

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

AS History Course Essays (HS03) *(Subject Code 5041)*

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

© Assessment and Qualifications Alliance 2005

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee, registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered Charity 1073334. Registered address Addleshaw Goddard, Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ.

Dr Michael Cresswell, Director General.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS UNIT 3 : COURSE ESSAYS

General Guidance for Examiners



A: INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

In marking 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 indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

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

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

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

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

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS**Level 1: 1-4 Marks (3) (Middle = 3)**

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: 5-9 Marks (7) (Middle = 7)***Either***

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

Or

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

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

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

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

So, is the response:

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

Important Note

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

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

How important was the part played by the military orders in the defence of the Crusader states in the twelfth century?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should provide detailed knowledge on the defensive needs of the Crusader states after c1100 and the role of the military orders. Key themes may include the following: the military orders as castle garrisons and elite troops; their military abilities/martial spirit; their numerical contribution; 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. Evaluation may focus on limitations in their contribution; this will include: rivalry between Templars and Hospitallers; their corporate independence and difficult relationship with secular and religious authority within Outremer, especially the crown, their greed and their fanaticism and the Muslim response they provoked. The role of Gerald de Ridefort at the springs of Cresson and the Battle of Hattin should also be examined, as this individual did much to bring on the virtual collapse of the Crusader states between 1187 and 1188.

At the highest levels answers will show understanding of the interaction of the various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned well-supported conclusion. They should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples.

By 1130 the two Military Orders, Templars and Hospitallers, were well-established within the four Crusader states formed in the aftermath of the First Crusade, Jerusalem, Antioch, Tripoli and Edessa. The security of these states was very fragile; they were spread out down the eastern Mediterranean and surrounded by hostile Muslim states. Outremer was weak with limited manpower, reliant on crusading armies as a temporary source of defence.

Because of these fundamental weaknesses, the military orders were arguably vital for the defence of the crusader states.

Sir Stephen Runciman believed that, in battle, the Hospitallers and the Templars were what the Kingdom 'most needed'. They were a permanent source of defence, unlike crusading armies, and the knights the orders provided were an elite force. They were highly trained and disciplined soldiers, who would not desert in battle. Such was their bravery that William of Tyre described them as having 'the spirit of fury in their nostrils'. Furthermore, these orders added much needed manpower to the Kingdom's armies, and were free, unlike mercenaries. They were also very well equipped in both armament and mounts, due to the wealth within the orders. An example of the success of the orders in battle was the Templars rescue of Baldwin IV and the destruction of Saladin's forces at Montgisard in 1177.

Another military function of the orders was their holding and maintaining of castles in the east. Unlike much of the Frankish nobility, the Templars and Hospitallers were rich enough to build and maintain their own castles. They were also given or sold castles by rulers and nobles who lacked either the manpower or resources to keep their castle. The Hospitallers alone were responsible for twenty-five castles in the East, including Krak des Chevaliers. This castle was of great importance as it was part of a 'great frontier' (Riley-Smith) and was the centre of operations against the Muslims in the region.

The role the Templars and Hospitallers played in the defence of the crusader states is open to interpretation, and this is reflected in the leading secondary sources; Riley-Smith believes that 'the contribution they made to the defence of the Latin east was comparatively modest'. This is supported by the small numbers they provided for the Kingdom's armies, as well as their numerous limitations, such as their independence and greed which led to a number of problems in the Latin East. Moreover, the Templars' building of a castle at Jacob's Ford may be seen as a provocative act and it was the bad advice of the Master of the Temple, Gerald de Ridefort, who persuaded King Guy to make the wrong decision and attack Saladin at Hattin in 1187 that led to the near destruction of the crusader states.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism*****B: The Development of new Monasticism in Twelfth Century Europe**

Examine the degree to which disciplined organisation explains the rapid growth of the Cistercian order in the twelfth century.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should provide detailed knowledge on the successful expansion of the Cistercians and analysis should focus on the role of the organisation of the order as a reason for the order's success; this should include the manner in which expansion was carried out while discipline and uniformity of practice was maintained – the Charter of Love (Carta Caritatis) and the maintenance of discipline through filiation and visitation. However, there are other reasons to consider. These include the roles of Bernard of Clairvaux and Stephen Harding and the ideals of austerity established by the order's founder, Robert of Molesme, and also the economic success of the order.

At the highest levels answers will show understanding of the interaction of the various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned and well-supported conclusion. They should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples.

The Carta Caritatis formed the constitution of the order, and the impact of the organisation and discipline it provided should be considered. The structure and discipline of the order, its federal framework and uniform observance of the monastic rule, filiation, daughter houses, visitations and the general chapter are all factors which may be discussed as means of preserving Cistercian ideals. The role of its author, Abbot Stephen Harding, may be considered. The impact of Citeaux as a mother-house led to the spiritual success of the order, and students may analyse the role of his Charter of Love (Carta Caritatis) in

maintaining discipline while expansion took place, and in establishing a clear monastic philosophy for the order. The attraction of the ideals of the order will be of central importance; their uncompromising insistence on poverty, simplicity and austerity.

The role of economic success was significant in allowing further expansion; in particular the role of lay brothers or *conversi*. This issue will include the social catholicity of its appeal which created an opportunity for the uneducated servant and working classes to enter religious life. The *conversi* had an impact on economic success as a cheap source of manual labour, allowing communities to be self-supporting. The Cistercians' focus on the wilderness made their monasteries relatively cheap to found, while benefactors were pleased to grant uncultivated land; skill in sheep farming and wool production was notable; austerity led to not only a flood of endowments but also funds for re-investment as did the papal privileges granting exemption from tithes in 1132; and the economic context of European demographic and economic expansion should also be considered.

The role of Bernard as an inspirational figure should also feature; by the time of his death in 1153 his abbey at Clairvaux was mother house to 68 of the 343 houses of Cistercian monks. Issues will include topics such as the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, his charismatic personality and personal example in austerity and asceticism, his prestige and inspirational role, while evaluation may focus on decline after his death. 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, may also be mentioned.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*****A: The origins of the French Wars of Religion**

How important are the weaknesses of the French crown in explaining the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion in 1562?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Weaknesses of the crown may be exemplified by reference to:

- the lack of strong leadership – the unexpected death of Henry II in 1559 led to rule by his weak son, 15 year old Francis II (who died within a year), and then the minor Charles X, dominated by his mother, Catherine de Medici. Although she represented the strongest element in French government, her ambitions for her sons and lack of personal religious conviction generated a period of weak rule
- the failure to control faction – the Guise emerged as the most influential of the noble families, generating more intense rivalry with other noble families, particularly the Bourbons and Montmorencies
- the failure to deal effectively with the Huguenots, e.g. as in the Edict of Amboise (banning Huguenot assemblies) and toleration of some gatherings which led to resentment on both sides
- Catherine de Medici's own inconsistency of action, e.g. although a Catholic, as regent she attended a Calvinist sermon, granted Huguenots freedom of worship in own homes, intervened in the Colloquy of Poissy and issued the Edict of January allowing Huguenot assemblies in countryside; this only intensified opposition from Guises and conflict in

the provinces, leading to Massacreat Vassy and the start of wars; relaxation of censorship meant that Protestant works were allowed into France and added to unrest

- financial weaknesses – crown debt was 40 million livres in 1559, largely as a result of the Habsburg-Valois wars and pensions paid to nobility. The Crown could not afford to embark on major conflict.

Other factors which could be balanced against the weaknesses of the crown, for example:

- the specific strengths of established networks of clientage which, combined with positions held by nobles, e.g. as provincial governors, gave them powerful support in the provinces, wealth gave them access to military support
- the spread of Calvinist faith, particularly after 1555 – accentuated differences between powerful families and generated rivalries exemplified in the Tumult of Amboise
- economic crisis – failure of harvest, rising prices and increased taxation affected workers, nobles and crown alike, reducing living standards and creating discontent
- the return of soldiers who had fought in Habsburg-Valois wars; limited prospects of employment drove them into service with nobility and strengthened the clientage base
- the weakness of Catholic Church – absenteeism, corruption, ignorance etc. led to a willingness to consider other faiths and allegiances.

Answers would be expected to offer some debate and include political, religious, social and economic issues in order to generate a balanced answer. Good answers will seek to offer judgement, e.g. that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that conflict would have occurred anyway, but that the specific weaknesses of the crown by 1562 provided a suitable opportunity.

Able students will also understand the connections, e.g. lack of strong leadership and failure to control faction meant that, for example, the clientage system developed unchecked.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*****B: The role of individuals and ideas in the French Wars of Religion, 1562–1598**

How important were theories of resistance in the Huguenots' struggle against the Catholic League and the government?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should recognise that, although there was some encouragement of the concept of 'suffering' as a part of the faith, both Luther and Calvin were prepared to sanction the use of force in self defence, so protestants were not necessarily expected to become martyrs or to be perceived as having 'fallen from Grace' if they resisted authority.

There are three main contemporary works to which historians refer for guidance on this and candidates should be aware of the main points they make, for example:

- *Francogallia* by Francis Hotman 1573 – this put forward the concept of the king as an elected officer who could be brought down by the people or supported by them, i.e. he was entirely dependent on their will. Huguenots could argue on this basis that a government could be destroyed if it was not based on the support of the majority of the people. This opposition could be expressed through bodies like the Estates-General.
- The Right of Magistrates by Theodore Beza 1574 – this agreed that kings could be resisted, and this could come from office holders as well as parliaments; this was a particularly important suggestion because parliaments met so infrequently. Office holders could be part of national or provincial (including cities) elites.

- *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos* by du Plessis-Mornay 1579 – the king had agreed to maintain God’s laws and fulfil his duties effectively; if this was not occurring then he could be removed.

However, it was not just ideas, but also events or their consequences, practical matters, the influence of individuals etc. which encouraged the Huguenots to resist, for example:

- the unity of purpose engendered after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew – self-defence was essential
- the ability to sustain the military struggle through the support of local communities, those with specific grievances against the crown etc. the independence of the Midi (almost a federal republic within France)
- the emergence of strong leaders, e.g. the Prince of Conde, Henry of Navarre, who were prepared to take up arms as necessary
- the influence of *politiques* like Michael de L’Hopital who did not see religious unity as essential – the priority was peace
- brief periods of religious tolerance as imposed by Catherine de Medici in 1562.

Significantly, ideas about resistance were not always supported by the Huguenots; they did sometimes perceive the need to uphold legitimacy, e.g. when Henry of Navarre became the heir to the throne, he accepted the hereditary principle and the Salic law which prohibited females from inheriting the crown – it was the Catholics who were then placed in the position of supporting resistance to the Huguenots.

Some candidates may simply use the ideas as a launch pad to provide a list of ‘other factors’ which could cover the economic, social, political, religious issues etc. in a more general way than above. Such answers would need to be assessed in the light of relevance to the question asked.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative C : The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1688–1789*****A: The Regency, 1715–1723**

Examine the extent to which the Regency of Orléans can be seen as a success.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The question demands explanation of the degree of success and answers would be expected to focus on the relevant aspects of a range of policies which can be argued to have been the most significant successes. Some criteria for measuring success can be established which could be in the short or longer-term and some distinction can be made between the interests of Orléans as Regent and the overall interests of the monarchy.

- Areas in which the Regency can be seen as successful might include: ensuring a period of stability during a Regency; in dealing with the Parlements and nobility; in achieving a compromise solution to the issue of Jansenism; in avoiding bankruptcy and reducing the Crown's debts. Good answers should focus on reasons for success but these might be considered issue by issue. There should, however, be appreciation of the inter-relationship of many of the reasons

Success might refer to:

- Personal factors: Orléans ensured that he became sole Regent which gave him the authority to shape policy; his determination to maintain the authority of the Crown, partly as he was the heir presumptive to Louis XV so long as the Peace of Utrecht was maintained; his skill in managing interest groups amongst the privileged and possible rivals; his skill in choosing effective ministers. Examples of aspects of policy which illustrate these reasons can be drawn from: the restoration of the Right of Remonstrance

to the Parlement of Paris in 1715 which gained Orléans the revoking of Louis XIV's will, releasing Orléans from the control of a Council of Regency. This establishing of his sole Regency with the goodwill of Parlement gained their co-operation in overturning the legitimisation by Louis XIV of his illegitimate sons, thus Orléans had precluded them from the succession and negated their influence, particularly that of the Duc de Maine. The Parlement, a key group amongst the privileged, had been mollified and Parlement's goodwill was furthered in 1717 as Orléans appointed the leading Parlementaire, d'Aguesseau, as his Chancellor. This "honeymoon period" continued with the inclusion of some Parlementaires in the Polysynodie (the councils of nobles created by Orléans). Here Orleans had given the nobility the chance to participate in government, overturning their exclusion by Louis XIV, thus avoiding their resentment and the possibility of a Fronde should nobility and Parlementaires join forces

- Orléans' resolute reaction when Parlement later proved recalcitrant over the issue of registering Unigenitus and over Law's financial schemes – the 1718 Lit de Justice; restrictions on the Right of Remonstrance; having three Parlementaires arrested; exiling Parlement to Pontoise in 1720, with the threat of even further exile, and the creation of new courts – he finally gained their capitulation and the registration of financial edicts. Orléans can be argued to have succeeded where Louis XIV had failed, in gaining the registration of Unigenitus in 1720 by the Parlement, and the Regent's firm action towards Parlement provided a lesson which Louis XV might have done well to heed
- The resistance of Brittany, partly led by the Parlementaires of Rennes, was dealt with by Orléans' skilful exploitation of their Gallican sympathies to ensure that they did not take up the offer of Spanish support, thus isolating their noble allies in Brittany. The Parlement did not protest at the execution of the noble leaders of Breton discontent
- Orléans' lack of religious commitment might be seen as a factor in gaining the registration of Unigenitus, as he was willing to accept a compromise and the Peace of the Church in 1720 was so ambiguous it could be seen as success for both Jansenists and their opponents, thus, in the short-term at least, both resolving a divisive issue and preserving the authority of the Crown
- Other reasons which might be considered include: the desire amongst the privileged to avoid the chaos of France's last Regency; Louis XIV's firm establishment of central government and the control of his Intendants in the provinces which continued under Orléans; the lack of common interest between the old aristocracy and the Parlementaires; the nobility's lack of commitment to the business of government which led to the failure of the Polysynodie; the general desire in France to recover from financial and economic exhaustion resulting from Louis XIV's wars which meant support for Orléans' pacific foreign policy; the benefits of Law's Système, which reduced the Crown debts by almost half, avoided the need for new taxation and also the fortunes made by wealth speculators before the système's crash ensured some support.

A balanced answer will need to address failures and limitations such as:

- compromising with nobility
- financial failure over Law's schemes
- lack of fundamental reform
- problems in relationship with Parlements

- continuing religious disquiet.

It is likely that candidates will conclude that the Regency was an overall success, but the issue of 'extent' must be addressed.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1688–1789*****B: Cardinal Fleury, 1726–1743**

How important were the political skills of Cardinal Fleury in ensuring a period of domestic stability between 1726 and 1743?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

It will be necessary to establish some definition of domestic stability so that the contribution of Fleury may be evaluated against other factors which aided its maintenance. The definition should cover a range of aspects which might be: the preservation of the authority of the Crown; avoidance of any political challenge to the government; no serious confrontation over the issue of Jansenism; financial and economic stability. Voltaire judged that “the good of the state was for a long time in accord with Fleury’s moderation”.

- Fleury’s caution can be seen as his major political skill and be demonstrated in many areas of government and policy: in preserving the authority of the Crown over the law and Parlement. Fleury can be seen as cautious in his dealings with the Parlements, withdrawing challenging Edicts and seeking to compromise. Fleury was careful to avoid resentment at Court, holding office only as a Minister of State rather than First Minister. He took care to ensure that the intendants continued effective representation of the Crown in the supervision of the provinces
- Fleury’s deliberate and cautious policy of financial reassurance after the failure of Law’s system, through measures such as the restoration of coinage in 1726, re-establishing the power of the Tax Farmers and making regular payments on royal debt, was effective in creating financial stability and confidence in the system. The policy of retrenchment aided by the effectiveness of Orry as Controller General from 1730–1745

produced the only balanced budgets of the eighteenth century. There might be comment on caution as damaging here: no fundamental reform of the system left the monarchy dependant on an inefficient tax basis and loans, a weakness illustrated in the limited war of Polish Succession when Orry had to revive the dixieme. In financial affairs, however, Fleury had judged that caution was essential after the upheavals of the Regency's financial experiment and was even careful to abolish the dixieme when the Polish war ended, although it needed to be re-imposed in 1741 in the War of Austrian Succession (which he had tried to avoid)

- Fleury was a skilful political manager: in relations with the Church his reaffirmation of the Church's tax privileges; in upholding Unigenitus whilst preserving the "rule of silence" over its implementation to appease the Jansenists
- Stability in the economy, and even its improvement, was aided by Fleury continuing to support the Bureau de Commerce set up in 1722, re-imposing heavy tariffs, echoing the earlier policy of Colbert and Law, as a secure economy meant contented middle and upper classes
- Foreign policy is not an issue covered by the specification, but some candidates might comment on Fleury's adroit diplomacy which aided the preservation of peace, ensured that military expenditure was manageable, and avoided any loss of confidence in the Crown's foreign policy, all of which contributed to domestic stability
- The skill and determination of Fleury can be argued as significant and supported by his ability to choose and support effective ministers such as D'Aguesseau, Maurepas, D'Angervilliers and, above all, Orry as Contrôleur-Général
- His firmness of purpose and timing, e.g. in compelling the Paris Parlement to register the King's declaration that all clergy should support Unigenitus in 1730; in the major assertion of royal authority in 1732 with the exile of 139 judges when they had refused to conduct their judicial duties. Fleury remained firmly Gallican in his dealings with the Papacy, even though he was a Cardinal, but he was also firmly, if quietly, anti-Jansenist, e.g. ensuring the removal of the last of the Jansenist bishops and abbots
- Other factors which contributed to the period of stability include: the religious controversy over Jansenism died down after 1731 as its convulsionnaire phase (claims of miracles/ emotion and disorder at a Paris cemetery) lost it some support, especially that of Parlement which did not criticise the closing of the cemetery. Economic prosperity was stimulated more by flourishing overseas trade and private enterprise than by any government initiative. An increased population meant a cheap labour force. There was no group with sufficient reason and power to challenge the authority of the monarchy and Divine Right was not yet seriously questioned.

The conclusion might be that domestic stability rested on a range of factors, not always within the compass of eighteenth century government, but that the caution, determination and skilful management of Fleury did ensure the preservation of the status quo and of the authority of the Crown, as well as enhancing its financial stability.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative D: Europe, 1825–1850*****A: European Diplomacy, 1825–1835**

Examine the extent to which the involvement of the Great Powers in the Greek Revolt was motivated by their own selfish interests in the years 1825 to 1830.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Mark as follows:

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

Indicative Content

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

Summary

The resolution of the Greek Revolt without a conflict between the Great Powers has been called “a major illustration and accomplishment of the Concert of Europe”. Conference diplomacy, which saw Britain and France working with Russia to solve the Greek Revolt, provided the flexibility needed for the successful co-operation of the Great Powers. However, the basis for co-operation over Greece can be seen to be the mutual suspicion of the Great Powers which stemmed from their own personal interests in the region.

Evidence of selfish interests

Britain valued its interests in the Mediterranean and the route to India and was suspicious of any other country which had interests in the Balkans. Russia supported the Greeks as co-religionists and she wished to maintain her maritime rights in the Black Sea and through the Straits. Britain, France, Austria and Prussia were suspicious of Russia’s aims in the Balkans and saw her as an expansionist power who ultimately wanted to increase her influence in Europe through the control of Constantinople and the decline of the Ottoman Empire. In 1826 Canning decided that it was better to co-operate with Russia in order to restrain her, rather than to persist in opposing her support for the Greek rebels. France had close links

with Egypt and also regarded the Mediterranean as an area for extending French influence, and this resulted in raising the suspicions of Britain. Austria was suspicious of France and viewed her as a source of revolution following her support for the revolt. Suspicion of Russian motives was illustrated through the opposition of the other Great Powers to Russia's declaration of war on Turkey in 1828. The long and protracted negotiations in London from 1830–1832 about the boundaries of the newly independent Greek State reveal the intense suspicion between Britain, France and Russia. Britain and France insisted on limiting the size of the new state for fear that it would become a Russian satellite.

Evidence of co-operation

The St. Petersburg Protocol of 1826 saw Russia and Britain agree to set up an autonomous Greek state under Turkish suzerainty. France joined this Anglo-Russian agreement in 1827 and the powers threatened Turkey with naval action unless an armistice was signed with the Greek rebels. At Navarino the British-French-Russian force destroyed the Turco-Egyptian fleet. Following Russia's short and successful war against Turkey, Turkey was unable to resist pressure to discuss terms for a settlement of the Greek Revolt. Britain, France and Russia declared Greece independent at the Treaty of London (1830). The Greek Affair showed that Britain, France and Russia could co-operate to the point of ignoring the legitimism proclaimed at Vienna.

Conclusions

Not all of the Great Powers co-operated over the solution to the Greek Revolt. Austria and Prussia maintained their opposition to revolution and refused to help the Greek rebels, and consequently the Holy Alliance was strained. Britain and France worked with Russia in order to peacefully restrain her interests in the region. The resolution of the Greek Revolt can ultimately be interpreted as an exercise in Great Power selfish interest rather than co-operation.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative D: Europe, 1825–1850*****B: The Revolutions of 1848 and their immediate aftermath to 1850**

How important was the part played by the Austrian Empire in the defeat of 1848–1849 Revolutions in the Italian states?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02

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

Mark as follows:

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

Indicative Content

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

The role of the Austrian Empire is one external factor that led to the defeat of the Italian Revolutions. Answers can also consider the role of France in addition to the internal reasons for the defeat of the Revolutions. These include divisions within the ranks of the Revolutionaries, the actions of Pope Pius IX and Charles Albert.

The part played by the Austrian Empire

The military recovery of the Austrian Empire is arguably the most important factor in the defeat of the Italian Revolutionaries. Radetzky's army was numerically superior with 70,000 men compared to the Piedmontese who could only raise a force of between 20-30,000. The Austrian victories at Custoza (July 1848) and Novara (March 1849) crushed the Piedmontese army and their allies, expelled the Piedmontese from Lombardy and forced the abdication of Charles Albert. The Austrians went on to restore the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the rulers of Parma and Modena, and then went on to occupy the Legations. The Austrian Navy forced the surrender of the Venetian Republic in August 1849. These humiliating defeats proved that if Italians were to defeat the Austrians militarily they would need support from abroad as they lacked sufficient soldiers, equipment and competent officers.

The part played by the French

Louis Napoleon refused to help Charles Albert in Piedmont's war against Austria in 1849. Charles Albert's misplaced fear of a French invasion meant that Italian forces were divided and vital troops were left to guard the western border. Mazzini's Roman Republic was crushed by 20,000 French troops led by General Oudinot in July 1849. France therefore weakened Piedmont's offensive against Austria and was decisive in the defeat of the Rome Republic and the restoration of the Pope.

Divisions within the ranks of the Revolutionaries

- Ideological divisions include: moderate versus radical due to the influence of the nationalist writers Gioberti, Balbo and Mazzini
- Geographically the revolutionaries were divided and had different aims. Uprisings in Milan and Venetia were against Austrian rule, whilst Sicily wanted independence from Naples. Revolutionaries in Naples, Tuscany, Piedmont and Papal States wanted a more representative government
- Socially the middle and propertied classes feared a social revolution and descent into "mob rule". Peasants failed to support the actions of the Revolutionaries because they ignored the issue of land hunger
- Culturally there was little awareness of an Italian national identity, which was hindered further by widespread illiteracy and a multitude of local dialects.

Actions of Pope Pius IX

The Pope withdrew his support for Charles Albert's declaration of war against Austria, which meant that the Catholic powers of Europe were bound to uphold the Pope's temporal power. This removed the Pope as a possible figure to unite the Italian States under and removed the possibility of Gioberti's Papal federation.

Actions of Charles Albert

Charles Albert created suspicions within the ranks of the revolutionaries as he required potential allies to submit to Piedmontese control. He was ineffective as a military leader and his strategic mistakes quickened the restoration of Austrian control. Charles Albert was not interested in uniting Italy-only extending his and Piedmonts' power.

Conclusions

It would be hard for candidates to deny that the part played by the Austrian military was very important in the defeat of the Italian Revolutions. However, considered answers will also look at a wider number of factors and conclude that the Italian Revolutionaries would not have succeeded as the concept of a united Italy was a dream held by a very small intellectual elite, an elite that did not have mass support or the means to make their dream a reality.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914*****A: The Balkans, 1870–1890**

With what success did the Congress of Berlin end rivalry and conflict in the Balkans in the years 1878 to 1890?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Rivalry and conflict in the Balkans had grown following the uprisings and rebellions across the area from 1875, and this destabilisation provided scope for the rival ambitions of Austria-Hungary (with her multi-racial empire) and Russia (with Pan-Slavism promoting her military and commercial interests). Candidates should review the details of the Congress and Treaty of Berlin with the initial success in averting further conflict after the Russo-Turkish War and apparently providing a balanced settlement. They should make reference to the break-up of an enlarged and Russian controlled Bulgaria, checking the prospects of Russian dominance in the Balkans after the earlier Treaty of San Stefano; Bosnia-Herzegovina occupied by Austria-Hungary, Britain's gain of Cyprus, independence confirmed for Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria, French consent to pursue Tunis etc. Germany alone gained nothing. However, although the acclaim of 'peace with honour' might suggest personal success for Bismarck and Disraeli, the Eastern Question was not solved, and no-one was satisfied. The Treaty can only be regarded as a temporary and limited solution, providing the sources of future unrest in the Balkans, with a lack of Turkish reforms and increased Slav nationalism and Russian bitterness. It marked a humiliating diplomatic defeat for Russia, breaking the Dreikaiserbund; Austria-Hungary now had a foothold in a Serb province, with seeds for further trouble in Bosnia, and her relations with Russia were bound to deteriorate. The Bulgarian Crisis starting in 1885 destroyed the delicate diplomatic harmony established at Berlin, with a revolt in Eastern Rumelia for union with Bulgaria contravening the Treaty and undermining Bismarck's

carefully balanced network of alliances, with a further disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in Europe only seven years after the Treaty of Berlin. The uneasy peace by 1890 revealed Austria-Hungary as the dominant power in the area, with Russia turning towards the Far East. Conflict in the Balkans had been put 'on ice' and would remain an unsolved problem for the future.

Higher level answers should show range over the period up to 1890 and should provide a balanced assessment, recognising that although the Treaty was perhaps as successful as could reasonably be expected, this success was largely superficial. Candidates might also observe that the Balkan states themselves seemed to count for little, and in future Balkan nationalism would be increasingly difficult to ignore. Less effective responses will tend to be over-descriptive, with a narrower focus, perhaps on short-term success in 1878.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914*****B: The Balkans, 1890–1914**

Why is Balkan nationalism so important in explaining the outbreak of war in 1914?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Balkan nationalism was important in a number of ways. It posed a direct challenge to Austria-Hungary and her status as a great power, provided a focus for Russian Pan-Slavism, and, perhaps, presented an opportunity for Germany's expansionist ambitions. The assassination in Sarajevo by a member of a Serbian terrorist group could not be allowed to pass unpunished, and led to a chain of events, some premeditated and others at least calculated risks, which in the end ran out of control. The complicity of the Serbian government was compounded by the individual military ambitions of Austria-Hungary, Germany and possibly Russia leading to 'blank cheque', ultimatum, mobilization etc. Candidates must of course also consider Balkan nationalism in the longer term. Serb nationalism in particular revived after the change of dynasty in 1903, which saw the deterioration of relations with Austria-Hungary, as the pro-Austrian Alexander of Serbia was murdered and Peter Karageorge, who favoured closer relations with Russia, became king. This force sought to unite all Serbs into a Greater Serbia, and was a deadly threat to the Habsburg Empire. Russia's support for the Serbs heralded a head-on clash. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the Serbian government's control over the nationalistic secret societies and the army was inadequate. The annexation of Bosnia in 1908 highlighted the Balkans as a potential European powder keg, leaving a residue of bitterness which foreshadowed the 1914 crisis – marking unqualified German backing of Austria-Hungary, and a new overconfidence from Austria-Hungary in pursuit of Serbia. Russia was left humiliated and embittered, and Serb nationalists now looked to Russia to

take on Austria-Hungary. The Italian attack on Tripoli in 1911 encouraged the nationalist self-confidence of the Balkan states, and the Balkan League (comprising Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece and Montenegro) was formed, declaring war on Turkey; but, unlike in 1914, the major powers defused the situation and controlled the outcome of the first Balkan War in the Treaty of London. However, Balkan nationalism now entered a further phase with the rivalry between Serbia and Bulgaria, vying for dominance, and Greece, Rumania and Turkey also took the chance to attack Bulgaria. Serbia's victory and significant territorial expansion constituted a major step towards war, challenging the position of Austria-Hungary. It became so important once the latter state decided to eliminate Serbia, and the Sarajevo murder provided her with the excuse that she needed.

Higher level answers will recognise the existence of both long and short-term factors in relation to Balkan nationalism, and the implications of this for the major powers. Less effective responses may be over-descriptive, with a more general narrative on the causes of the First World War.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917–1929*****A: Lenin and the consolidation of the Bolshevik State 1917–1924**

Explain why 1921 was such a significant year in determining the chief characteristics of Lenin's regime inside the Soviet Union.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will clearly focus on some key events in 1921, but should also show an awareness of context, including preceding events and the results of the events and decisions taken by the Communist Party in that year. The three years before 1921 had been a dramatic period in Russian history. Following the coup of 1917 the Bolsheviks had fought a bitter and destructive civil war against internal enemies, supported by foreign interventionists, in order to survive and then establish their regime. Despite their ultimate victory by 1921, the Bolsheviks had faced enormous difficulties which still threatened the very survival of Lenin's regime.

For much of this period the Communists had operated a "policy" of War Communism. This was a series of measures which involved ruthless direction of the Russian economy from the centre. It meant nationalisation of enterprises and requisitioning of grain from the peasants in order to feed the Red Army and the starving towns. These measures incensed the peasants in particular, who although they had been allowed possession of the land after the Revolution, now found their crops taken from them by requisitioning squads. There was also a growing opposition from workers who objected to harsh labour discipline and conscription. Basically the Bolsheviks were centralising control, partly as a means of winning the war and partly as a means of enforcing conformity and discipline: local soviets found their powers usurped by the centre, the committees of workers trying to run factories were replaced. This was not just the response to a war situation but was in the tradition of

Lenin's "democratic centralism". There was opposition from groups such as the Workers Opposition who resented central Communist control. Although the secret police or *Cheka* was active in suppressing opposition, there were still remnants of other leftwing parties such as Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries unhappy with the situation. Opposition erupted in 1920–1921, in the Tambov Revolt and most notably in the March 1921 Kronstadt Revolt. The latter was seen as having considerable symbolic significance as well as being a threat to nearby Petrograd, since the sailors of Kronstadt had been enthusiastic supporters of the 1917 Revolution.

Trotsky's Red Army crushed the revolt ruthlessly. However, for Lenin, the Revolt confirmed a decision he had already made, that War Communism had to be abandoned in order for the Communists to retain power. Consequently at the Tenth Party Congress in March 1921 it was abandoned in favour of the New Economic Policy. This abandoned requisitioning, to be replaced by a tax on peasants' produce, with peasants free to dispose of their surplus as they liked. In industry nationalisation was abandoned except for "the commanding heights of the economy" such as railways and mines. The restitution of private enterprise inaugurated the era of NEP, which stimulated the economy, particularly agriculture, although the ending of war also had an impact. NEP was a very important decision for the Communists: Lenin justified it first as a necessary strategic retreat to ensure Communist survival, then gave it an ideological justification, arguing that it represented a halfway stage on the way to full socialism. It is true that all Communists believed fervently that eventually NEP would have to give way to full-scale state control of the economy and an end to private enterprise, as the precursor to socialism. However, many hard-line Communists resented the concessions made in 1921, especially since as recently as 1920 some like Trotsky had been arguing for more coercion, including the militarization of labour.

Lenin was prepared to make economic concessions, but not political ones. 1921 saw a relaxation of control over the economy, but a tightening of political control. The Congress laid down that there must be uniformity within the Party: factionalism and the public airing of policy disagreements were banned. Lenin was prepared to allow policy discussion only within the higher ranks of the Party behind closed doors. The clampdown was immediate, completing the policy of centralisation begun soon after the Revolution. Although there were continuing expressions of discontent, for example by the Workers Opposition, they were soon crushed. Remaining non-Communist groups like the Mensheviks were harassed out of existence, and there was a purge of the Party itself. Significantly, the 1921 Kronstadt Rebellion was to be the last outbreak of mass opposition during the history of the USSR. Lenin himself never publicly regretted the decisions made in 1921, but he did soon express concerns over the growing centralisation and bureaucratisation for which he was largely responsible. 1921 was the beginning also of a clampdown in other areas: soon Lenin issued secret orders for an attack on the church, and in 1922 there was to be a Ministry of Censorship to ensure that culture was subordinated to the political needs of the regime.

Therefore 1921 was significant not just in the short term in highlighting the threat to Lenin's regime and showing Communist ruthlessness in dealing with it; but also in the longer term it established the basis of the one-party totalitarian state more commonly associated with Stalin. Indeed, the ban on factionalism and dissent was one of the factors which enabled Stalin to manoeuvre his way to power in the 1920s, whilst NEP remained an area of controversy until it was finally overturned by Stalin at the end of the 1920s.

Summary of Key Points about 1921:

- the end of Civil War
- the end of war communism
- the beginning of New Economic Policy
- the Kronstadt Rebellion
- the Tenth Party Congress
- the focus on party unity
- the consolidation of single-party state
- the beginning of economic recovery.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917–1929*****B: Stalin's rise to power 1922–1929**

Explain the main reasons why the issue of the succession to Lenin as leader was not resolved until 1929.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The struggle to succeed Lenin had already begun before his death, since his health was bad from 1921 and he increasingly withdrew from day-to-day Party life and infighting. Kamenev, Zinoviev and Stalin effectively led the Party. Stalin had most of the advantages, particularly since being appointed General Secretary to the Party in 1922. He was in control of the Party machine, which soon made Stalin the most powerful man in the USSR, and he also held other key positions in the Orgburo and Secretariat. Trotsky had played a major role in the Revolution and Civil War but did not have a strong Party base.

Lenin's Testament added to the uncertainty of the succession. It criticised the qualities of all the leading contenders and seemed to be advocating a sort of collective leadership. His postscript was particularly critical of Stalin, the two men having fallen out, with Lenin stressing Stalin's unsuitability as leader.

Following Lenin's death early in 1924, Stalin seized the initiative: by taking charge of the funeral arrangements and effectively isolating Trotsky, he presented himself as Lenin's heir and the true voice of the Revolution. Behind the scenes there was much manoeuvring. Already between 1923 and 1925 Stalin, Kamenev and Zinoviev were united against Trotsky, who was feared partly because he commanded the Army. There were also disagreements about other issues such as economic policy and entry to the Party. Lenin's Testament still played a role. The contents of the Testament were discussed by Party Leaders and the

Central Committee, but not published further because there were fears of encouraging division and factionalism, and therefore the opportunity to dismiss Stalin was missed. Trotsky's influence steadily declined. His policy of "permanent revolution" proved less popular than Stalin's espousal of "Socialism in one country". He made tactical mistakes, and was disliked for perceived arrogance and inconsistency – in 1926 and 1927 Trotsky formed an opportunistic alliance with his former opponents Kamenev and Zinoviev against the growing influence of Stalin. By 1927 Trotsky had been expelled from the Party and his colleagues were demoted. The "United Opposition" was defeated, mainly because Stalin used his growing control of the Party machine and his own alliance with the right to prevail, although he was careful to present himself as the representative of the centre. Having defeated the Left, Stalin after 1928 turned on the Right, and he now espoused the former hard-line policies of the defeated Left towards the economy. In 1928 the leading figures of the Right – Bukharin, Tomsy and Rykov – were also driven from any positions of influence. By 1929 Stalin was effectively in control of the Party and the country and could launch his own political and economic revolution.

The leadership issue took several years to resolve therefore for several reasons. Because of the way Lenin had run the Party, there was no clear procedure for a successor to be elected or to take power, resulting in manoeuvring and in-fighting. Closely bound up with the power struggles were important arguments over policy: for example Trotsky argued against the bureaucratisation of government whilst Stalin favoured a centralised bureaucracy; there was the argument as to whether Russia should concentrate on prompting world revolution or concentrate on building socialism inside Russia. Above all there was the debate about the future of the economy and the pace of industrialisation. The Left argued that this should be forced ahead, with an end to NEP, and the peasants basically producing the food and financing industrialisation, if necessary through drastic measures like collectivisation. The Right favoured a more moderate approach, encouraging the peasants to prosper, believing that this would stimulate the economy. The Left's policies were adopted, but only after their chief representatives had been removed from positions of influence. The succession took so long to resolve partly because the "official" Party line kept changing, and few dared challenge it openly because of the ban on factionalism. There was no way in which "opposition" groups could present a public platform. Therefore the struggle for leadership was an in-party affair with no clear lines of procedure, and it took time for the most ruthless candidate, Stalin, to use his skill, his position and his ability to outmanoeuvre former colleagues and opponents, to make his way to the top of the pile.

Summary of Key Points:

- Lenin's Testament
- the uncertainty over succession
- the rise of Stalin
- the decline of Trotsky
- the power struggle – Left versus Right
- the debate over NEP and path to socialism/industrialisation.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative G : Germany, c1925–1938*****A: The Weimar Republic c1925–1933**

How effectively did the governments of Germany manage the economy from 1925 to the end of 1932?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on the German economy 1925–1932, assessing the government's contribution to economic developments. Candidates are likely to differentiate between the years 1925–1928/29 when the economy seemed to be on the path to recovery, and those 1929–1932 when governments struggled to counter the effects of the Wall Street Crash. Answers should appreciate that some of the problems faced by the economy post-1929 were already foreshadowed in the earlier period and the government's attempts at management throughout the period had both merits and weaknesses.

Relevant material on the government's management of the economy 1925–1928/29 may include:

- the influence of the Dawes Plan (passed August 1924) which reorganised the Reichsbank and reduced the burden of reparations by giving a longer time to pay. The Young Plan of 1929 cut the bill further
- the plan approved an allied loan to Germany helping to meet the first revised payments, and heralded investment from USA. American loans helped finance industrial expansion and scientific management and mass production techniques were introduced

- the government sponsored public works schemes (football stadiums, opera houses) helping to maintain high levels of employment
- the government provided new welfare schemes (comprehensive unemployment insurance, 1927)
- higher wages were offered for state employees and elsewhere real wages rose, standards of living increased
- government encouraged the development of cartels which permitted greater co-operation within groups of firms and industries
- the use of industrial tribunals and compulsory arbitration helped maintain good industrial relations and reduce the number of strikes.

Relevant material on the government's management of the economy 1928–end of 1932 may include:

- the problems posed by the growth of unemployment. Unemployment benefits caused a budget deficit which led to the break up of Müller's "Grand Coalition" (March 1930)
- Governments were wary of increasing public expenditure (e.g. promoting public works) for fear of a repetition of the 1923 crisis, and so decreased expenditure (e.g. cut war pensions) aggravating situation
- difficulties in borrowing money owing to a lack of foreign confidence
- legal restrictions on the Reichsbank (agreed in the Dawes and Young Plans) prevented an increase in the amount of money spent or devaluation of the mark
- Brüning (Chancellor 1930–1932) may, at first, have deliberately allowed economic troubles to continue as part of a campaign to end reparations and dismantle the welfare state
- Government acted too late in establishing public works schemes in 1931–1932 (under Brüning and Papen). This led to some recovery in 1932, but Hitler took the credit.

For a balanced answer, candidates will also need to assess the success of the government's measures throughout the period. Details might include:

- the Weimar economy after 1925 was based too heavily on external credit particularly from America, and it was too short-sighted to allow short-term loans to finance long-term projects
- German governments had placed the country in a position where it was highly vulnerable to the Wall Street Crash
- the economy was out of balance. Industrial production was growing at a slower rate than that of other European countries and Germany's share of world production had

fallen from 14.3% in 1913 to 11.6% in 1926–1929. Germany had built up an industrial capacity which could not be fully used and there was a growing trade deficit

- cartels were, in some respects, a hindrance as they drove up prices and the cost of living rose
- economic recovery had done little for the urban *mittelstand*. Bitterness over earlier hyper inflation remained with unsatisfactory government schemes of compensation
- agriculture was affected by the world-wide agricultural depression. Farmers struggled with debt and failed to reach pre-war levels. Prices fell from 1927 and by 1928 over a third of all farms were running at a loss. Agricultural organisation and practices were outdated
- recovery was only superficial and unemployment went from 2 million in 1926 to 1.4 million in 1928, but back to 1.9 million in 1929 before the impact of the slump. Despite government efforts, by 1928 tension between employers and workers was high (e.g. 1928 Ruhr lockout)
- post-1929, governments did what they could, within the confines of the international situation, and did introduce policies which helped improve the situation – albeit too late to save themselves politically.

Answers may also consider other factors affecting economic development, but the main thrust of essays must be the effectiveness of government management. Answers will probably conclude that the recovery 1925–1929 was highly fragile and not simply wrecked by the events of 1929, and that measures taken in 1929 to the end of 1932 did ultimately show some reasonable management.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938*****B: The Nazi consolidation of power 1930–1938**

How important was the part played by fear of communism in Hitler's rise to and consolidation of power from 1930 to August 1934?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on Hitler's rise to power 1930–1933 and his consolidation of power 1933–1934 and should, in particular, examine the part played by the fear of communism. Balanced answers will also look at other factors influencing Hitler's rise to and consolidation of power and will make a reasoned assessment of the importance of the part played by communism as opposed to other influences.

Candidates might present some of the following material to indicate the importance of fear of communism:

- the lower middle classes, professionals and newer businessmen were disillusioned by the policies of the Weimar Republic and (particularly in the case of the latter) desperate after the economic crisis of 1929. They feared communism would undermine their status and wealth and were therefore attracted to a party which offered to destroy communism
- members of the landed and upper middle classes (especially large landowners, businessmen and industrialists) saw Nazism as a safeguard from communism which threatened their positions. Hitler established links with big business, e.g. Hugenburg in 1929 and Thyssen. Such men wanted a disciplined and constrained workforce to undo some of the pro-trade union and welfare policies of the Weimar Republic

- Hitler's anti-communism was attractive to the aristocratic elite and may have made them more ready to support and intrigue with him 1932–1933. Anti-communism suited the “Nationalist” mood particularly in view of the increasing influence of Russia on the German Communist Party (KPD) from 1928
- anti-communism was a central part of Hitler's campaigning platform. The Communists (who were often linked with the Jews in Hitler's rhetoric) could be blamed for Germany's troubles. This played on people's fear at a time of economic and political instability and helped win support
- the SA deliberately stirred up trouble against Communists in the streets. They gave the impression that the Nazis were doing something (in contrast to the government) in combating the spread of a dangerous doctrine. Hitler deliberately encouraged the fear of communist violence as its members could be targeted as scapegoats
- Hitler was able to use the fear engendered by the Reichstag fire (February 1933) and thus fear of communist activity to consolidate his rule through Emergency decrees. Repression of the KPD opened the way to political control and the banning of the Communist Party in the March Enabling Act
- fear of communism helped Hitler to carry out the Night of the Long Knives, without reprisals, and to remove any leftist threat to his power.

A balanced answer will also need to look at other reasons for Hitler's rise to, and consolidation of, power:

- the economic circumstances and the effect of unemployment (4.5 million in 1931 and nearly 6 million in 1932), coupled with the Nazi economic promises
- the appeal to the nationalist right through Hitler's attack on Versailles and the association of the Weimar Republic with wartime defeat (the “November criminals”)
- the inadequacies of the Weimar governments; the problems of coalitions and the polarisation of politics; the death of Gustav Stresemann, (October 1929) leaving a political vacuum
- the appeal of Nazi policies:
- Hitler's own leadership and personal qualities/‘cult’.
- his use of “law” and concessions to consolidate his rule
- intimidation/terror and propaganda.

Candidates may argue that Nazi support came about through a variety of different factors and that some were more important to different groups in society. For example, the support of the working class was probably based more on personal appeal and the Nazi social programme with promises of a better future than on the anti-communist stance.

In conclusion, candidates will probably point out that Hitler came to power through the politicians' intrigue, not electoral endorsement and that he was able to consolidate his power through a mixture of legality and violence that was not entirely dependent on attitudes in the country as a whole. Nevertheless, it was the mass following which he built up, both through his anti-Communist stance and through other factors, which put him in a position whereby he had to be considered for government and it suited him to use the fear of communism in his bid to retain and extend the power he was granted in 1933.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa*****A: Britain and Kenyan Independence, 1953 to 1964**

Examine the extent to which economic factors led to Britain granting Kenyan independence in 1963.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on assessing the relative importance of economic issues in the process of decolonisation in Kenya. In order to establish an analysis it is necessary for candidates to consider the significance of a range of other factors.

Economic Factors:

- during the 1950s Britain's colonial economic policy was based on trying to make the empire an economic asset rather than a liability. The Colonial Economic Development Corporation had been set up in 1948. Britain's post-war economic condition demanded that the empire become economically productive in order to strengthen Britain's attempts to establish itself as a global power. Economic weakness would undermine that aim. Kenya was part of the process of economic development. The question was, was Kenya an economic asset or a liability?
- by the late 1950s it was apparent that Britain's trade with the empire, and with Kenya, was significantly less than its trade with the USA and Europe. Britain's economic interests appeared not to lie in colonial economic development but rather in strengthening links with Europe, for example. Kenya, as part of the empire, was simply not providing the economic advantages to Britain that were sought

- Mau Mau terrorism and the State of Emergency that it had necessitated had further increased the economic costs of maintaining a presence in Kenya. Large numbers of British troops were needed to contain the Mau Mau threat.

Other Factors

- **The Suez Crisis:** this may be used to suggest there was a turning point in British imperial policy from 1956. The crisis underlined the reality of Britain's status as a second-rate international power dependent upon its alliance with the USA. It would not be necessary, or relevant, for candidates to enter into too much detail on the crisis other than to illustrate the idea that it was an indicator of Britain's imperial weakness which was not lost on Macmillan when he took office
- **Macmillan:** reference may be made to 'Mac's' cost-benefit analysis as far as Kenya was concerned. He quickly came to establish a pragmatic approach to imperialism. Answers may link this to economic factors. His "Wind of Change" speech could be developed and linked to nationalism in Kenya and on a pan-African level. Britain was no longer able to resist the growth of nationalism but the question is whether Macmillan was driven more by economic issues than he was by the impact of nationalism. Candidates may argue that he was primarily interested in Britain's future in terms of its strategic and economic strengths and security. Britain's future lay in having a political and economic presence in Europe and through its alliance with the USA. Thus Kenya was increasingly becoming an irrelevancy. In this sense Macmillan was a catalyst in the process
- **Nationalism:** This may be examined in terms of pan-African nationalism but more detail needs to be developed around the impact of Kenyan nationalism. This may focus on the Mau Mau but there may also be reference to the development of more sophisticated Kenyan action through the political skills of men like Mboya. Reference to the economic impact of the Mau Mau has already been made above, but candidates may consider the political impact of Mau Mau i.e. it drove Britain towards developing a new position in terms of Kenya's constitutional structure. The Mau Mau forced the process of change through events like the Lyttleton Constitution which attempted to widen political representation in Kenya. Candidates may argue that once this process was underway then it would inevitably lead to independence.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa*****B: France and Algerian Independence, 1954 to 1962**

Examine the importance of FLN terrorism in the achievement of Algerian independence in 1962.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the relative importance of the FLN, particularly in terms of its aggressive nationalism, as a contributor to Algerian independence. Other factors need to be considered in order to establish this relative importance.

FLN Terrorism:

- the FLN exploited French military weaknesses and was able to rapidly increase its membership as it exploited the Army's over-reaction to terrorism. It used deliberate tactics which would create martyrs out of innocent Algerians at the hand of the French
- its actions maintained the momentum of opposition. The French simply could not ignore the FLN, partly because of the political fallout in France itself. French troops were being killed and the cost of maintaining such a large military presence was unacceptably high
- a similar outcome began to influence leading French politicians. De Gaulle was ever conscious of the political and economic impact of FLN terrorism and the contribution of the FLN was significant in this sense

- the Army had brought the FLN under control by 1958. The Battle of Algiers was a significant turning point in FLN effectiveness. Many of its leading activists had been eliminated or imprisoned and its ability to function as a terrorist organisation had been greatly reduced.

Other Factors:

- **De Gaulle:** Candidates may argue that his role was crucial in the achievement of independence. He was a realist and he had a vision for France, that lay very much in expanding French influence in Europe. Algeria was a major distraction from this. It created political division and it was moving important army officers towards overthrowing the French government. A withdrawal from Algeria would remove many of the barriers to de Gaulle's plans for the future of France. Candidates may develop the gradual conversion of de Gaulle to accept that independence was the only option
- **The French Army:** this played a significant role in bolstering the efforts of the FLN. Its tactics were based on using state power against the interests of innocent Algerians, and in the process strengthening the ranks of the FLN. It also contributed to independence in that it totally rejected any form of political compromise by demanding that Algeria remain within the French empire. The formation of military terrorism directed against the government was a significant factor. The OAS could be usefully examined here
- **The Colons:** This group had little political impact on the French government. It co-operated with the dissident force within the French Army and thereby lost any influence it might have had. Like the Army, in many ways its actions served to accelerate independence rather than retard it.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915–1924*****A: The accession to power of the Bolsheviks and Lenin's regime**

Examine the extent to which the introduction of the New Economic Policy in 1921 was a betrayal of Communist ideals.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to have a clear understanding of the NEP and its key features:

- some reduction in central economic control, though Lenin did claim he retained “the commanding heights of the economy”
- the unpopular grain requisitioning by the Cheka introduced under War Communism was abandoned
- peasant farmers were allowed to keep any surplus they produced and to sell it for personal profit. Later they were allowed to rent land and hire labour
- markets and money were restored with the introduction of a new revalued rouble.

Candidates will also need to have political understanding of the nature of Bolshevism. Before the revolution Lenin wrote anti-capitalist economic theory against landlords and capitalists as can be seen in the April Theses.

Lenin conceded that the introduction of NEP was an admission he could not run the economy purely on ideological grounds, and that political ideology had to come second to practical necessity. Figs argued that “by March 1921 Soviet power in much of the countryside had ceased to exist”.

- Lenin had to feed the people and under War Communism there was famine. Requisitioning had exacerbated the problems of providing food for the urban populations
- drought in 1920 was followed by severe winter, then a dry summer in 1921. Climatic misfortune combined with government policy (as above) to cause the worst famine in 30 years
- Lenin faced serious unrest in the Tambov region
- there were strikes in many of the cities
- the Kronstadt Revolt was the final straw
- the currency had collapsed and the USSR relied, to a great extent, on a barter economy
- Lenin was helped by Bukharin who appealed to the peasants: “Enrich yourself under NEP”.

This information will help to explain why Lenin apparently “betrayed” his Communist ideals. The USA had provided aid but Lenin’s government was slow to act to protect its own people. Lenin did call the decision a “strategic retreat”. Candidates may well debate the word “betrayal”, considering his decision to be pragmatic.

On the other hand, ideologically-driven Bolsheviks, e.g. Trotsky disagreed with the introduction of NEP because it made concessions to the peasants and re-introduced capitalist market forces. Trotsky called NEP “degeneration of Bolshevism” and he condemned the Nepmen, e.g. kulaks, retailers, tradesmen, small manufacturers. These Bolsheviks certainly considered NEP to be a betrayal of Communist ideals.

The introduction of NEP was more than abandoning economic ideology. It also affected the nature of the Bolshevik Party. Lenin had allowed opposition and discussion but after NEP he needed to prevent the development of faction.

Candidates may well conclude that NEP did betray Bolshevism, but Lenin faced enormous economic difficulties throughout his period in power and pragmatically adjusted to harsh realities. In that way he betrayed, but arguably saved, Bolshevism.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915–1924*****B: The establishment of the Weimar Republic**

Examine the extent to which the impact of the First World War caused the economic difficulties of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919 to 1923.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to show full understanding of the economic difficulties of the Weimar Republic, culminating in the hyperinflation crisis of 1923. The question requires candidates to balance the impact of the First World War with other factors that explain why Germany suffered such economic difficulties. The economic difficulties included budget deficit and inflation.

The question covers several critical years. Candidates may well refer to the economic policies followed by the first Finance Minister Erzberger, 1918–March 1920, who taxed profits and inherited wealth, and introduced progressive taxation that fell most heavily on the wealthy. These policies meant the government was open to criticism. In fact opposition was so intense that Erzberger was accused of gaining personal financial advantage, and although the charges were proved false, he was discredited. Erzberger, leader of the Centre Party and an armistice negotiator, was assassinated. Such economic instability clearly exacerbated the economic difficulties inherited from the war.

The impact of the First World War can be interpreted very widely:

- the economic decisions made by the Kaiser's government including the sale of war bonds

- some candidates will examine the economic difficulties Germany faced in the final months of the war as the Home Front collapsed under the pressure of total war and blockade. Shortages inevitably fuelled the inflation crisis.

Candidates might refer to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles as part of the impact of war or as a separate cause of the economic difficulties. They may refer to:

- land losses, e.g. the impact of the loss of the Saar coalfields
- reparations were fixed in 1921 at £6,600 million payable in goods and currency. These proved to be very inflationary.

Other reasons for the economic difficulties include:

- the Allied governments chose to retain the blockade until the Treaty was signed so prolonging the severe shortages and fanning economic difficulties, especially inflation. The German government also added to the difficulties. By 1919 the German government faced a growing budget deficit and had to repay war loans, so it chose to print a lot of money. It needed all this money to pay compensation to war victims, to pay public servants' wages, to provide welfare and to enable industry to have access to cheaper loans to rebuild and provide employment. It has been suggested the government was also hoping that high inflation would act as an argument against further payment of reparations
- John Maynard Keynes was very critical of the reparations settlement in "the Economic Consequences of the Peace". He urged the US to cancel the Allied debts and the Allies to reduce reparations. The US refused to cancel the debts as President Calvin Coolidge said "they hired the money, didn't they?". Raymond Poincaré, the French Prime Minister, made his country's position very clear. France wanted "her due, all her due". Such intransigence added to Germany's economic difficulties
- there is also some blame on the French and Belgian governments who invaded the Ruhr, though they did not know that the German government would support the German passive resistance to the occupation.

Candidates may well conclude that Germany faced huge economic difficulties at the end of the war; but that many factors, possibly including the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, combined to turn a serious situation into a crisis by 1923.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative J: The Effects of World War I, 1915–1924*****C: ‘Mutilated Victory’: Italy and the First World War, 1915–1920**

Examine the extent to which the political disillusionment of the Italian people in the years 1915 to 1920 explains the emergence of Fascism in Italy.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Mussolini later claimed that the nationalists who followed d’Annunzio’s enthusiastic support for Italian entry into World War I were the founders of Fascism. Certainly the war strained Italy and therefore weakened the Liberal government. Candidates will need to assess how far the Fascists were able to capitalise on the political disillusion with the Liberal government, and how far other factors explain the rise of Fascism in Italy.

Many factors explain why Italians were disillusioned with their government that fought the war and signed the peace. Candidates will need to examine the political disillusionment and may refer to some of these. This is by no means a definitive list:

- the First World War: impact of stalemate on the Italian front with defeat at Caporetto in 1917; low morale among many of the poorly equipped troops; high casualty rates; growing national debt; war industry was strictly regulated by central government. The Fascists could use the wartime grievances, e.g. and appeal by promising to set up government by those who had been fighting, i.e. a trenchocracy
- a direct consequence of the war was the peace treaty agreed at St. Germain. At the time, many Italians claimed they had been badly treated in the “mutilated peace”. The Fascists could play on this feeling of national grievance

- the Liberal government was under attack from the right and left wings and this added to political disillusionment. Mussolini was able to draw support from the political elites, especially the King and the Pope who wanted stronger government.

There are, however, other reasons for the emergence of Fascism. Candidates will need to balance each against political disillusionment.

- Fascism had organisation through the Ras, and historians stress the importance of this. They were successful in local elections
- their views were widely publicised through “Avanti”. The Fascist propaganda was effective
- D’Annunzio set an early example for Mussolini to follow. The occupation of Fiume showed the inadequacy of the Liberal government as it took almost a year for the government to regain control. He also set the tone for the later Fascist state, e.g. his followers wore blackshirts
- Fascism had an identifiable leader in Mussolini. His careers as journalist and soldier in World War I gave him popular appeal
- Socialists (the PSI, the Italian Socialist Party) inspired by the Revolution in Russia organised a wave of strikes for two years, the Biennio Rosso, with factory and land occupations. The threat from the Socialists drove many to the Fascists.

This list is not definitive but indicates some factors that might be examined by candidates.

The best answers may well consider how Mussolini’s Fascist movement developed over the period 1919–1920. Historians place a lot of importance on the local developments in Fascism at this time as the main support came from the petty bourgeoisie. They provided the mass basis for power. At the same time Mussolini exploited landowners’ and industrialists’ fears of the left wing, and took advantage of the Biennio Rosso to reposition Fascism on the right wing of politics in Italy.

Candidates may well conclude that political disillusionment was a factor in explaining the emergence of Fascism, but that emergence was not simply a negative reaction against the existing political system.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870–1950*****A: Population change in Britain, 1870–1945**

How important were improvements in public health in explaining the population growth which took place between 1870 and 1914?

In your answer you are not required to refer to the period 1914–1918.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The broad thrust of the question is to examine the relative importance of improvements in public health in explaining population growth as against other factors.

Examples of improvements in public health might include:

Government legislation; central and local improvements and medical improvements.

Other factors contributing to population growth might include:

- expansion of the economy
- the general rise in living standards with greater availability of food and education
- urbanisation
- the growing use of contraception
- pressure on middle class incomes.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative K: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1870–1950*****B: The Cotton Industry in Britain, 1870–1950**

How important, in the years 1870 to 1950, was the loss of overseas markets as a reason for the decline of the cotton industry?

In your answer you are not required to refer to the periods 1914–1918 and 1939–1945.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The broad thrust of the question is to examine the importance to the cotton industry of the loss of overseas markets.

Candidates are likely to argue that the loss of overseas markets was important because:

- the loss of overseas markets meant that the British cotton industry failed to invest in new technology and followed an unsuccessful cost reduction strategy. The introduction of the Toyoda automatic loom by Japanese manufacturers in 1924 allowed for cheap production. The impact of Japanese competition may be quantified by estimates of approximately two-thirds of lost British sales going to Japanese manufacturers
- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton in response to growing pressure from German competitors in Africa
- general descriptions of the loss of markets such as India after the First World War may also appear. British exports to India were replaced by exports from Japan and the United States
- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany and the USA introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914.

Counter arguments against the loss of foreign markets as a key factory may include:

- the refusal of the weavers to adopt the ‘more looms’ systems in 1931
- the failure of government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936
- Oldham was a centre of industrial militancy pre-1914 but the first general cotton strikes came in the 1920s. This may be linked to employers cutting wages and using low grade cotton, which slowed production and therefore reduced earnings in a piece-rate based industry
- the growth of alternative fabrics such as rayon in the 1930s
- Britain’s return to the Gold Standard, 1925–1931 (most commentators agree that it was overvalued by 10%)
- renewed competition emerging by 1950 from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong.

Candidates may quote from Rose’s *History of the Lancashire Cotton Industry*.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941*****A: America, 1919–1929**

With what success did Prohibition fulfil the aims of those who promoted it?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Aims

- officially to stop the sale, drinking and manufacture of intoxicating liquor
- reformers wanted to stop abuse of children, break up of families, poverty etc.
- to conserve grain.

An examination of success might include:

- it stopped the drinking, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor because it was the law, but virtually overnight it spawned an illicit bootleg business. Alcohol was imported from Mexico and Canada. Illicit stills grew up in both urban and rural areas. Industrial alcohol was stolen. Speakeasies flourished and sold illegal supplies of alcohol
- in some Southern counties and rural areas they went ‘dry’ and stayed that way, therefore indicating success
- it was not successful in cities especially the North, e.g. New York and Chicago because people carried on drinking
- some social problems did improve, e.g. there was less drunken violence against the family, but this is difficult to prove conclusively
- no conclusive proof that it dealt with poverty issues because they were too complicated for it just to be about spending money on drink

- violence between rival gangs grew, e.g. the St. Valentine's Day Massacre/Al Capone etc. so instead of reducing violence, prohibition actually encouraged it
- grain supplies were conserved but since the First World War had ended and the agricultural depression of the early twenties declined, production increased anyway officially the aims were achieved instantly but in the long run it was not a success, as shown by its repeal in 1933 when consumption had gone back up to 70% of pre-war level
- nor did it deal with the social problems that the Temperance Societies thought it would.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941*****B: The New Deal, 1933–1941**

With what success did the First New Deal help farmers and poorer regions?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

An evaluation might include:

- Context: the first New Deal was 1933–1934. It involved measures to deal with farming as well as industry and unemployment
- the AAA (Agricultural Adjustment Act) tried to raise crop prices by reducing production, to try to blunt farmers increasing production as a way of raising income when prices for farm products were falling. The aim was to restore parity
- initially there was some success when farm income rose, but as farmers started from a very low base anyway the success was muted. It stopped some farmers from starving
- measures favoured landowners, not the sharecroppers or tenants, because money was paid to the farm owners, not the workers
- some farmers ignored the new measures and the price of farm products fell
- legislation could not change poor farming techniques or drought or loan foreclosures
- success was seen in the TVA scheme (Tennessee Valley Authority) because jobs were provided and cheap electricity came to the valley. Other states got cheap electricity. It helped farmers and others too. It became a model for other schemes
- the second New Deal also helped farmers, and so it was not just the first new deal that helped, and it tackled different issues such as soil conservancy
- black farmers/sharecroppers were not helped much because of racism

- some poor regions such as the Oklahoma Dust Bowl did not benefit since schemes were not rolled out right across the country. Many farmers left Oklahoma and went to California
- therefore success was not right across the country and fundamental issues such as poor farming methods were left alone, i.e. first new deal was only partially successful
- farmers needed to be educated to understand the 'supply and demand' relationship. Consumers lacked money to buy produce because of unemployment/depression problems.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1135*****A: The Introduction of Norman Military Feudalism, 1066–1087**

Examine the extent to which the function of a castle was as a centre of colonisation.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

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

As centres of colonisation:

- many castles served as the *capita* – the military and administrative headquarters of their lords
- as such, they followed the pattern they had in Normandy of castle, priory, and *buhr* or town
- castles in the north, such as Holderness or the Pennine crossings, controlled strategic points and allowed for pacification and consolidation
- the same can be seen in the Welsh marches where the local population became militarily and economically dependent on their lords, e.g. Chepstow
- Domesday records how Robert of Mortain held a market at Launceston and there is some archaeological evidence to suggest that castles were linked with mills

- Mortain also established boroughs in close proximity to his castles at Pevensey and Berkhamstead and this practice was not unusual among contemporaries.

Role of Castellans:

- gave the tenant the power to control the surrounding district
- income derived supported the tenant's personal needs and enabled him to discharge his feudal obligations
- given to men of proven military skill and administrative abilities, e.g. Robert of Eu, Roger of Montgomery, William of Mortain.

Military functions:

- secured borders and quietened troublesome frontiers, e.g. Durham, Welsh marches, strategic sea links secured by Sussex rapes castles
- held new ground, e.g. Sequence of motte and bailey in advance on London post-Hastings (Hastings-Dover-Canterbury-Winchester-Wallingford-Berkhamstead)
- supported each other through the construction of castleries, e.g. Arundel-Bramber-Lewes
- as a base for further conquest, e.g. Chester, Shrewsbury, Hereford
- as a base for operations and a means of intimidating potential unrest, e.g. Southwest, Welsh marches, the north – Warwick, Nottingham, York, Lincoln.

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

Castles were used for both offence and defence; they were the outward and visible signs of Norman domination and the psychological aspect is attested to by the chronicles. They were also paramount agencies of settlement and colonisation, creating centres that were at once defensive and commercial at the *capita* of a baron's honour. Royal castellans and vassals were responsible for the military subjection and economic exploitation of the conquered lands.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative M: Aspects of the Norman Conquest, 1066–1135***B: Developments in Monasticism, 1066–1135**

Examine the extent to which English monasticism, in the period 1066 to 1135, benefited as a result of the Norman Conquest.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates would need some familiarity with the nature of English monasticism before the conquest but it is not envisaged that real depth of knowledge would be required pre-1066.

Answers should be focused on the degree of change and continuity afforded by the conquest and the influence of monastic reform in Europe generally at this time. At the highest levels, answers will show understanding of the extent of continuity and change in English monasticism across the whole period.

The range of relevant factors will include Lanfranc's reforms, effects of patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, racial tension and culture clash, spoliation and the imposition of feudal service, the effects of the introduction of new Orders. A range of well-chosen factual examples should support answers, such as:

Negative Effects

- in the first generation after the conquest changes occurred that affected both the discipline of the monasteries (Lanfranc's reform) and their personnel (Normanisation). Some abbeys also lost lands transferred to Norman houses (Le Bec) or to knights in order to meet the impositions of feudal service (Abingdon). Strains were caused by the maintenance of military households (Wulfstan of Worcester) and there were violent clashes as a result of the imposition of new practises (Glastonbury)

Positive Effects

- the second generation viewed themselves more as ‘Anglo-Norman’ and monasteries benefited from an increase in both royal and aristocratic patronage. Refoundations were made after the Harrying of the North (Jarrow, Monkwearmouth, Whitby) that continued the monastic tradition in this area. The introduction of new Orders (Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinian Canons) led to an upsurge in the number of those joining orders, as well as to the economy, particularly the Cistercian foundations in Yorkshire. There were changes in the design and layout of monastic churches which now followed the Decreta of Lanfranc (Rochester, Evesham, Durham) rather than the Regularis Concordia (Winchester)
- Latin replaced the vernacular but annals were maintained through later writers (Orderic Vitalis, Eadmer, Simeon of Durham). By preserving the past a degree of continuity was maintained. There was continuity of English saints (Swithun, Cuthbert, Edmund, Werburgh) and hagiographers rewrote the lives of such English saints for new audiences (Augustine, Edith of Wilton, Wulfhilde of Barking)
- English monasticism also experienced cultural interchange on a wider scale than previously. The effect of an Italian archbishop from Normandy, Norman abbots – and monks – in the wake of the conquest and the impact of Bernard of Clairvaux can be balanced against the role of Englishman Stephen Harding in the constitution of Clairvaux (the Carta Caritatis) and Bernard’s secretary William, returning to plant Cistercian monasticism in the north
- in the first generation after the conquest, 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 practices, rebuilding, imposition of servitia and the endowment of Norman monasteries with English lands. But English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of English and Norman culture, the introduction of the new Orders and being drawn into the mainstream of European reform; but English saints still protected their churches, attracted pilgrims and provided mausolea.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03***Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529***A: Pretenders and Protest in the Reign of Henry VII**

Was Lambert Simnel a greater threat to the security of Henry VII than Perkin Warbeck? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is the security of Henry VII's position in the years 1485–1499; and on the relative importance of Simnel and Warbeck in threatening that security. Answers should be based on a direct response to a clear choice – was Simnel or Warbeck the greater threat? Narrative biographical description of the two men will be of limited value; the key requirement is assessment and explanation of relative significance.

Answers will be expected to link a range of factors that made Henry vulnerable in general; and made the pretenders especially dangerous, although answers may argue that Henry was mostly in control, that the pretenders got relatively little support from Yorkists, and that Henry was only ever really worried about foreign interference. Nevertheless, some comparative comment on the relative 'threat' is needed.

There is a genuine choice of interpretation available, based on reasons such as:

Simnel:

- his threat came early, when Henry was at his most vulnerable
- he obtained significant support in Ireland (Warbeck did not)
- Lincoln, Lovell and Margaret of Burgundy were a powerful combination raising support abroad
- Simnel's army included a backbone of German mercenaries

- Simnel's challenge led to a major battle, at Stoke in 1487 – Warbeck's challenge never raised an invading army.

Warbeck:

- his threat was far longer-lasting than Simnel, not finally disposed of until 1499
- he claimed to be the younger brother of Edward V and it was impossible to disprove his claim because nobody knew what had happened to the princes in the tower
- he got strong support (and expert 'training') from Margaret of Burgundy
- he got promises of support and recognition from Charles VIII and from Emperor Maximilian (more lasting high-level foreign support than Simnel)
- Henry VII was forced to take a lot of actions in including attainders and the arrest of Stanley in 1495 to prevent the plot from growing
- the support from James IV of Scotland in 1497 was a serious threat
- Henry had Warbeck executed – he treated Simnel much more leniently.

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

Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529

B: The Career of Thomas Wolsey

With what success did Wolsey increase his own personal power and prestige in the years 1515 to 1527?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the rise in the personal power and prestige of Wolsey over the period from 1515, when Wolsey was appointed Lord Chancellor, to 1527, when Wolsey's position began to be undermined by his perceived failures in the negotiations for the royal divorce. Descriptive material on Wolsey's fall in 1529 can be of little relevance, though some high-quality answers may possibly make effective points about how his decline and fall relates to the "success" of his earlier career. Similarly, answers should not be unbalanced by excessive biographical material on Wolsey's early life and 'rise to power', although valid points can be made in explaining the extent of his power and influence already by the time of the starting date 1515.

The key words "personal power and prestige" put Wolsey himself firmly centre stage. There is also scope for answers to offer relevant judgements about the nature of the key relationship between Wolsey and the King – the old 'master or servant' question – but this should not unbalance the answer. The core issue is the advancement and the importance of Wolsey within Henry VIII's government and court.

Even within the restrictions of the key dates, Wolsey's career was wide-ranging. Answers should not be expected to be comprehensive or equal in coverage but ought to provide a range of evidence across the period as a whole. Some of the key aspects of these years might include:

- becoming a Cardinal (at Henry's urging) in 1515, and the whole question of Wolsey's power as a prince of the church
- overcoming rival personalities such as Warham in 1515 and Fox in 1516
- his role in the King's Council and his relationship with powerful magnates like Suffolk and Norfolk
- successful intervention to reconcile Henry and his sister Mary Tudor after her secret marriage in 1515
- his importance in foreign policy and schemes to advance Henry's prestige, both in the years from 1515 to the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520 and in the period of 'mature diplomacy' in 1521–1527
- his role in legal reforms, including the Court of Chancery and Star Chamber
- his reputation as a social reformer, including actions against enclosures
- his role in financial and tax reforms and the issues associated with raising money – above all the Act of Resumption, 1515, dealing with Parliament, and the Amicable Grant of 1525.

A descriptive narrative account of Wolsey's actions would be of only limited value. The framing of the question requires assessment of Wolsey's success in dominating royal government and making himself 'indispensable'. Many answers will credit Wolsey's reputation as inflated and exaggerated, pointing to his failures (such as foreign policy misjudgements and the reaction against the Amicable Grant) and to the limitations on Wolsey's power, both from rival influences at court and from Henry VIII himself. Such answers may also use valid arguments that Wolsey's decline from 1527 merely exposed the weaknesses of his position before then.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640*****A: The Nature of Puritanism and its Threat to the Crown, 1603–1625**

Examine the extent to which James I was threatened by Puritanism in the years 1618 to 1625.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

There should be some general definition of Puritanism attempted perhaps with comments on how, by its very nature, it was a potential threat to James's position as Supreme Governor and therefore as monarch.

With particular focus on the period 1618–1625 there should be clear coverage of the following main issues: the Book of Sports, Arminianism and foreign policy and why these alienated Puritans and potentially turned them against James. For consideration of the 'ways' in which Puritanism threatened James, the two main examples should be through their preaching and the platform of Parliament.

Candidates will show how James's support for Arminian bishops and his foreign policy were fundamentally linked in terms of Puritan attitudes towards James in these years. For Puritans, in the context of their fundamental anti-Catholicism, James's support for Arminians was a sign that his policy was, at best, appeasing Catholicism, and at worst that he had been won over to or corrupted by the forces of the anti-Christ. Candidates may point out the contradictions in James's policy. He had supported the Calvinist line at the Synod of Dort but promoted Arminians for a variety of reasons; to maintain balance within the church; they were the one faction that clearly supported his foreign policy; he did find aspects of their theology appealing. Some candidates may also show an appreciation of the most complicated related issue of Montague's work, 'A New Gagg for an Old Goose'.

James's foreign policy was based on his hatred of war, religious conflict and financial and strategic considerations, but the Puritan perception of it as pro-Catholic was more important than the reality. Comment about the relations between Parliament and Puritanism should also feature. What made Puritanism appear more threatening in this period was that their views seemed to be shared by a broader sweep of society, as most were anti-Catholic and on the surface pro-war. Answers should also show how James dealt with this apparent threat. In response to preaching, he issued the 1622 Direction to Preachers and despite the pressures in Parliament James always remained in control. In conclusion, it is likely to be pointed out that no one really fundamentally challenged his authority and that Puritanism was not really a threat.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640*****B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603–1641**

Was religion the most important reason for the problems Charles I had as ruler of Scotland in the years 1625 to 1640? Explain your answer.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates should outline the nature of Charles's religious policy and why it caused problems in Scotland. Answers should cover the whole period although there may be greater depth on the years 1637–1640. Candidates should look at other aspects of Charles's rule over Scotland and how these also created problems. Better candidates will link these factors with religion to show that while fundamentally religiously-based, the Covenanting movement was also a national reaction, showing the self-interest of the Scottish ruling classes.

Religion

- proclamation demanding observation of articles of Perth
- Charles's personal instructions for kneeling at communion
- impact of visit of Laud and Charles in 1633
- new book of Common Prayer (1633, introduced 1637)
- imposition of new canons by royal decree
- the National Covenant Movement 1637–1640.

Whilst the focus should be on religion, other areas that could be examined include:-

- 1625 Act of Revocation
- Charles's manipulation of Scottish Council
- Spottiswoode and Bishops on Council
- failure to dislodge nobility from local power
- collapse of the power of Huntly and Campbell
- bad harvests 1622–1624 and mid 1630s
- impact of imperial mercantilism
- cases of Balmerino and Leighton.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714–1802*****A: The Nature, Extent and Threat of Jacobitism, 1714–1746**

Examine the extent to which British Jacobites posed a serious threat to the stability of the government between 1714 and 1746.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

This question covers the entire period from 1714 to 1746, therefore candidates should demonstrate knowledge of events between the two main Jacobite uprisings, as well as of the uprisings themselves. Candidates will almost certainly discriminate between English and Scottish Jacobites in their responses; both are relevant, and therefore both should be covered.

In 1715 there was sufficient potential support for Jacobitism in Scotland for the Earl of Mar to consider it worthwhile to begin his campaign there. There was much less support in England, where the Jacobites were linked in the public mind with the discredited Tories. Prosperity, complacency and the growing acceptance of the Hanoverian regime combined to limit Jacobite prospects south of the border in the decades following 1715; ministerial uncertainties in 1722 stimulated a new conspiracy under Atterbury and Lacy, but never really showed any prospects of success. Several minor outbursts of Jacobite activity in Scotland in the 1730s served to remind the government that there was still potential backing for the Jacobites in Scotland, but none in themselves posed any real threat.

In 1745, attempts were made to win English support with promises to end the Hanoverian influence over foreign policy and assurances that the position of the Church of England would be protected, but English Jacobites provided little more than vocal support. North of the border there was much more activity, with the Young Pretender rousing emotional

support amongst the clans; however, the real value of relatively untrained Scots fighting against an organised British army must be questionable, as the eventual rout at Culloden demonstrated. There was the prospect of some Welsh support in 1745, but the Welsh gentry, under Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, failed to deliver any real support. Although the question does focus mainly on Jacobite support within Britain, candidates may also refer to other reasons for Jacobite failure, in order to point out that success was unlikely even had more substantial British support been forthcoming.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714–1802*****B: The British in India, c1757–c1802**

How important was the East India Company in the expansion of British influence within India in the years c1757 to 1784?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

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

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

government office as Governor and later Governor-General of Bengal, he retained the belief that the Company had a vital role to play in the continuing British control of India.

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

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841*****A: Government Response to Poverty**

How effective was the Poor Law Amendment Act, in the years 1834 to 1841, in solving the problems identified by the Royal Commission on the Poor Law of 1832–1834?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The broad thrust of the question is to examine the effectiveness of the New Poor Law, in relation to the problems of the old law and the views of the commissioners.

Arguments which could be used to suggest it was effective include:

- it reduced the cost of the Poor Law which was a major goal of the middle class. Although this can be argued to be only an indirect inference of the Report it was an important motive of those who voted upon the legislation in the House of Commons and reflected the attitude of the commissioners to provide a cost-effective measure
- it helped to create a more uniform approach to the issue of Poor Relief throughout the country, which Benthamites desired in preference to the haphazard way in which the Speenhamland system had spread (clearly stated in the report)
- the workhouses were feared and a social stigma was attached to those who entered them.

Arguments that it was not effective are likely to draw upon the following points:

- it did not recognise the cyclical nature of unemployment, which meant it ignored the needs of Britain's increasingly urban population and was therefore never fully implemented in the North

- the reform paid little heed to the cause of poverty, but it could be argued that the commissioners failed to take this into account anyway
- there was still variation in the system as it was applied across the country, especially in the industrial North, where very few Workhouses were built despite the Benthamite desire for uniformity across the country
- the quality of the personnel running the new workhouses was often no better than that of the old and corruption and abuse continued.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841*****B: Religion and Politics in England and Ireland c1820–c1841**

Explain the main reasons why the Church of Ireland caused controversy in both England and Ireland in the years 1820 to 1841.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The thrust of the question is to explain the controversy caused by the Irish Church. This may be both political and religious.

- the main reason why the Church of Ireland remained controversial was that it represented the imposition of English power in Ireland
- it was the symbol of a foreign ruling class which did not share the religion of some 95% of the population living in Ireland
- where Protestants did have a majority in the northern counties of Antrim, Down and Londonderry (though not the city) and in Belfast; it was a Presbyterian form of Non-Conformity which regarded the Church of Ireland as little better than the Catholic Church which they bitterly opposed
- both Catholics and Non-Conformists were forced to contribute to the Church of Ireland via tithes, even after the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 enabled middle class Catholics to obtain seats at Westminster, as the Church of Ireland remained the established Church in Ireland until 1869
- tithes guaranteed the Church of Ireland remained controversial, but its role as a landowner meant that it was also embroiled in the land question which led to frequent agrarian unrest and often murderous outbreaks of widespread violence
- the brutal suppression of agrarian outrages by British troops only served to inflame nationalist sentiments and further isolate the Church of Ireland; a view reinforced from Catholic pulpits

- for many conservatives in England, the Church of Ireland was symbolic since any attempt to disestablish it could lead to similar arguments in England. The Ultra-Tories believed Catholic Emancipation was simply a step along this road
- Canning's advocacy of Catholic Emancipation made attitudes to religious issues in Ireland a live political issue
- the Lichfield House Compact between the Whigs and Irish MPs kept the issue in the forefront of politicians' minds, as the Whigs drew a lot of support from urban non-conformists.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921*****A: The Nature and Impact of New Liberalism, 1906–1915**

How effective were the Liberal welfare reforms in alleviating poverty in the years 1906 to 1915?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will be expected to focus on the effectiveness, and also the limitations of the welfare reform legislation over the whole period, in order to reach judgements on individual measures and the reforms overall. Central will be consideration of how far poverty was alleviated. Poverty should be defined, even if only implicitly. Answers may well refer to the work of Charles Booth (*Life and Labour of the London Poor, 1899–1903*) and Seebohm Rowntree (*Poverty: A Study of Town Life in York, 1901*). Both found about one third of the population of the cities studied to be living in poverty with the major causes being unemployment and old age. Solutions were quite beyond the scope of private charity and the Poor Law. Government action was necessary. There was also the 1904 *Report into Physical Deterioration* following the rejection of so many recruits by the army during the Boer War. Although Conservative/Unionist governments did not pick up the challenge, the Liberal governments from 1906 did. The early relevant reforms included the significant extension of provision of free school meals (1906), school medical inspections (1907), and the ‘Children’s Charter’ (1908).

There was clearly some improvement in the quality of life for a significant number of children. For workers, conditions for seamen were improved under the Merchant Shipping Act (1906), there was the Workmen’s Compensation Act (1906), miners were granted the eight hour maximum working day (1908) and similar legislation covered shop workers with a compulsory early closing day (1911). Apart from the Workmen’s Compensation Act this employment legislation did not significantly reduce poverty *per se*, but improved conditions

at work for those affected. Trade Boards for the sweated industries (1909) such as box-making and tailoring were established. These followed publicity given in the press to low rates of pay for piece work and the slums in which the employees lived.

However, improvements were introduced by the new boards only slowly. Labour Exchanges were introduced in 1908. These were of undoubted benefit to those seeking work and also to employers in having a wider pool of labour from which to choose. Previously the unemployed called at factories themselves. Reversal of the Taff Vale Case (1900–1901) by the Trade Disputes Act (1906) is relevant, as it freed the unions to use the strike weapon in struggles for better pay and conditions. However, the major welfare legislation of the period came with the introduction of Old Age Pensions (1908) and National Insurance (1911). The former undoubtedly alleviated poverty amongst the very old. It also led to savings in the Poor Law budgets as fewer elderly entered the workhouse when they became destitute. The non-contributory scheme gave five shillings (25p) a week to a single person over 70 and seven shillings and sixpence (37 and a half pence) to married couples. Collection at the post office had none of the stigma of receiving poor relief.

Despite its eligibility limitations this was one of the great welfare reforms of the Liberals. The other was the introduction of National Insurance. The effective part of the Act before the First World War was Part I, which gave cover against ill health. The scheme was contributory (by employee, employer and the state). When ill the insured person received 10 shillings (50p) a week and free medical attention. Lloyd George forced through the measure against much opposition (mainly against the compulsory nature of the scheme). However, it was limited as it covered only the insured worker and not his dependants. Part II of the National Insurance Act introduced a contributory scheme for insurance against unemployment. The unemployed worker would receive seven shillings (35p) a week, but only for 15 weeks. The scheme was also restricted to a few industries and was not in extensive use until just before the war. There was also social legislation contained within the People's Budget in terms of taxation of the wealthier members of society (e.g. super tax and taxes on land) to fund expenditure including Old Age Pensions. During the first two years of the War there were some measures which also helped to reduce poverty, notably taxes on, and restricted hours for, drinking, and welfare measures for women workers notably in the munitions factories. Higher wages, especially for women, and full employment also led to a relatively high standard of living in general.

Better answers will see limitations in the extent of measures in assessing the effectiveness of the Liberal governments in alleviating poverty. Some were amended in the Lords and some Bills were defeated (or dropped), e.g. Education and Licensing Bills. Overall there was an unprecedented amount of legislation, driven by 'New Liberalism', in order to make some attempts to alleviate poverty and pauperism especially for children, the elderly and the unemployed. On the other hand some areas were left largely untouched in this period, most notably slum housing. Also the Poor Law was left intact.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921*****B: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland c1895–1921**

How important in explaining the growth of support for Sinn Fein by the end of 1918 is the British government's failure to carry through Home Rule for Ireland?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should address the importance of the British government's failure to carry through Home Rule together with other factors which explain why Sinn Fein was so strongly and extensively supported by late 1918.

The Sinn Fein 'movement' had begun in the late 19th century. There was cultural development through the work of the Gaelic League amongst others. Sport was encouraged by 'Sinn Fein' looking for fit young Irish men. From a separate cultural identity developed a concept of a (completely) separate political identity for Ireland. Aggressive separatist nationalism challenged Home Rule, e.g. Arthur Griffiths started the *United Irishman* in 1898, which preached 'Sinn Fein' (Ourselves). He founded Sinn Fein as a Party in 1902. The Irish Republican Brotherhood (I.R.B.) began in 1907. Emergence of more extreme nationalism coincided with the return of the Liberals to government in 1906 and growing concern amongst Protestants, especially in Ulster, that Home Rule might again become a real 'threat'.

However, before 1914 Sinn Fein was a marginal political party. The Irish Nationalists clearly remained the more important and popular nationalist party until the First World War during which the dramatic shift took place. Until then, John Redmond, leader of the Irish Nationalist Party, had rather neglected changes taking place in Ireland. He focused on developments in the Westminster Parliament. Crucially after the 1910 General Elections the Liberals needed Irish Nationalist votes in the Commons especially in reducing the Lords'

powers. This led to the introduction of the Third Home Rule Bill in 1912. The arming of Ulster Unionists led to the nationalist equivalent, the Irish Volunteers. Ireland (and possibly Britain) was probably saved from civil war by the outbreak of the First World War. The implementation of Home Rule was delayed until the end of hostilities – but seemed the final decision (though not accepted by the Unionists). Most Irish Nationalists at first rallied to the war effort, but ‘extreme’ elements used that co-operation to oppose Redmond and increase their own support. 169,000 of the Irish Volunteers backed Redmond in 1914, but 11,000 did not, rejected Home Rule (and constitutional means) and called for complete independence. However, until 1916, Sinn Fein did not enjoy wide support. The turning point came at Easter 1916 with the Republican Rising by the I.R.B., and perhaps particularly the way in which the Rising was suppressed and martyrs created by the actions of Asquith’s Coalition government. The Rising itself did not enjoy widespread support. However, after surrender, martial law was imposed and the ringleaders executed. The ‘martyrs’ (15 executed in Kilmainham gaol) became heroes and the Irish Nationalists, led by the complacent and ineffective Redmond, were severely damaged. In 1917 Sinn Fein won two by-elections. Opposition to Irish conscription, a major mistake by the British government in 1918, increased support further for Sinn Fein. In the December 1918 Election Sinn Fein won 73 seats (to the Irish Nationalists 6) and formed the Dail. The crucial period of change was during the War and especially from Easter 1916. British mistakes in brutal suppression of the Rising and execution of its leader greatly intensified support for Sinn Fein and its political agenda of independence and republicanism. The increased influence of Ulster Unionists on the Coalition government in the later stages of the War further intensified nationalist feeling and suspicion that a British government could renege on even Home Rule. Unionists were just as intransigent against an independent republic of Ireland, if not more so than they had been in opposition to Home rule. Their determination to resist had been intensified further by the events from 1916 onwards. Their conservative allies held key political positions in the British government especially from late 1916. By 1918 for most nationalists Home Rule was no longer an option. Irish politics had become polarised by intransigent Unionist opposition to Home Rule, or worse, independence for Ireland, and Sinn Fein determined to establish a free Republic.

It was not so much the failure of the British government to carry through Home Rule up to 1914, or even 1916, which led to the growth in support for Sinn Fein, but British government actions in and following the Easter Rising and the two following years (1917 and 1918). By 1918 there was no clear commitment by the British government to implement the Home Rule legislation which had actually been passed in 1914. It was the changes in Irish politics brought about by the Easter Rising, consequent events and British government reaction to them, which were crucial in the advance of Sinn Fein.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic and Social History, 1750–1830*****A: Britain's Economy in 1750**

Examine the degree to which Britain was an 'industrial economy' in 1750.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The question asks candidates to make a judgement on the state of the British economy in 1750 and to prioritise the elements, which could be described as 'industrial' compared to those which were clearly 'agricultural'. It should require some attempt at definition as to what an 'industrial economy' actually is. This is open to some debate, but should consider the extent to which manufacture was organised for an extra-regional market and one in which the wage-based proletariat were dependent on others for production of food. One would also expect evidence of a developing infrastructure in terms of transport and finance. The conclusion, which one would expect to be drawn is that it depended where you looked due to the regional nature of the British economy. However, there is little doubt that the elements which would lead to a fully fledged industrial economy were present in 1750.

Elements which suggest that Britain was an industrial economy in 1750:

- there is considerable evidence of the growth of manufacture in Britain by 1750. This can be identified in the Midlands region with the growth of proto-industrial output in hosiery, lace and small metal wares – tin toys, buttons – and in small arms. The growth of the textile industries in both Lancashire and Yorkshire are also significant developments in this period. Straw hatting was a feature of the southern Midland counties, for example Bedfordshire. What is significant about these industries is the organisation of the workforce, through putting out, the manufacture for non-local

markets and the external systems of finance. A significant proportion of those involved in the manufacture had this employment as their primary source of income

- Britain was far from being a subsistence economy. Considerable developments had, and were, taking place in agriculture to improve output and the range of goods produced – for example the development of stock rearing associated with the East Midlands. Improvements in arable farming and the development of technologies were also continuing. Much of the investment in agriculture was conducted on a large scale. East Anglia was a major region to develop its agriculture as was the area surrounding London
- money from land was used to finance developments in industry (for example the Fitzwilliams in Yorkshire).

Elements which suggest that Britain was not an industrial economy in 1750:

- much of the British economy was still agricultural. It was the main employer of labour, the majority of the population lived in the countryside, grain was a major export commodity
- most manufacturing took place in workers' own homes, not in factories or mills. Most of this took place in the countryside, not the town and workers still involved themselves in agricultural production at key times during the year
- large-scale production of iron and steel was still very limited. The Darbys of Coalbrookdale were able to produce on a fairly large scale, but most production of heavy metals was, in 1750, limited by power and also by demand
- the road network was very patchy. Only roads around London and the major centres of commerce were able to sustain the bulk transport of goods. Transport was organised very much on a regional basis. Water transport was favoured for long distance haulage for bulky goods as it had been since the middle ages
- the banking system was not well developed. Much investment was undertaken by local attorneys acting as intermediaries for individuals who wished to lend money to secure annuity. Many early industrial ventures were funded by money lent by family and friends.

Overall, it would be more accurate to describe the economy as proto-industrial rather than industrial. Candidates may refer to the work of Pat Hudson, Kriedte, Medick and Schlumbohm, Clarkson and Mendels in relation to this. Britain was a country of regions, some of which were developing industries and which would go on to become major industrial areas – for example Yorkshire and Lancashire. However, it would be difficult to argue that in 1750 Britain was an industrial economy.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative S: Aspects of British Economic History, 1750–1830*****B: The Standard of Living of the Working Classes, 1780–1830**

Examine the extent to which the lives of both men and women were changed by the impact of industrialisation in the years 1780 to 1830.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

This question is outside the main concerns of the standard of living debate but it examines the impact of industrialisation on both men and women. As with the traditional debate, there is a clear distinction between the experience of those who lived in the town and those who were involved in manufacture but in the countryside. There is also a difference between the experience of single women and married women; the impact of industrialisation was significantly different depending on who was considered and where they lived. It is likely that candidates' conclusions will be determined by where they place their focus.

Impact of industrialisation on women:

- women who lived in the countryside were not unaffected by industrialisation. The need to increase agricultural production resulted in the replacement of the sickle by the scythe. This meant a reduction in the employment of women in the fields and a move to dairying which increased with the need to produce milk, butter and cheese for the urban market
- the main group to be affected by industrialisation were the young women who were employed in the early production of textiles. They were employable due to their nimble fingers and willingness to accept discipline. Many of these were employed in the water-based mills. Shorter argues that they experienced a sexual revolution, although this is

debated. The steam powered mechanised mills located in the towns resulted in some decline in employment for women. The impact of factory conditions in terms of long hours, poor wages and inhuman working conditions are well known

- women who re-located to towns experienced the same decline in conditions of living as men – problems linked to overcrowding, poor sanitation and a decline in life expectancy. In terms of their roles married women in towns tended to have the same functions as their sisters in the countryside.

Impact of industrialisation on men:

- the most notable group of workers to be affected by industrialisation were the handloom weavers. This group refused to make the transition into the factories and so experienced a fall from being the aristocracy of labour to a group who worked endless hours for ever-decreasing pay
- candidates may outline the move from independent labourers working in their own homes, determining hours of work and teaching their sons the trade, to men working in factories having lost all dignity and independence of labour. However, many of the workers had lost their independence before the move to factories through the putting out system
- factories did offer opportunity for skilled labour and certainly this group were able to improve their living standards through improved wages and increased purchasing power
- the key issues about living and working conditions of urban dwellers apply to both men and women.

Candidates may use the work of Maxin Berg, Neil Smelser and E.P. Thompson to consider these issues. They may take the approach of the optimists/pessimists although the focus of this debate is very much related to the impact of industrialisation on men.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848*****A: The Significance of the 1832 Reform Act**

How important was the influence of utilitarian ideas in the investigations of the Poor Law Commission and in the framing of the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The question requires candidates to consider the influences behind the work of the Poor Law Commission in the years 1832–1834 and the contents of the actual Act. Candidates are directed towards one factor, the influence of the utilitarian movement, but they need to show some awareness of other influences upon the Commission and the terms of the act to demonstrate balance.

- the **Utilitarian movement** contained the followers of Jeremy Bentham who argued that the test for institutions and laws should be their utility to society; in particular he advocated that actions should provide the greatest good to the greatest number
- Benthamites therefore judged actions by their efficiency and accountability. They believed in investigations to gather information to provide the evidence on which action could be based – a ‘scientific’ test
- actions should then benefit the greatest number of citizens, though their view of a citizen meant a man of property and means – those responsible enough to have a say in society

- they had therefore favoured reform in 1832 as a way of improving the efficiency and accountability of government by including the middle-classes who were responsible and who contributed to the wealth of the country
- the **Poor Law Commission** itself was an example of utilitarianism; the Commission collected ‘scientific’ evidence to determine what reform of the old poor law was necessary
- the leading Commissioners were Edwin Chadwick and Nassau Senior, both of whom were committed followers of Bentham
- the idea behind the new workhouses was that conditions would be inhumane and pay would be less than the lowest paid job. This principle was called ‘less eligibility’ and it ensured the greatest good of the greatest number, from middle-class ratepayers who saw their contribution to the poor-rate reduced (from £7 million nationally before 1834 to £4.5 million after the Act) to the poor themselves who were saved from idleness
- Utilitarianism was therefore a key part of the philosophy of the Act and explains its contents
- the Act also set up a uniform system, administered centrally from London by Chadwick, totally in keeping with the utilitarian belief in efficiency, which was synonymous with centralisation.

However, there are **other possible motives** to be considered.

- the Whig party might be seen to have begun **an age of reform** after the success of the 1832 Reform Act; reform was popular and had proved to be effective in preserving the privileges of the wealthy. Furthermore, Whig radicals like Brougham and Durham, who did not appear in Melbourne’s more reactionary government after 1835, believed that the duty of government was to try to solve social problems. The social problem being addressed was not of course poverty, but more the threat of the poor to affluent society
- the Whigs also were aware of the need to **benefit the newly enfranchised electors** who backed them in 1832 (and would again in 1835). The New Poor Law would reduce the burden of local rates on the very middle-class, the very class the Whigs had won over by enfranchising and the very class whose continued support was essential to prevent a return to pre-1830 politics when the Tories dominated.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative T: Aspects of British History, 1832–1848*****B: Chartism and other Radical Movements, 1838–1848**

How important was the part played by division within the movement in explaining the failure of the Chartist campaigns in the years 1838 to 1848?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The Chartist campaign peaked in 1838/1839 with meetings and a petition to parliament, in 1842 with a second petition, the rejection of which led to strikes and riots, including the Plug riots in Lancashire and finally in 1848 with a third petition following a rally at Kennington Common in London. Candidates should assess general reasons for failure relevant to the whole period, though some answers may address specific reasons for the failure of each wave.

Candidates are directed to one reason for the failure of the Chartist campaign, the **divisions within the movement**.

- the chartist movement was divided geographically, with the result that there was little co-ordinated action. The 1839 Newport Rising was meant to be the precursor to further uprisings in Yorkshire, but instead it was an isolated event. There was also a North/South division associated with Lovett and O'Connor
- the movement also became divided between those seeking redress of economic grievances (the 'Plug Plots' of 1842) and those who fought for political reform and whose case was undermined by their association with those who took direct action

- reference is likely to be especially made to the division between ‘physical’ and ‘moral’ force Chartists, between Fergus O’Connor and William Lovett. O’Connor called on people to choose between the National Charter Association and Lovett’s National Association for promoting the Political and Social Improvement of the People. He viewed with distrust the Complete Suffrage Union as a middle-class takeover of popular radicalism. Lovett supported the CSU, but even his supporters in London backed O’Connor.

However, these divisions are not as stark as may first appear:

- there was a remarkable amount of agreement at key points. Furthermore, attitudes could vary, e.g. Lovett was also capable of violent language, and having worked with radicals like Francis Place he understood how to move a crowd. In 1842 O’Connor’s *The Northern Star* warned against the use of violence and O’Connor preferred to use a strategy of intimidation, often acting to prevent violence, as in January 1840 and April 1848.

Other factors should also therefore be considered in explaining the movements failure:

- the reaction of the governments to Chartism. The governments’ **attempts to alleviate suffering** and therefore remove support; Peel’s government aimed to deprive Chartism of mass support by removing many of the grievances of those who sought further reform. The introduction of income tax enabled the repeal the Corn Laws and ensured cheap food, whilst the 1833 Factory Act restricted hours of work for women and children. For those supporters of Chartism as a ‘knife and fork’ movement in response to economic depression and unemployment, governments addressed their concern. Furthermore, the ending of import duties helped alleviate hardship
- the Government’s contribution could also involve discussion of the more **confrontational response** that the movement engendered. Arrests of leading Chartists in 1839 and 1842, armed response to public meetings in Newcastle in 1838, riots in Lancashire and south Wales in 1839 (20 killed at the Newport Rising), use of the army in Wolverhampton in 1842. The use of troops transported swiftly by railway and the use of urban police forces after 1839 were part of this response
- the lack of a middle-class alliance with the working-class after 1832. Apart from a brief period in 1842 when middle-class non-conformist radicals supported the movement, the campaigns threatened the middle-class who had won the vote in 1832. Therefore the effective pressure of a cross-class alliance as seen in 1832 did not materialise. The middle-class were instead supportive of government actions to repress Chartism
- the reformed House of Commons was still dominated by aristocratic interest, hence only 46 supporters of Attwood’s petition in 1839. Reform would never be conceded by such a Parliament
- objections to violence lost support to the Anti-Corn Law League
- the other powerful counter-attractions for the dissatisfied (Ten Hour Movement, Anti-Corn Law League, Trades Unions).

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951*****A: The Making of the Welfare State 1942–1951**

How important was Aneurin Bevan's contribution to the establishment of the National Health Service in the years 1942 to 1951?

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is the establishment of the NHS – and on an assessment of the relative importance, along with ‘other factors’, of Nye Bevan’s contribution to that process. Answers will be expected to explain a range of issues involved in the emergence of plans for a national health scheme; and should also deal with the whole period from 1942, when the Beveridge Plan was formulated, to 1951.

Bevan’s contribution may indeed have been vital but it would not be sufficient just to cover his actions as Minister of Health in the Attlee government. There may also be a difference of balance between answers which credit Bevan with decisive importance (and thus focus most of their evidence on his contribution) and those which emphasise more varied and ‘long-term’ factors – perhaps going back before 1942 to explain previous improvements to health provision, or to contrast the attitudes of the ‘Hungry Thirties’ with changed views emerging during and because of the war. But this must be carefully applied to the question – as usual, description of the “background” for its own sake will be of little value.

Nor is coverage pre-1942 a requirement. Many excellent answers will concentrate mostly on 1945–1951. One feature of good answers may be differentiation between Bevan and his supporters on the one hand, as opposed to the Labour cabinet as a whole. Bevan did more than anyone to frame policy and push it through – but there were other views within the Labour ranks, not only when he clashed with Gaitskell over prescription charges in 1951.

The idea of ‘importance’ may also include evaluation of success – it can be argued from the Left that Bevan ‘failed’ (by making too many compromises with vested interests); from the Right that he ‘failed’ (by inflicting excessive public spending and the nanny state on a struggling economy); or that he was the hero of the hour (the only man who could have pushed through Labour’s greatest achievement).

The parliamentary battle for the NHS culminated in victory in 1948 but the key date 1951 allows scope for analysis of the implementation in practice – and for problems of financing it to emerge. Some historians argue that the NHS was “too successful” because take-up of its services was much more than had been expected. Answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive. The key requirement is for an argued assessment of Bevan’s relative importance.

HISTORY**UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951*****B: Winston Churchill in opposition and government, 1929–1945**

Explain the main reasons why it was difficult for Winston Churchill to become accepted as Prime Minister and national leader in the summer of 1940.

Mark Scheme

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

This question has a clear focus on Churchill’s consolidation of power in the tense weeks and months after his appointment to replace Chamberlain. Answers would be expected to provide a range of evidence and to place Churchill in the context of his years in the political wilderness before 1940 (which might make it seem surprising he ever became prime minister at all); the key developments of the summer of 1940; and his later legendary reputation (which might make it seem odd that it was ever ‘difficult’ in the first place).

Answers should also be able to explain the nature of (and key personalities other than Churchill within) the Conservative Party – and thus to explain why many in his own party regarded him as a loose cannon, as a provocative maverick with his own circle of personal followers and advisers, disloyally undermining the Conservative leaders of the National Government up to and including Chamberlain. Churchill had often been wrong on some of the big issues of the 1930s, notably India and the Abdication crisis of 1936. Some answers may make valid points about Churchill’s previous career and his record of “crossing the floor” – such pre-1929 material could be effective but it should not be descriptive and it should not unbalance the answer. The question is explicitly focused on 1940.

The key issues in the summer of 1940 were:

- why Churchill was chosen as Prime Minister
- how Churchill secured his eventually dominant position in the wartime coalition.

Many answers will deal in greater or lesser detail with one or the other issue. Some may give a relatively brief coverage of the tense days of May 1940 before moving on to Churchill's massive popularity as the war developed later that summer; others will wish to analyse in depth the vital early stages when Churchill *might* have been deposed by those 'realists' who wanted to take the best deal available to end the war. Such answers may benefit from the excellent account by John Lukacs in *Five Days in London: May 1940*. Either approach is valid.

Answers should show an understanding that Churchill had many obstacles to overcome after becoming Prime Minister. There was every chance that the war cabinet might opt for a peace plan. Churchill needed, for example, acceptance and support from Halifax and Chamberlain, though some answers may argue convincingly that it was not very "difficult" for Churchill because of the simple fact that there was nobody else that the Labour leaders would serve under.