significant role of the army and its impact on the popular Algerian view of the French. The army became increasingly right wing and this must be viewed in the context of the arrival of de Gaulle. He saw the army as a threat to the stability of France. The army adopted an ultra-right wing approach to Algeria and was determined that Algeria should not become a second Indo-China or Suez. The army's approach was significant in influencing de Gaulle's approach. He took a wider view of France's long term interests that led beyond the possession of empire. France's role in Europe was important for de Gaulle. Algeria was a major distraction. De Gaulle's aim was to advance France as the driving force in Europe and the political instability that the Algerian question created undermined this objective. To this extent the FLN had a major impact on the thinking of the man who could generate independence for Algeria. Other factors may include the impact of French public opinion on the process. Many young conscript troops were being killed by the FLN. This began to have a significant political fall out on the French government. There was little sympathy for the fate of the colonies and the colonies became a major ally of the right wing army factions. This was enough to make de Gaulle oppose them. Overall the role of the FLN was very much a catalyst in that it triggered other factors which eventually brought about independence.

**Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924****A: The accession to power of the Bolsheviks and Lenin's regime**

Explain the importance of Lenin's leadership, in relation to other factors, in the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in Russia in 1917.

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 role, especially in respect of propaganda and organisation, was central in contributing to the seizure of power. An evaluation of the relative importance of these aspects might be illustrated with reference to Lenin's charisma and the impact of his return(s) to Russia, particularly with the publication of his April Theses as a blueprint for action. Lenin did not, however, organise the eventual coup single-handedly. Trotsky was particularly prominent in his control of the Military Revolutionary Committee.

As well as the detailed planning and activity of the Bolsheviks in 1917, their ideological motivation underpinned their intention to over-throw first the Tsarist and then the Provisional Governments. In Marxist terms, the leadership of the revolutionary group was not, in itself, a primary concern since the victory of the insurrection was inevitable.

Candidates should balance the role of Lenin, his party and his ideology, against a range of other factors encompassing the weakness of Russia in 1917. The decline of the Romanov dynasty was personified by Nicholas II, not least in his flawed attempts to rally the troops in their disastrous war effort. At the time of his abdication in March 1917, the problems of the war and the economy were growing. The subsequent Provisional Government, led by Kerensky, proved unable to bring short-term relief, destabilised as it was by threats from the left (the Bolsheviks in the July Days) and the right (the Kornilov Affair in September).

The traditional western view of the Russian Revolution has been of a coup organised by a small revolutionary group, dominated by Lenin. Revisionists, such as Fitzpatrick, have placed more emphasis on the role of workers, soldiers and peasants in forming soviets and committees before Lenin's final return from exile. The most recent views of scholars such as Service incorporate elements from both interpretations.

**Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924****B: The establishment of the Weimar Republic**

How important were economic factors in destabilising the Weimar Republic in 1923?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Candidates may legitimately focus exclusively on the year 1923 or they may adopt a broader approach, concluding that instability was the product of longer term factors. This broader approach is likely to consider the inherent problems of the Republic stemming from its inauguration following the abdication of the Kaiser and defeat in the Great War in November 1918. The nature of the constitution, the perpetuation of Right Wing influence, the instability reflected in the Spartacist rising and Kapp putsch as well as the post war inflation exacerbated by the setting of a figure of £6,600 million for reparations in 1921 are all likely to feature. Candidates may note that the 1<sup>st</sup> instalment was paid. The 2<sup>nd</sup>, for 1922, however, was not.

The occupation of the Ruhr by French and Belgian troops in January 1923 further destabilised Weimar, especially since it was met with government-backed passive resistance, which cut productivity and increased welfare expenditure. The printing of more money as a means of paying for the disruption backfired in that it caused hyperinflation, which reached a peak in November when there were 200,000 million marks to the dollar.

These economic circumstances increased political and social instability and were exploited by Hitler, who tried to seize power starting with a putsch in Munich, at the height of the hyperinflation. However, candidates are likely to argue that the instability of 1923 was not solely the product of economic circumstance.

Candidates may look beyond 1923 and argue that since the Republic survived both political and economic threats, which arguably were at their most menacing in 1923, there is some basis in the view that economic factors had a limited impact on the government as it overcame them to enjoy a relative boom, albeit short-term, from 1924 to 1929.

**Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915-1924****C: ‘Mutilated Victory’: Italy and the First World War, 1915-1920**

How significant was d’Annunzio’s occupation of Fiume in demonstrating Italian disillusionment with the post-war peace settlement?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

By the time of the occupation in September 1919 it was already known that the post-war settlement (the Treaty of St Germain) had not included all the territorial gains expected by Italy, particularly Dalmatia. Fiume itself had not been promised by the Treaty of London in 1915, so its occupation could be seen as a form of compensation for the so-called ‘mutilated victory’. In any case, the prevalent impression exaggerated the actual facts of Italy’s deprivation, and d’Annunzio’s actions added to the polarisation between the inactivity of the liberal ministers and the dynamism of his troops (about 300-strong).

His use of propaganda further fuelled nationalist sentiment, as his followers wore blackshirts, saluted with the Roman straight-arm and chanted rhythmic war cries. His own balcony speeches referred to ‘our Mediterranean’ and a possible coup against the government in Rome.

At the same time, however, factors within Italy gave right wing opposition direct cause for disillusionment. The economy was in crisis, with over two million demobilised soldiers, on-going inflation and a national debt which was five times higher at the end than at the start of the war.

While the government remained seemingly paralysed by ‘trasformismo’, or a lack of party loyalty, Mussolini founded the Fascist party (March 1919) and the unions organised strikes and factory occupations (1919-20).

While the Fiume incident can be reduced, with hindsight, to a flamboyant stunt it was one of several circumstances which at least reflected, and arguably exacerbated, the feeling of many Italians that they were the poor relations of the Great War victor nations.

**Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870-1950****A: Population change in Britain, 1870-1945**

Were improvements in public health more important than patterns of marriage in explaining population change in the years 1870 to 1945?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Responses may confine themselves to broad generalisations such as improvements in public health meant that more people survived childhood and therefore people lived longer. This will take the form of detailed statements of changes in public health legislation or a description of changes in patterns in marriage. For example, the extension of school medical services will be seen as addressing some of the needs of the poorest and therefore to have had a significant impact upon childhood mortality. The wider availability of sulphamide drugs in the 1930s was a key factor in reducing deaths from scarlet fever and other childhood diseases. Better candidates may express the view that public health was more important at different times, and may also comment on the wider context, e.g. the two world wars in this period or on the influence of social class.

After 1860 the proportion of people never marrying rose to 11%. The death rate declined from 22 per 1000 in 1870 to 12 per 1000 in the mid-1920s. The infant mortality rate fell from 150 per 1000 late in the 19<sup>th</sup> century to 105 per 1000 between 1901-1925. From the mid-1860s the net migration rate from Britain was 25000 p.a. but this was drawn disproportionately from the young. Scotland had a higher death rate, lower infant mortality rate and higher rate of illegitimacy than England.

**Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870-1950****B: The Cotton Industry in Britain, 1870-1950**

How important was Britain's return to the Gold Standard in 1925 in causing the problems of the cotton industry in the 1930s?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 show an understanding of the poor state of the Cotton Industry in 1930 with reference to the Depression and the Gold Standard. In 1928 the Bank of England forced the merger of a number of firms into the Lancashire Cotton Corporation because the Lancashire banks could no longer sustain the losses. The widespread industrial unrest and strikes of 1918-21 and 1928-32 will be seen as very damaging though there was greater industry-wide co-operation after 1932. The Oldham spinners led the 1919 strike to try to achieve a 48 hour week whereas in 1921 the employers responded to cuts in Far East demand by cutting wages. Fierce competition from Japan hit Blackburn in the 1920s as its main export was cheap cloth to India, and Oldham also lost its markets for coarse yarn in India and the Far East. In 1929 the government arbitrator recommended wage cuts.

Relevant detail may be provided on the rate at which the £ returned to the Gold Standard (most commentators agree it was overvalued by 10%) or on the number of looms and how many were not in use due to lack of demand (approximately 20% on the eve of the Depression). Candidates should also show an awareness of other factors affecting the cotton industry, such as the loss of the markets such as India due to World War One, Japanese competition, growing demand for new products like rayon, and the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation. Better answers will probably see the Gold Standard as damaging an industry which not only faced many problems after 1919 but which was already in decline before the First World War.

Candidates may argue that the real problems stemmed from the loss of overseas markets during World War One, to Japan and the USA, and to Japanese investment in electric looms. Others may argue that even before 1914 the industry was facing ever increasing competition. The Gold Standard may therefore be seen simply as putting a final nail in the industry's coffin.

**Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919-1941****A: America, 1919-1929**

How successful were the Ku Klux Klan between 1919 and 1929?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 consider a range of reasons for the success of the Ku Klux Klan between 1919 and 1929. They should also be aware of the lack of success and hence the decline in popularity that occurred in the latter part of the period. Candidates should consider the context of the success in the early part of the 1920s, i.e. the very nature of the 1920s. Also they need to cover the whole period to show the falling away of the Klan after 1925.

In the 1920s there were a number of divisions and inherent conflicts which led to a feeling of insecurity particularly in areas where people felt left behind. For instance there was the rural v urban division. People in rural areas seemed to have different perspectives than those living in the cities and they viewed city dwellers as non American because there were so many ethnic groups living there. Differences between protestant v catholic reared up, especially in the cities. Blame for declining job opportunities, declining morals, nativism led to calls for anti-immigration. This feeling was eventually responded to with the 1924 anti immigration act, which heavily favoured white Western European immigration. Anti-Darwinism in rural areas were all manifestations that developed from a sense of unease. There were calls for a return to 'normalcy' in the 1920s after the progressive movement of the previous decade. There were calls for traditional standards v revolution in manners and morals. Some people in the rural areas felt left behind by the speed of change and progress happening in urban areas and so they turned towards the Klan.

Nativism led to the successful appeal and rise of Klan membership between 1915 and 1920. The rise in numbers and popularity was due to their creed; messages of moral piety and they gave the farmers someone to blame for their lack of prosperity. But the Klan's success was not universal. They were much more successful in recruitment in rural areas of the South and West than the cities and the North. They had multi targets including blacks, Catholics and immigrants. This meant they could broaden their appeal.

The Klan were particularly popular amongst those with a poor educational background and those in the backwoods. However, they appealed to some educated whites who were deeply racist and those in the South who had always viewed the African American as little better than a slave.

Arguably the Klan's greatest success came with political power at state level, e.g. Governor. Here they were able to influence events over a state. However, there was no national political appeal. Legislation was brought in 1924 to limit immigration but it is debatable how much this had to do with Klan activities as opposed to other fears. So even in the political arena their efforts were not that successful.

They were particularly successful in their efforts at intimidation on a local level particularly in the South through violence, lynchings, burnings etc. They terrified whole black communities and enforced rigid segregation. They infiltrated the police force and filled many minor public offices. Klan bigotry appealed to the blue collar worker and gave them a sense of importance and belonging through ceremonial activities e.g. dressing up in white hooded gowns and attending mass meetings with Grand Wizards.

Their decline came about after 1925 when the Indiana Grand Dragon was imprisoned and a public trial revealed corruption. Eventually the prosperity of the 1920s destroyed the Klan's appeal and they had to scale down their activities. The cities always remained outside the appeal of Klan. Therefore success was limited to rural areas. Although activities and membership declined they were never eradicated and continued their activities on a smaller scale. Success depends on definitions. Success was greatest in the South and in rural areas. Since they didn't attract urban support on any great scale their success was always going to be limited.

**Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919-1941****B: The New Deal, 1933-1941**

To what extent is it correct to say the New Deal benefited some groups in American Society much more than others?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 consider a range of benefits to various sectors of Society, e.g. white American males, Native Americans, African Americans, Women and Mexican Americans

Candidates should be prepared to concede that white males benefited the most, through a raft of New Deal legislation and the change to Keynesian type work programmes. Various alphabet agencies were designed to help male unemployment, e.g. CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps), PWA (Public Works Administration), WPA (Works Progress Administration). The TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) did a lot for poor Southern whites because it helped to tackle unemployment in the Southern region. Poor whites took many African American jobs. There were also a lot of different Acts from 1933 onwards which helped white people and who seemed to benefit the most from the provisions, such as the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 which provided grants to states for the relief of destitute persons. Later there was the development of the Social Security Act of 1935, which aimed to protect workers by insurance for unemployment and old age. Male whites seemed to be able to get better access to these improvements more so than any other social group in society. Also males in both rural and urban environments benefited from the New Deal.

African Americans benefited through legislation and the help of Eleanor Roosevelt. New Deal measures: Fair Employment Practices Committee was set up. The idea behind this was to help different groups in society. There were more African Americans in government and Civil Service. There was positive discrimination in NYA. Roosevelt's Supreme Court became more helpful after 1936. African Americans benefited from relief measures even if whites benefited more because African Americans were seen as a bloc vote to be wooed especially in Northern cities. The New Deal was seen to benefit more than it really did. There was still a lot of racism, which got in the way of helping African Americans and this racism was both overt and hidden. This racism was evident in farming (sharecropping in the South) and in the cities.

Women were seen to benefit with more important posts in government and through the activities and success of Eleanor Roosevelt. But some legislation actively worked against women, e.g. 1933 Economy Act whereby lots of women lost jobs and also unequal wages under NRA (National Recovery Act). Furthermore the CCC barred women, which led to them not being able to get jobs. There was strong discrimination towards men having better jobs since they were considered to be the main breadwinners and head of the family. Also they should have better pay as a priority. Women were not seen as a bloc vote and so were considered to be less influential.

Native Americans benefited through the Indian Reorganisation Act, Dawes Severalty Act and the positive influence of the Indian Bureau chief but these are in the context of having lost much already. Most of the tribes had already lost their lands before the 1930s so they started from a low base.

Many Mexican Americans suffered from competition for jobs especially in California and since many were seasonal workers anyway little was done to help them. They went back to Mexico after the end of the picking season and so were not considered to be a high priority.

Mexican Americans benefited little from the New Deal because there were no specific programmes aimed at them. The FSA in 1937 helped slightly but by then many Mexican Americans had returned to Mexico.

The most common answer is likely to agree with the proposition and debate the extent of help since the New Deal did benefit white males much more than any other group in American society.

**Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066-1087****A: The Introduction of Norman Military Feudalism, 1066-1087**

How important was the use of castles in consolidating the Norman Conquest in the period 1066-1087?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 point is that Norman rule was initially based on force and such force was embodied in the use of walled places. Therefore, the Normans were dependent on castles to:

- Maintain the conquest
  - Defend frontiers
  - Establish control in areas of strategic importance
  - As centres of colonisation
  - As residences
  - As administrative centres
  - As police posts and barracks
- ie. As bases from which such force could be exercised.

**1. Bases for active operations**

- Gave the tenant the power to control the surrounding district
- Income derived supported his personal needs
- This enabled him to discharge his feudal obligation
- It provided a base for operations and a means of intimidating potential unrest e.g. Southwest, Welsh marches, the North - Warwick, Nottingham, York, Lincoln
- Secured borders and quietened troublesome frontiers e.g. Durham, Welsh marches, strategic sea links secured by Sussex rapes castles

**2. As part of military strategy**

- Held new ground e.g. sequence of motte and bailey in advance on London post-Hastings-Hastings-Dover-Canterbury-Winchester-Wallingford-Berkhampstead
- Supported each other (castleries) e.g. Arundel-Bramber-Lewes
- This was reflected in the importance of siting e.g. Oxford, Pevensey
- As bases of further conquest e.g. Chester, Shrewsbury, Hereford

**3. Role of castellans**

- Men of military skill
- Administrative abilities
- Ability to deal with problems

e.g. Robert of Eu at Hastings, Roger of Montgomery at Pevensey, prince-bishop at Durham, Earl of Northumberland at Bamburgh, William of Mortain at Cardiff

The dates of the building of castles and the siting of castelries 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.

The physical impact of castles is also attested to in the chronicles, both the psychological impact and the physical destruction of areas in towns to provide sites (Lincoln, York, Norwich, Shrewsbury).

The imposed limitations on private fortifications shows the importance that possession of castles had and thus the nature of the role the castellans filled in their positions as holders of these centres of authority and bases from which power and authority were exercised. This adds to the importance of the role of such men in the marches where such restrictions on the building of private fortifications did not apply.

Castles were used for both offence and defence: they were the outward and visible signs of Norman domination and paramount agencies of settlement and colonisation. Royal castellans and vassals were responsible for the military subjection and economic exploitation of the conquered lands.

Other aspects of military feudalism as methods of consolidation will probably be mentioned – roles within the system, nature of Norman military response – this can be either implicit or explicit as long as judgement is uppermost. Some reference may be made to the views of Allen Brown, Cathcart-King or Le Patourel but this is not a requirement.

## Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066-1087

### B: Developments in Monasticism, 1066-1135

How beneficial was the Norman Conquest to English monasticism in the period 1066-1135?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### 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 real depth of knowledge would be required pre-1066

Answers should be focussed on the condition of abbeys in England in 1066, the degree of change and continuity afforded by the conquest and the influence of monastic reform in Europe at this time.

At the highest levels answers will show understanding of the interaction of positive and negative factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned, well supported conclusion.

The range of relevant factors will include the effects of Normanisation, racial tension and culture clash, as well as spoliation and the imposition of feudal service. These can be balanced against the effects of increased patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, their role in colonisation and expansion, particularly in Wales and its effects, the degree of continuity afforded up to 1135 and the beneficial effects of the introduction of new orders, bringing England into the mainstream of continental reform. Answers should be supported by a range of well chosen factual examples and would be expected to refer to the views of monastic chroniclers where appropriate.

#### 1. Negative Effects

- Seizure of land and treasure for benefit of Norman abbeys e.g. Le Bec
- ‘Alien’ priories staffed by monks from Norman Mother Houses e.g. At Wilmington
- The recruitment of ‘foreign’ monks e.g. Shrewsbury, Chester, Battle
- Land given to relatives of new abbots and thus alienated e.g. Urse of Worcester, Picot of Cambridge
- Strains caused by the maintenance of military households e.g. Wulfstan of Worcester
- Quotas may have been punitive for some houses as there appears to be no correlation between service demanded and the wealth of the community
- Tenurial disruption occurred when lands held by thegns killed in the conquest were granted to abbots’ Norman knights e.g. Abingdon
- Protracted resistance to imposed Norman abbots e.g. St Albans
- Changes in practice produced tension and violent reaction e.g. Glastonbury

## 2. Benefits

- Introduction of new orders e.g. Cluniacs (Lewes 1077), Cistercians
- Latin replaced the vernacular but annals were maintained under the sponsorship of Norman priors e.g. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle
- Continuity of native historiography through later writers e.g. Orderic Vitalis, Eadmer, Symeon of Durham. By preserving the past, continuity was maintained
- This led to developments like the Textus Roffensis with its substantial collection of Old English Law
- Continuity of English saints e.g. Cuthbert, Edmund, used to preserve monks' patrimony. Relics of saints e.g. Oswald, brought in money from pilgrims and Anglo-Norman hagiographers rewrote lives of English saints for new audiences e.g. Augustine, Edith of Wilton, Wulfhilde of Barking
- Benefits came from Norman patronage of English houses e.g. Shaftesbury, Gloucester. Daughter houses were established through the generosity of benefactors e.g. St Albans. Refoundations were made after the Harrying of the North e.g. Jarrow, Monkwearmouth, Whitby

There was spoliation of English houses, removal of native ecclesiastical leaders and their replacement by Normans, racial tension and culture clash, the introduction of new liturgical practises, extensive rebuilding, imposition of servitia and endowment of Norman monasteries with English Lands; but English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of English and Norman culture. English saints still protected their churches, English monasteries attracted endowments from colonists for whom they provided mausolea and Norman reformers collaborated in the monastic revival of northern England.

**Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483-c1529****A: Pretenders and Protest in the Reign of Henry VII**

How seriously did rebellions threaten Henry VII's government?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Answers would be expected to place rebellions in the context of the period c1483 to 1509 and particularly 1485 to 1499. There would need to be awareness of the precariousness of Henry's throne, especially before 1499 and an assessment of the threats posed by the Lovell, Yorkshire and Cornish rebellions. Candidates are also likely to refer to the troubles resulting from the activities of the pretenders, Lambert, Simnel and Perkin Warbeck and in particular the inter-connection between Warbeck's activities and the Cornish rebellion.

Key events and developments would include rebellion in Yorkshire in 1489 due to the widespread resentment which the parliamentary subsidy voted to Henry to go to the aid of Brittany caused. Also, there would be the role of local resentments, including the fact that the counties to the north of Yorkshire were exempted from the tax as they were expected to defend the country from the Scots. There may be discussion of the role of the Earl of Northumberland and his murder because he had supported the tax's imposition and Henry's settlement of the area after the Earl of Surrey had suppressed the revolt, including a pardon for most of the rebels.

The seriousness of the Cornish rebellion of 1497 will be discussed, especially its causes, which once again was in part a reaction to a parliamentary subsidy and other taxes this time voted to Henry to deal with a possible invasion threat from Scotland. There may be discussion of other causes such as Henry's government being too grasping, while at the local level some members of the gentry resented their exclusion from local power and patronage. There will be discussion of the rebels virtually unimpeded march across the south of England to Blackheath. Henry's reaction to this and the defeat and suppression of the rebellion will feature, as well as the extent of the threat, which it represented to Henry's government when it was too grasping in its demands, ignored local sensibilities, and came at a particularly difficult time given Warbeck's activities.

Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483-c1529

**B: The Career of Thomas Wolsey**

How important was Wolsey's personal relationship with Henry VIII in his career between 1509 and 1530?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Answers would be expected to place Wolsey in the context of the period 1509-29. Candidates may include some examination of Wolsey's rise before 1509 due to important contacts such as the Marquess of Dorset. There should be some examination of Wolsey's elevation to the royal council and the key events in his rise – the planning and the execution of the successful expedition to France in 1513 and Wolsey's impressing of the king. Thereafter, key events and developments would include Wolsey's rapid rise to become archbishop, cardinal and Lord Chancellor and the king's effectively leaving him to run both domestic and foreign affairs after 1515 with only occasional interventions from Henry VIII until the mid 1520s, although foreign affairs was to some extent an exception to this.

Explanations of Henry's importance to Wolsey's career will be inevitably focussed on the key period of 1515 to 1529. This may include references to Wolsey's personal relationship with Henry VIII and the importance of the latter if the Cardinal was to maintain his power. There is likely to be coverage of Henry's interventions in both domestic and foreign policy and how Wolsey was able to keep the king's confidence and also limit the influence of his opponents. The importance of initiatives such as the Eltham Ordinances in 1519 and in 1526 to keep Henry's attention when Wolsey thought it was wandering may be included. Also there is likely to be consideration of how far Wolsey met Henry's demands, especially after 1520 for an active foreign policy, which included promoting Henry's prestige in the eyes of Europe with events such as the Field of the Cloth of Gold which Wolsey stage-managed. There may be discussion of the key importance of Henry's role in events such as the Amicable Grant of 1525 and the impact of Henry's desire for an annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon and Wolsey's increasingly desperate attempts to deal with this in the context of a deteriorating international situation, not least in terms of Henry's declining confidence in his minister and the opportunity which this gave to his political enemies to engineer his downfall in 1529. There is likely to be discussion of the key events surrounding Wolsey's fall from power in 1529 which was hastened once the cardinal lost his automatic right of access to the king during that year due to the influence of the Norfolk, Suffolk and the Boleyn faction. Wolsey's fall was sealed by the recalling of the king's divorce case to Rome in July 1529. Henry dismissed Wolsey from the chancellorship in October 1529 and a charge of praemunire was launched against him. Henry's personal relationship with Wolsey was over. Between 1529 and 1530 Henry kept Wolsey's hopes alive of some return to power as the archbishopric of York was returned to him. In early November 1530 due to his enemies machinations and his own secret correspondence with foreign rulers, Wolsey was arrested on a charge of high treason but died on his way to London before he had been brought to trial.

**Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603-c1640****A: The Nature of Puritanism and its Threat to the Crown, 1603-1625**

To what extent were James I's concerns about Puritanism in the years 1618 to 1625 increased by developments in foreign affairs?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 explain, in general, what concerns Puritanism raised for James I. In relation to this there should be a clear understanding of how, by its nature, Puritanism posed a political threat to James's position as Supreme Governor and monarch. Candidates may make a distinction between the majority of Puritans who were moderate and the minority of extremists. In relation to this many may point out that by 1618 James had dealt with the threat relatively successfully. The main focus, with this context, must however be on 1618 to 1625 and how the events of those years affected James's concerns about Puritanism. A clear grasp of the nature of anti-papery and the subsequent Puritan concerns about James's approach to the Thirty Years War should be illustrated. Candidates should show an understanding of James's policies and in particular might refer to his reliance on Arminians. The 1622 Direction to Preachers and the 1625 Sabbath Act. Better answers might seek to set James's response in a wider context. The response of the 'country' and in particular MP's may be seen as in line with 'Puritan thinking'. Many might also comment that James was never seriously threatened and remained in control of his foreign policy despite the actions of the 'Protestant Alliance' post 1623. Despite the increased pressure post 1618 because of foreign policy concerns, James successfully managed Puritanism by always maintaining a balance in his church and recognising the distinctions within Puritanism.

**Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603-c1640****B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603-1641**

How successfully, during the period 1603 to 1625, had James I achieved his objectives in Scotland?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 explain James's general objectives regarding control, union and religion. While James promised to return to Scotland every three years he returned once, in 1617 and candidates may judge his success by his 1607 comment that 'this I must say for Scotland, here I sit and govern it with my pen, I write and it is done, and by a clerk of the Council I govern Scotland now, which others could not do by the sword'. James did realise that the Scottish Privy Council was crucial. He increased its efficiency by reducing it in size; Councils 'Register' shows James's active interest and that he was closely informed; an efficient postal service between Edinburgh and London was established; James sent a constant stream of letters to the council carefully explaining his policies and decisions. Dunbar, (Treasurer of Scotland, Chancellor of the Exchequer in England), journeyed endlessly between the two kingdoms. Vital however was James's own ability to interpret the information he received and take appropriate action in the Scottish context. In a wider sense control was also addressed by the presence of a growing number of Privy Councillors among the Lords of Articles which ensured even tighter management of the Scottish Parliament. The borders were pacified, MacGregors and other clans dealt with, JPs introduced and loyal nobles rewarded. In religion, James had the sense not to impose uniformity but, in Morrill's words went for a 'congruent' church. Thus while candidates should show that there were problems, especially after 1621, they should, through illustrative examples, comment on James success in achieving his objectives as an absentee king.

**Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714-1802****A: The Nature, Extent and Threat of Jacobitism, 1714-1746**

How similar were the reasons why the 1715 and 1745 Jacobite Rebellions failed?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 be expected to analyse the reasons for the failure of both Jacobite rebellions, discriminating between common factors and those unique to a specific rebellion. In 1715, the Earl of Mar was supported by 18 Scottish lords and 5000 men, compared with only 1500 government troops in Scotland at that time; his indecisiveness, particularly after the inconclusive battle of Sherrifmuir, resulted in lost opportunities to take the initiative. Other Jacobite commanders, such as Forster and Derwentwater, can be similarly criticised. However, there was no real evidence of Jacobite support outside Scotland and parts of Northern England. The death of Louis XIV and the onset of the Regency in France limited the prospect of French support. Finally, there were strong links between the Whig government and the Hanoverian regime, although there was some panic from a dynasty which had only just been established and was aware of its relative unpopularity.

In 1745, Prince Charles Edward proved a more impressive Jacobite leader, though not without fault; the decision to turn back at Derby and the decision to fight at Culloden were both open to criticism. Once again there was a distinct lack of foreign support, and relatively limited support in England. However, this time there was a stronger government resistance than in 1715; the Hanoverian dynasty was more settled and, whilst hardly enjoying massive support in its own right, inspired little positive hostility and the British army provided a more substantial presence than in 1715.

Candidates should also refer to the changed role of the Old Pretender; in 1715, he showed some degree of positive, though ineffective involvement, but in 1745 he appeared to be largely indifferent to the activities of his son and his British supporters.

**Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714-1802****B: The British in India, c1757-c1802**

How important are the ambitions and rivalries of Indian princes in explaining the extension of British rule in India in the period 1757-1784?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Candidates may well mention, as contextual background, the religious tensions between Moslem and Hindu and the commercial and political struggle between Britain and France – both of which affected the policies of individual princes. Also relevant is Clive's desire to expand British influence by whatever means possible, contrasted with Warren Hastings' greater respect for native Indians, and his emphasis on consolidation rather than expansion.

Substantial advance was possible during the Seven Years War, when the Nawab of Benegal, Siraj-ud-duala, attempted to take advantage of British preoccupation to expel British influence ('Black Hole of Calcutta'); Clive's response was a series of victories culminating in the Battle of Plassey (1757), after which Siraj was executed and replaced by his disloyal commander, Mir Jafar. He in turn was later deposed by the anti-British Mir Kasim, but Mir Jafar was restored after Hector Munroe's victory at Buxar (1764). On his return to India in 1765, Clive placed a British puppet on the throne in Oudh.

With corruption in Madras leading to a major challenge to the authority of the pro-British Nawab, Hastings was sent to India to introduce reform and stability. He marginalised the position of the corrupt Nawab of Benegal, supported the pro-British Nawab of Oudh in the Rohilla Wars (1774), interfered decisively in a disputed succession in the Mahrattas against a pro-French candidate (1775), and acted decisively to protect the fortune of the Nawab of Oudh against the Begums (his mother and grandmother) in 1782. Most important of all, he had defeated a hostile coalition of Indian powers under Haider Ali at Bombay and Madras in 1780, after which he skilfully split the coalition. Although his priority had been consolidation, the corruption, ambitions and unpopularity of native princes had opened the way for further expansion.

Thus in the early part of this period the rivalries and ambitions of the Indian princes was a major factor; in the latter part, rivalries and ambitions constituted more of a passive role, with Hastings deliberately exploiting the divisions.

**Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815-1841****A: Government Response to Poverty**

How successfully had the Poor Law Amendment Act improved the administration of the Poor Law by 1841?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

The question refers specifically to the improvement in administration. There are several areas where candidates can mention changes:

- Centralised administration based on Somerset House in London under Edwin Chadwick as main Commissioner. This brought about a major change from the decentralised system pre-1834 which was based on parish organisation.
- The re-organisation of the Poor Law nationally into poor law unions. Parishes were grouped together into unions. Each poor law union was responsible for producing a workhouse for their area. This standardised poor law provision across the country.
- Each local poor law union was chosen by ratepayers in an election. These Poor Law Guardians were responsible for the delivery of the Poor Law in their area.
- The previous diversified system of offering a variety of poor law relief had been replaced by a system in which the pauper received it from within a workhouse. No longer was a variety of ‘outdoor relief’ offered.
- As a counter to this question it can be stated that by 1841 the new system had not been fully introduced. Resistance to the New Poor Law was commonplace across industrial northern England. This slowed down the implementation of the new system. The situation was made worse by the industrial slump of 1839 which placed thousands on the ‘streets’ seeking poor law relief.
- Also the elderly, sick and children were treated in a way similar to the Old Poor Law.

**Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815-1841****B: Religion and Politics in England and Ireland c1820-c1841**

How justified were criticisms of the Anglican Church, in England and Ireland, by its supporters and its opponents between c1820 and 1841?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

**In Ireland**

Candidates should mention criticism from Catholics in Ireland in 1820s in their campaign for Catholic Emancipation and, in the early 1830s, the Tithe War of 1831-35. Candidates can also mention the need for reform of the Irish Church in 1833.

**In England**

Candidates can mention the quest for civil and religious equality by Nonconformists and Catholics which criticised the Anglican establishment. They can also mention the reform of the Anglican Church via the Ecclesiastical Commission of 1835. Also they can mention the criticism of the Oxford Movement.

These criticisms can be placed against the established position of the Church of England; the demands by non-conformists in the 1820s which led to the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 and then attacks by Catholics which led to the Catholic Relief Act of 1829. Also in the 1830s Anglicans closed ranks to defend the Church against radical attacks by 'left wing supporters of the Whig government'.

## Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895-1921

### A: The Nature and Impact of New Liberalism, 1906-1915

With what success did the Liberal governments of 1906-1915 deal with the causes and effects of poverty?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### 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 attempt to distinguish between causes and effects, although only those responses at the higher levels may do. The main factual material is the welfare legislation/reforms introduced by the Liberal governments. Before the First World War the major innovations were old age pensions, National Insurance and concerning children (school meals, medical inspection, Children's Charter relating to health, smoking, treatment of offenders). Also significant were the Workmen's Compensation Act, labour exchanges and trade boards for sweated industries. Some of the taxation changes in the People's Budget are relevant in that they produced some redistribution of wealth with revenue intended (in part) to fund the welfare reforms particularly the payment of pensions. The pre-war welfare legislation was mainly complete by 1911. During the initial stages of the First World War government actions taken under D.O.R.A. attempted to help deal with causes and effects of poverty (even if initiated for different reasons), e.g. in relation to drink and beginnings of better health and maternity care. Overall the effectiveness of the measures has been questioned. Pensions were paid only to the very old and National Insurance payments implemented only shortly before the onset of the First World War. The Poor Law was retained and no significant measures taken in relation to slum housing. Nevertheless the list of reforms was impressive and each made some impact on the effects of poverty. Social service spending doubled between 1906 and 1915.

Answers should cover the whole period. There may be brief reference to 'distractions' for the government from other issues, e.g. the Irish Question, suffragettes, industrial unrest, foreign policy and the First World War itself. Overall the Liberal reforms were more successful in dealing with the effects of poverty (e.g. through pensions and National Insurance) than the causes, though the proportion of the whole population covered, with the possible exception of children, was restricted. War-time developments eventually, but only marginally by 1915, helped considerably in dealing with not only effects, but also causes, of poverty by payment of higher wages and improved health measures (both directly and indirectly). Unemployment was a major cause of poverty and Churchill's measures were important, but it was the necessities of war which produced 'full employment'. Booth and Rowntree had found unemployment and old age to be major causes of poverty. The Liberal reforms certainly began to address them but with limited impact by 1915.

**Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895-1921****B: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland c1895-1921**

How important was the opposition of Ulster Unionists in preventing all-Ireland Home Rule between 1912 and 1921?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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 address the importance of Ulster Unionist opposition and cover the whole period. There can be (brief) reference to the issues at stake and their origins before 1912. From 1912 the main factual material includes the Party situation in the Commons and the Third Home Rule bill, emergence of stronger opposition in Ulster (leadership of Carson and Craig, arming of the Ulster Volunteers, the Solemn League and Covenant, support from Bonar Law and the Conservative Opposition), failure of Asquith's six years exclusion proposal, the Curragh mutiny and the further heavy arming in 1914 of the Ulster Volunteers (matched to some degree by that of the Irish Volunteers). The threat of civil war in 1914, essentially because of the Unionists' refusal to contemplate Home Rule of any kind, was very real. The comparative calm of the early years of the First World War was shattered by the 1916 Easter Rising with its declaration of an independent Irish Republic and then Sinn Fein's electoral success in 1918 with its demand for a 32 counties independent state. Ulster Unionists' intransigence to even Home Rule was intensified further by these events, but they 'retained' six of the Ulster counties, ironically the only part of Ireland to receive 'Home Rule' after the violence of 1919-21 and as part of the 1921 settlements.

Prevention of Home Rule for the whole of the island of Ireland, or inclusion of the six counties within the Irish Free State was 'achieved' by Ulster Unionist determination, threat (and use) of force and allies in Britain notably in the Conservative (and Unionist) Party which held key political positions from 1916 and especially after the 1918 election.

Essentially Ulster Unionists were successful, not in preventing a 'break away' for most of Ireland, but in preserving the union with Britain and Protestant ascendancy in the north-east of Ireland.

**Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750-1830****A: Britain's Economy in 1750**

Examine the accuracy of the view that by 1750 industry in Britain was still backward but agriculture had undergone a major transformation.

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Answers would be expected to assess the two main elements of the question. They should consider the main features of agriculture – some regional specialisation had occurred as had development of new techniques to improve output and production, there had been some voluntary enclosure. However, the main periods of parliamentary enclosure had yet to take place and the pattern of land-ownership and the use of common land ensured the continuation of pre-industrial practices. The textile industry had undergone some change, which might be considered proto-industrial and there was a definite emphasis on external markets – a feature of a more developed industrial structure. Other industries such as iron were essentially pre-industrial. Reference could also be made to the infrastructure and banking which may be a significant indicator of industrial change.

Discussion and supporting material offered could be: an awareness of the features which could be described as denoting industrial development and those which might be described as pre-industrial such as the production of iron in which major developments did not take place until the 1760s, although it had established itself in large scale/non domestic production (Mathias). The significance of the model of proto-industrialisation for the textile industry and others such as the small metal trades, framework knitting etc could be examined (Hudson). The significance of wealth distribution as identified by Gregory King could be discussed and linked to the finance available for investment in family enterprises (Mathias). There could be an awareness of the argument that major agricultural change took place in the seventeenth century with the drainage schemes and new techniques employed following the Restoration. The statistical work of Overton and analysis presented by Turner on the impact of enclosures on society and the economy should also be considered.

**Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic History, 1750-1830****B: The Standard of Living of the Working Classes, 1780-1830**

Examine the validity of the view that the real change in the quality of life of the working classes between 1780 and 1830 cannot be understood by a study of prices and wages alone.

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Answers would be expected to assess the arguments relating to both the statistical approach, which considers that the changes in the standard of living can be quantified. Candidates may consider a range of different quantifiable strategies; the most common is real wage index based on a comparison of wages and prices. Alternative material available relates to unemployment data and poor law payments. Much of the data is flawed as it is either based on wholesale prices, or, in the case of wages/poor relief/unemployment statistics is only available for small groups of people in certain geographical areas at particular times. All the income data, apart from the poor law payments are based on the male earner and ignore what women earned, often in the black economy. Hartwell who argues for an improvement and Thompson/Hobsbawm who use similar types of statistics to suggest that the standard of living of the working classes did not improve. They should recognise that the pessimists do tend to use more qualitative data than the optimists. More recent studies suggest that only a qualitative understanding can be gained. Horrell and Humphries have indicated that the types of data collected ignore the role of women's contribution to the family economy and the problems created by significant periods of unemployment/underemployment. The latter is significant when the black economy cannot be quantified.

Discussion and supporting material offered could be: a detailed analysis of the quantitative material especially relating to prices and incomes and to consumption. There should also be an understanding of the limitations of these in terms of what material is used to construct indices such as the Brown, Phelps, Hopkins. The problems of qualitative data – for example using criminal records for insights into the black economy should also be recognised. Overall candidates should conclude that the two needed to be taken together as neither are, individually, secure.

## Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832-1848

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

How important was the need to meet the demands of the new electorate in the introduction of the Whig reforms, 1833-1841?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

#### 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 consider the motives behind the Whig reforms of the 1830s. These are specifically identified in the specification as the Factory acts, the Poor Law Amendment Act and the Municipal Corporations Act. Answers should consider the motives behind each of these three acts and for a balanced answer consideration of motives other than the demands of the new electorate are necessary.

The question directs candidates towards one motive, that the 1832 Reform Act had enfranchised a further 286,527 men, essentially from the middle classes, whose interests governments now had to consider. It is possible to see the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act in this light, given the savings in local rates previously paid by the middle class under the inefficient and expensive Speenhamland system.

However, other motives need to be considered:

- The Reform Act had established a principle of uniformity in political institutions, which was now applied in other areas – this led to the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act.
- Humanitarianism was a factor behind the 1833 Factory Act, with its attempts to prevent the exploitation of children. The compulsory registration of births in 1836 might be used as evidence that the former measure was a genuine attempt to tackle the issue of child labour.
- The Utilitarian principles of Bentham (the greatest happiness of the greatest number) are a further motive and can be seen at work in the drive for efficiency that the Poor Law Amendment Act represents as well as the narrow conception of the causes of poverty that the Benthamites accepted. They believed that the vast majority of poverty was caused by idleness and therefore the idle poor should be removed from the community, receiving relief only in workhouses, where conditions should be worse than outside to encourage people to work – the principle of ‘less-eligibility’. The presence of Benthamites like Chadwick, Bishop Sumner, Bishop Blomfield, Bourne and Lewis on the 1832 Poor Law Commission are significant, with their emphasis on utilitarian principles like uniformity.

Arguments that politicians were more concerned with being elected than any general principles like utilitarianism could be used to argue that the demands of the new electorate were paramount. Therefore the Reform Act made cheaper Poor Law provision necessary, whilst the limitations to the Factory Act and the lack of change in local representatives as a result of the Municipal Corporations Act suggest a lack of any real principle, dismissing the significance of humanitarian or utilitarian principles. Alternatively, it might be argued that the new electorate was only an addition of 50% to the pre-1832 electorate and was therefore not a majority. The landed elite accounted for 71% of members of the House of Commons in 1841. Therefore general principles might be more important.

**Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832-1848****B: Chartism, 1838-1848**

How important was dissatisfaction with the 1832 Reform Act as a reason for the development of Chartism in the years 1838-1848?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**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. Some mention may also be seen of O'Connor's co-operative idea. Candidates should assess reasons for the development of Chartism that show awareness of the changing motives over the ten-year period. Some answers may address specific reasons for the development of each failure of each wave – but the best will show an awareness of some common factors.

Candidates are directed to one reason for the development of the Chartist campaign, the dissatisfaction of radicals with the 1832 Reform Act. Reference to the six points of the people's charter and evidence of why the demands were necessary would show the limits of 1832. Payment for MPs and an end to the property qualification for voting would be needed to end the landed dominance of the House of Commons – 71% in 1841 after the Reform Act; equal constituencies would remove the remaining anomalies – Doncaster (population 10,000) had no representation; secret ballots would end pocket boroughs that had not yet disappeared in 1832; annual parliaments would make the government more accountable, given that the reformed governments could claim to represent the people, yet acted more as an elected dictatorship; and universal suffrage would give the vote to more than the 18% of adult males enfranchised in 1832 and end the anomalies based on the £10 qualification (many skilled workers qualified for the vote in London, but many of the middle class, which the Act was meant to enfranchise, did not qualify in Wales. Reference might be made to the fact that the Reform Act had whetted radical appetites, that the working class now assumed that the next step would be to grant them the vote, but given the attitude of the politicians (e.g. 'Finality Jack' Russell), there was a need for further agitation. This might be linked to the relative effectiveness of agitation in 1831/32.

However, other causes of Chartism should also be considered:

- Working class dissatisfaction with social and economic conditions – the ‘knife and fork’ analysis of Chartism. Wages were falling; food prices and unemployment were rising.
- From 1837 a general depression set in enhancing these concerns.
- Anger at the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act, which created workhouses and blamed poverty on laziness, whilst also ending poor relief for many.
- Effects of industrialisation – overcrowding, pollution, disease-ridden towns; poor working conditions, which the 1833 Factory Act had only gone some way towards addressing (did not apply in textile factories, not enforced)
- Other demands of the working class might be addressed through the Chartist movement, so people joined and made the movement a broad church – eight hour day, end to child labour, government hostility towards Trades Unions, for example.

All of these factors meant that the working class people sought a more representative parliament which would not ignore their needs.

- O’Connor’s dream of a new Britain, based on communal land might also be discussed.

Candidates might argue that Chartism was essentially motivated by economic suffering in periods of unemployment and depression and was therefore not popular when the economy improved, meaning that the political reasons were less important. Alternatively it might be alleged that the reasons for Chartism changed over the period – initially dissatisfaction with the Reform Act was the catalyst, but then the movement embraced those whose concerns were more social and economic.

**Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929-1951****A: The Making of the Welfare State 1942-1951**

How completely had Aneurin Bevan achieved his objectives for the establishment of the National Health Service by 1951?

*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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20**

**Indicative content**

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

Answers would be expected to cover a range of factors – how the idea of the NHS and the welfare state arose from the war years and the Beveridge plan; how it was planned and carried through by the Attlee government from 1945; the nature of opposition from the medical profession and from the Conservatives; how the NHS was set up in 1948, and then was established in the years to 1951; and above all the personal role of Aneurin Bevan within the Labour government.

The emphasis in the question is on “his (ie Bevan’s) objectives” – many answers will make effective differentiation between Bevan and his supporters, rather than the Labour Cabinet as a whole. Some answers, therefore, may focus on a close examination of Bevan’s personality and policies; but many valid answers will take a wider view of other factors, perhaps even going back to Beveridge and the war years to deal with the wider political context of the “objectives” for the NHS and the welfare state, placing Bevan in context. It will be important to distinguish between those answers which apply such material to the question, as opposed to those which stick to a rigid, pre-prepared descriptive survey.

The question offers scope for an analysis of aims and objectives behind the NHS; of the policies and actions up to its establishment in 1948; and of how completely the outcomes by 1951 matched the objectives. Many answers may overdo the description of personality and policies at the expense of assessing the results – the question demands above all a judgement on the scale of the achievement in securing the NHS, by 1951. The NHS was indeed set up and can be regarded as one of the lasting success stories of the Attlee legacy, with Bevan as a hero for the Labour Left because of the tenacity with which he fought against all obstacles. On the other hand, it can be argued that Bevan was prevented from being as successful as he might have been by his abrasive and controversial style, or because he did not receive full backing from his Cabinet colleagues. One key factor is that Bevan did in the end resign from government in 1951 after his clash with the Chancellor Hugh Gaitskell over prescription charges – a split which helped to bring down Attlee’s government a few months later. Answers may equally well argue that Bevan was difficult and unrealistic – or that only Bevan’s personal contribution could have kept alive the ideals of equality and pushed the NHS through despite the difficulties caused by compromisers in the cabinet, by opposition from vested interests, and by the problems of the post-war economic crisis.

Although the question is focused on the NHS, there will be answers which broaden out into discussion of the welfare state in general, or even of the Attlee Legacy as a whole. Such a wider approach can be duly rewarded, but it is by no means a requirement – and it must be made explicitly relevant, not part of a rigid pre-prepared approach.

## Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929-1951

### B: Winston Churchill in opposition and government, 1929-1945

How successfully did Winston Churchill manage the relationship between Britain and her American and Soviet allies from 1941 to 1945?

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: 1-6      L2: 7-11      L3: 12-15      L4: 16-18      L5: 19-20

#### Indicative content

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

Answers would be expected to include a balanced (though not necessarily equal) coverage of both the American and Soviet “relationship”. There should also be some recognition of why the key dates have significance. Churchill came to power in 1940, with Britain fighting a war alone until June 1941 when the Soviet Union was invaded and became a *de facto* ally; the USA entered the war after Pearl Harbour in December 1941. Background material covering issues before 1941, such as Churchill’s historic anti-Communism going back to 1918; or the very important links between Churchill and FDR which already existed in 1940-41 before the Americans were formally at war (Lend-Lease, for example) – can be made highly relevant but must, of course, be directly applied to the question. From late 1941 to early 1943, Churchill was a key figure in the crucial stages of the war; but, as the two future superpowers built up to full military and economic strength, Britain and Churchill were forced into a subordinate role.

“Managing the relationship” covers a potentially wide range. This includes personal diplomacy and face to face meetings, especially the big conferences in 1943 at Tehran and Casablanca and in 1945 at Yalta; matters of strategy such as convoys and code-breaking, and Soviet demands for a ‘second front’; also the issues of propaganda and public opinion. For example, the high public profile of Churchill, especially in the USA, tended to conceal how much British power was secondary by 1943-44; and during the war years much attention was given in Britain to promoting a positive image of the USSR and “Uncle Joe” Stalin, even when British policy was privately very worried about Stalin’s aims in Eastern and Central Europe.

Measuring “success” covers many aspects and answers should not be expected to be comprehensive. Churchill might be seen as highly successful in key combined operations such as the Battle of the Atlantic or D-Day. He might be seen as unsuccessful in the end – failing to prevent the Soviet take-over in Eastern Europe, or leaving Britain deep in debt and completely overshadowed by American power. Many answers, often good ones, will differentiate between the “relationship”, perhaps suggesting that Churchill succeeded with Roosevelt but failed with Stalin; or arguing that Churchill was correct at Yalta in urging a tougher line against Stalin but was undermined by the greater power and influence of the USA. There might even be answers building on the recent TV series *Allies At War* and analysing the very different attitudes of Churchill and FDR towards De Gaulle – but this is by no means essential material.

Comprehensive coverage would be a lot to ask. Good answers may stress one ally more than the other, or deal with some of key issues between 1940-41 and 1945 in more depth than others. A good “balanced answer” will cover a range of factors and issues, but not necessarily all of them or at the same depth.