



# General Certificate of Education

## History 5041

### *Course Essays (HS03)*

# Mark Scheme

## *2006 examination – June series*

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

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

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**

### **AS UNIT 3: COURSE ESSAYS**

#### *General Guidance for Examiners*

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**UNIT 3**

**COURSE ESSAYS**

**In marking Coursework Essays all examiners must, to decide on levels and placing of a response within a level, refer to:**

- **the generic essay mark scheme and its descriptors for AS**
- **the exemplification of AS level descriptors**
- **the indicative content designated by the Principal Examiner**
- **additional content (i.e. not in the indicative content) which is relevant and targeted**
- **guidance on discriminating within a level.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The answer is excessively generalised and 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 (Middle = 7)*****Either***

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

***Or***

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

**Exemplification/Guidance**

*Either* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

*Or* responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

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

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

**Exemplification/guidance**

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

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

---

**D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL**

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

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

So, is the response:

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

***Important Note***

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

## Summary of mark scheme for HS03

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

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

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism*****A: The Military Orders in the Latin East in the Twelfth Century**

Examine the extent to which rivalry between the Templars and the Hospitallers limited their role in the defence of the Crusader states.

**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.**

Analysis will focus on the contribution of the military orders within the context of the geographical and manpower problems faced by the Crusader states. Answers should show knowledge and understanding of the situation in the Crusader states in the 1180s in particular, and their near collapse in the aftermath of the battle of Hattin in 1187.

- analysis should examine the role of the Military Orders within the context of the near collapse of the Crusader states in the years 1187 to 1188. That collapse may be seen as suggesting failure for the Military Orders, a failure to which their rivalry may have contributed. However, students may argue that collapse was inevitable given the long-term structural weaknesses of the Crusader states in terms of both geography and manpower; a numerical weakness which even the 600 elite, dedicated knights of the Military orders could not offset, geographical and strategic isolation which even their castles, like Belvoir and Crac des Chevaliers, could not mitigate
- given that this topic is focused on the Military orders, credit should be given for answers which argue the positive contribution of the Orders, that the survival of Crusader states was partly due to the martial spirit and numerical contribution of the Templars and Hospitallers:
  - the implication of the question may be countered by the suggestion that their role was a positive one, a key contribution to the defence of states facing significant

numerical and geographical weaknesses. Analysis of success may look at their positive influence in the 1180s

- it may focus on the military abilities/martial spirit of the orders, their elite status and numerical contribution, and also their popularity in western Europe, forming an important channel for funds to Outremer, the link between their corporate wealth and the development of their role into castle building in particular, their inspirational role and the manner in which they made permanent the crusading ideal and expressed the martial/religious ethos of the period
- positive analysis may stress that the Hospitallers became a key military bulwark from the 1130s providing knights and castles as they militarized their role. Together the orders provided a vital military force, they protected pilgrims, their castles guarded pilgrimage routes, the orders maintained pressure on the Muslim enemy, raiding from their castles, and they fulfilled an important political role as advisors to the King
- they played a key role in the defence of the Holy Land, their commitment and discipline inspired others and led to financial support for the beleaguered kingdom. At Cresson and Hattin they laid down their life for Christendom. In the recovery of the Kingdom after 1187 the castles of the Templars and Hospitallers were a key element in the recovery of Christian control
- it may be argued that the main reason for the failure of the defence of the Crusader states had little to do with weaknesses in the contribution of the Military Orders. Rather it was the growth of Muslim unity under Saladin; from 1174 he began to unite Egypt and Syria, Fatimid and Abbasid, Sunni and Shi'ite. The unity of Jihad against the isolated Crusader kingdom made victory inevitable. However, the fanaticism of the Orders, reflected in their treatment by Saladin in 1187 at Hattin, may be seen as issue in weakening the Crusader states, heightening religious tension and making compromise impossible
- although most historians make general reference to rivalry between the two military orders few give precise examples; Riley-Smith simply notes of them that 'they were competitive, sometimes selfish, occasionally quarrelsome', whilst Alan Forey states, 'the extent of rivalry was exaggerated.' Nevertheless, their rivalry was a key factor in the failure of King Amalric's campaign to capture Egypt in 1168: the Templars refused to participate alongside the Hospitallers. The long-term consequence of the failure of this campaign was the unification of Egypt and N. Syria under the leadership of Saladin between 1174 and 1183, leaving the Crusader states in the 1180s isolated and surrounded by a united Islamic world:
  - by the 1180s the rivalry between the two orders was reflected in the links between the Hospitallers, Count Raymond of Tripoli and the 'doves', the peace party which sought accommodation with the Muslims, while the Templars were more militant, siding with Reynald of Chatillon and the 'hawks', those who sought continual warfare
  - in September 1186 the Military orders were divided over the succession to the throne; Gerard de Ridefort was a key supporter of the claim to the throne of Sybilla and her husband Guy of Lusignan, while Roger of Moulins, Master of the Hospital

supported Raymond of Tripoli's claim as regent. Indeed Roger refused to hand over his key to the treasury where the crowns were kept

- regarding the Orders, it may be argued that Gerard de Ridefort's was a personal impact, that he was to blame, not divisions between the orders. In May 1187 Gerard de Ridefort, Grand Master of the Templars, actually taunted his Hospitaller counterpart with cowardice. The subsequent battle at the Springs of Cresson and the loss of 140 elite troops from the Military orders, including Roger of Moulins, Grand Master of the Hospital, played a key role in the subsequent defeat at the Horns of Hattin in July 1187
- students may argue against the implications of the question; in 1184 the two orders co-operated in seeking aid from the west, the two Grand Masters, Roger of Moulins for the Hospitallers, and Arnold of Torroja for the Temple, set out on a diplomatic tour of western Christendom. They could argue that the Crusader states only lasted as long as they did because of the orders' commitment, castles and numerical contribution
- judgement may refer to context, for example in the aftermath of the near collapse in 1187–1188 it was the orders which ensured continuity, the two Hospitaller castles of Crac des Chevaliers and Margat survived the Muslim onslaught and provided footholds which Richard and the Third Crusade exploited to ensure the continuing survival of Outremer for a further century.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative A: Medieval Monasticism*

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

Was the contribution of Bernard of Clairvaux the most important factor in the growth of the Cistercian order during the twelfth century? Explain your answer.

#### **Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should provide some detail on the successful expansion of the Cistercians, including an outline of the growth of the order, number of houses, popularity and moral influence, perhaps mentioning its rapid growth from one house in 1112 to 343 in 1153 and 738 by 1500. Analysis should focus on the role of Bernard of Clairvaux as a reason for the order's success, but there are other reasons to consider. These include the role of Stephen Harding; the Charter of Love (Carta Caritatis); the maintenance of discipline through filiation and visitation and economic factors. 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.

Answers will consider a range of reasons for the growth of the Cistercian order, but the role of Bernard as an inspirational figure will be central in any essay; by the time of his death in 1153 his abbey at Clairvaux had sent out monks to create 68 new abbeys. Issues will include topics such as the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties, his charismatic personality and personal example in austerity and asceticism, his prestige and inspirational role, and his 'golden eloquence' in articulating Cistercian ideals, especially his letters and debates with Peter the Venerable as a means of promoting the New Monasticism.

Evaluation may focus on such alternative reasons for growth:

- Robert of Molesme, founder of the first Cistercian monastery, Citeaux, in 1098. Robert was an inspirational figure who did much to form the ideals of the Cistercians; for example the return to the original rule of St. Benedict; their austerity and retreat to the wilderness. However, he was only at Citeaux for about one year and the expansion into a monastic order took place under the influence of Stephen Harding, Abbot of Citeaux from 1109 to 1133 and Bernard in his role as Abbot of Clairvaux
- Stephen Harding and the impact of Citeaux as a mother-house also led to the spiritual success of the order, as did the social catholicity of its appeal. Students may analyse the role of his *Carta Caritatis* in maintaining discipline while expansion took place
- also the impact of economic success in continuing expansion; the Cistercian focus on the wilderness; benefactors and uncultivated land; sheep farming and wool production; manual labour and the use of *conversi*; the flood of endowments; papal privileges and the economic context of European demographic and economic expansion
- other reasons for success are elements of attraction to the order including its constitution and organization, especially visitations as a means of preserving Cistercian ideals. The period after Bernard's death in 1153 will be of key interest, as a contrast to 1113 to 1153, because of the growth of criticism and dilution of the order's economic ideals and purity.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative B: The French Wars of Religion*

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

Examine the extent to which the Guise family was responsible for the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion by 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.**

Answers would be expected to consider a range of factors linked to Guise responsibility and to other issues in explaining the outbreak of the Wars of Religion, and to draw supported conclusions about the responsibility of the Guises, for example:

#### **The Guise family:**

- Charles of Guise was an Archbishop at 14 and a Cardinal by 1547. He was a pluralist and acquired extensive lands on the death of Francis I in 1547 – and epitomised the faults of the Catholic Church
- the Guises had been the dominant noble group until the death of Francis II which meant they lost prominence by 1560 and felt excluded
- during their period in power, they had alienated other powerful families through reducing financial favours to them but continuing to retain their own financial health – Montmorency and Bourbon families particularly angry
- the Guise were assiduous in persecuting Protestants, e.g. 1559 burned Anne du Bourg at the stake
- the Guises remained in Catholic Church when others were deserting it; their clients followed them. This generated a similar drawing closer together of faction based around Protestantism

- after the Edict of January, the Guises set up the Triumvirate in alliance with Montmorency and St. Andre; this brought them the support of Philip II of Spain and by virtue of this may have been seen as traitors/opponents as early as 1561
- the Guises carried out the Massacre of Vassy, generally seen as the trigger for war – not the first such incident but the first in which a prominent figure was involved.

**Other factors could be:**

- growth of Protestant factions which began to practise more openly and attract more followers
- the general weakness of the crown after the death of Henry II, e.g. no heir of sufficient age to take the crown immediately
- the difficult situation of Catherine de Medici as Queen Mother who, although a staunch Catholic, was willing to negotiate with protestants for the sake of internal peace, recognition for her children and her own ability to remain as a ‘guide’ to them
- the financial problems of the crown which generated an unwillingness to intervene earlier before the conflict became too great
- Catherine de Medici’s seizure of power on the death of Francis II and the demotion of the Guises
- the failure of the Colloquy of Poissy to resolve the religious disputes.

Inevitably, the Guises’ swift response and taking control in 1562 left Catherine de Medici with limited scope for action because the issues were different for different areas of France.

The Guises may be seen as power hungry seeking their own aggrandisement or as guardians of the faith and crown; alternatively they may be the victims of circumstances beyond their control.

## 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**

Explain why Henry III was so important in determining the outcome of the French Wars of Religion by 1589.

#### **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.**

**Henry III was important because:**

- he was perceived as being a staunch Catholic
- his experience as King of Poland and his reputation as an able commander/good soldier/interested in the role of king suggested he was a person of some integrity and had the will to resolve problems
- the length of his reign provided some stability and the expectation that the religious troubles could be resolved
- he was seen as the last hope of restoring order therefore had initial support; political theorists of the time suggested monarchy was the answer to anarchy.

**But, for example:**

- he did not live up to the challenge despite a positive start re. the Edict of Blois and the Code Henri III in which he presented a series of controversial but strong proposals, e.g. eradicating financial corruption, streamlining government by reducing the number of

offices, dismissing the ‘old guard’ and appointing new men who owed their authority to him and might be expected to work for the crown rather than for themselves

- he was challenged by the Politiques and eventually gave the Huguenots freedom of conscience in the Peace of Monsieur 1576
- he presided over a deteriorating economy, increasing demands on finance and a refusal by Huguenots to pay taxes such as the decimes
- he did not provide an heir to the throne leaving Henry of Navarre in that position
- even the Catholic League and Henry of Guise appeared more attractive than Henry III to the people, resulting in a military struggle with the League and its supporters which eventually led to Henry III’s assassination and the succession of Henry IV in 1594.

Henry III’s failure to resolve the issues in France and the lack of respect in which he was held did determine the succession of a Huguenot turned Catholic (i.e. Henry IV) to the throne; it also made it more likely that a strong character would be welcome and royal authority be seen as desirable. It was never likely however, that France would be anything other than Catholic; even the shortcomings of Henry III and his predecessors was insufficient to shift a whole population; what France needed, and Henry IV provided, was strong leadership; even the Huguenots considered this important.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

##### **A: The Regency, 1715–1723**

Was the legacy of Louis XIV the most important factor underlying the difficulties of the Regency of Orléans? 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 main focus of answers should be on the range of problems inherited from Louis XIV's reign and the evaluation of these against any difficulties of Orléans' own making as well as any resulting from factors beyond his control. Candidates at higher levels are likely to appreciate the inter-linking of these aspects in their evaluation. The major areas in which Orléans faced difficulties might be seen as: overturning the Will of Louis XIV; upholding the authority of the Crown over the Parlements; implementing the radical financial system of John Law; resolving the dispute over the Papal Bull Unigenitus; the Polysynodie. Foreign policy is not a required part of the specification but candidates might include this and may be credited for it although it must not be expected.

#### **The legacy of Louis XIV:**

- the financial costs of his extravagance and, particularly, his warfare had left the Crown with a debt of over 3 thousand million livres and the Crown was on the edge of bankruptcy – tax revenue for the next three years would not cover even interest on the debt
- the terms of Louis XIV's Will: his distrust of Orléans meant he was to be subject to a Council of Regency for the 5 year old Louis XV with its head, Louis XIV's illegitimate son, the Duc de Maine, also in command of troops
- the issue of Jansenism: the Church was bitterly divided over the 1713 Papal Bull Unigenitus which Louis XIV had firmly supported; the Archbishop of Paris was in

prison; Parlement, claiming to be the defenders of Gallicanism, had not registered the Bull by 1715

- hostilities unresolved in the Treaty of Utrecht and France's military exhaustion.

### **Difficulties of Orléans' own making:**

- restoring the Parlement's Right of Remonstrance as the price of overturning Louis XIV's Will. Orléans, with the support of the Parlement, replaced the Council of Regency and overturned the legitimisation by Louis XIV of his illegitimate sons – including the Duc de Maine who had been head of the Council. De Maine became a bitter critic of the Regent and encouraged Court and ministerial faction thereafter
- setting up the Polysynodie which proved incapable of decision-making
- not appreciating the depth of feeling over Unigenitus so that his "compromise" Peace of the Church in 1720 did not resolve the issue of Jansenism in the longer term
- his reputation, making Orléans easy to criticise
- Orléans did not remain firm: e.g. Orléans resolute reaction when Parlement proved recalcitrant over the issue of registering Unigenitus and over Law's financial schemes – having three Parlementaires arrested; exiling Parlement to Pontoise in 1720, with the threat of even further exile, and the creation of new courts – was partially weakened when he sacrificed Law and his *Système* to gain Parlement's registration of the Peace of the Church
- underestimating the power of privilege to resist reform
- the setting aside of Louis XIV's Will also antagonised Philip V of Spain, excluded from the succession by the terms of Utrecht.

### **Difficulties which can be argued to have arisen from other factors:**

- Law's mistakes: his failure to appreciate the necessity of limiting the fiduciary issue – continuing to print paper money led to inflation and the loss of confidence; his deliberate overselling of the potential of Louisiana fuelled speculation in its stocks; Law had linked the Trading Companies to the Banque Royale which meant that both were brought down in the collapse
- the determination of the tax-exempt and officers to resist Law's Scheme: they were horrified by his proposals for all-class taxation and the ending of many minor venal offices
- the vested self-interest of rentiers and bankers whose resentment helped to burst the Mississippi Bubble: the huge increase in circulation of paper money in 1717 led to abrupt inflation which affected holders of fixed capital, whilst Law's proposal for the repayment of loans rather than interest would diminish the income of lenders and rentiers; the astute timing of the large investors' sale of stock. All of the privileged were horrified by some of Law's further proposals, e.g. all-class taxation; suppression of many minor venal offices

- as rentiers the Parlementaires were the most implacable opponents of Law's proposals; Chancellor d'Aguesseau's opposition to Law stiffened Parlement's resistance. Parlement also posed as defenders of those affected by inflation and those ruined by the crash of the *Système* in 1720. The hedging of the registration of *Unigenitus* with so many restrictions limited its effectiveness and enabled later Parlements to dispute its enforcement
- Court and ministerial faction played a part in the criticism of Orléans' policies, especially Law's scheme, and encouraged Parlement's resistance, e.g. the Duc de Maine and his supporters; some Court nobles resented the ending of the *Polysynodie* in 1718 and, together with Secretaries of State Dubois and D'Aguesseau, were critical of the Protestant foreigner Law's rapid rise to prominence and office; there was some Court intrigue with Spain
- the indolence of the nobility in the *Polysynodie*
- resistance in Brittany.

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743*****B: Cardinal Fleury, 1726–1743**

Examine the extent to which Cardinal Fleury had strengthened the French monarchy by 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 the strength of the monarchy in 1726 so that Fleury's effectiveness may be evaluated, for example:

- society's acceptance of Divine Right as the foundation of royal authority. By 1726 there had been no challenge to the theory that the monarch was absolute not arbitrary in the exercise of his power; and the monarch was held in respect by his people
- Orléans had restored the Parlements' Right of Remonstrance in 1715 and, although he had dealt firmly with their opposition, their potential remained and the issue of Unigenitus had not been resolved by Orléans' compromise
- the financial strength of the monarchy was the least assured – although Law had diminished Crown debts they were still considerable, and the flaws of tax exemption and corruption continued; the collapse of Law's scheme had left the markets nervous.

The extent to which the monarchy had been strengthened by 1743 can be challenged and Fleury's contribution argued as preserving – to an extent – rather than strengthening.

- Divine Right had not, directly, been challenged by 1743 but works such as Locke's Two Treatises on Government and, particularly, Montesquieu's Lettres Persanes (1721) had begun to have some effect on the thinking of the elite. Fleury had not banned these. Their ideas may have contributed to Voltaire's Lettre sur Anglais and the 1732 pamphlet Judicium Francorum. Even though the Parlement of Paris formally

condemned both in 1734, the arguments were ominous for the authority of the monarchy

- the authority of the monarchy was strengthened over the Church by Fleury reaffirming its tax privileges, and over religious belief by the upholding of Unigenitus. This was aided to some extent from 1731 by Jansenism entering its convulsionnaire phase (claims of miracles/emotion and disorder at a Paris cemetery), as a result Parlement did not criticise the closing of the cemetery and Jansenism lost some support
- Fleury can be seen as having strengthened the monarchy over the law and Parlements: 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. On the other hand Parlement continued to strengthen its position as the defender of Gallicanism against which it claimed as the Ultramontanism of the Crown
- foreign policy is not an issue covered by the specification but some candidates might comment on Fleury's adroit diplomacy and preservation of peace ensuring that military expenditure was manageable, and the Crown was not exposed to any loss of confidence as a result of military defeat. Again, not strengthening but preserving
- it might be argued that the authority of the King in government was maintained by Fleury being only a Minister of State rather than First Minister and the intendants continued effective representation of the Crown in the supervision of the provinces
- the Crown's finances were strengthened by Fleury's policies, e.g. the deliberate policy of reassurance through measures such as the restoration of coinage in 1726 and making regular payments on royal debt thus effective in increasing confidence in the monarchy's ability to meet its debt repayment and raise further loans. Creating the General Farm, grouping taxes and "farming" tobacco, increased Crown income and the loyalty of Tax Farmers. The policy of retrenchment – careful administration and rigid economies, especially in military expenditure, aided by effectiveness of the Controller Generals, le Peletier des Forts and, particularly, Orry (1730–1745) – produced the only balanced budgets of the eighteenth century. There was, however, no fundamental reform of the system which left the monarchy dependent on an inefficient tax basis and loans which could not support the costs of war, whilst the re-establishment of the power of the Tax Farmers was a retrograde step. Thus, the Crown's financial strength was somewhat illusory and the dixieme had to be imposed in the Wars of the Polish and Austrian Succession
- although the greatest wealth accrued to the financiers, from royal loans and contracts, rather than to the Crown, the stabilising of currency in 1726 had restored confidence in general which aided investment in the economy and overseas trade to the benefit of France. Thus a more contented, if mainly urban, population might be argued to have strengthened the monarchy
- Fleury, however, did not deal with the inequalities, inefficiency and corruption in the tax system. The opportunity for the wealthy to buy office and, hence, tax exemption meant that the Crown did not share to an equal extent in the increasing prosperity of France.

---

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

Examine the extent to which the Great Powers were prepared to co-operate over the Eastern Question in the period 1825 to 1835.

**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.**

**Summary**

The Eastern Question, i.e. the problem of how to deal with the decline and possible disintegration of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, threatened the Concert of Europe through two specific crises during the years 1825 to 1835. The first was the Greek question and the second was the Mehemet Ali crisis of 1831–1833. In addition the Eastern Question threatened the Concert of Europe because of the interests of individual Great Powers in the area which had repercussions for co-operation. Thus the decline of Turkey led to rivalry and suspicion between the Great Powers. However, war was averted (at least until 1854) through Conference diplomacy in the case of the Greek revolt and through a re-confirmation of the East/West divide and balance of power following the Munchengratz Agreement of September 1833.

**Approaches**

Descriptive narratives about the decline of Turkey, the Greek Revolt and the Mehemet Ali crisis are not in themselves useful. Answers must assess the impact of the Eastern Question on peace in Europe through a critical examination of the ways in which the Great Powers co-operated and compromised in an attempt to avert conflict within the period 1825 to 1835.

### **Impact of the Greek Revolt on the Concert of Europe**

There was a change in Great Power relationships, most notably:

- Austrian and Russian relationships were strained because of Russia's support for their Greek co-religionists
- the St. Petersburg Protocol (1826) demonstrated British willingness to work with Russia, an empire formerly regarded with suspicion because of her absolutism
- British intervention in the Greek Revolt deepened Anglo-Austria hostility
- France demonstrated her capabilities as a Great Power and maintained links with Russia through the Treaty of London (1827)
- despite tensions over the Revolt an independent Greece was a triumph of Congress Diplomacy
- the creation of an independent Greece represented a crushing blow for Metternich and Austria found itself virtually excluded from the Concert of Europe in the final years of negotiations.

### **Impact of the Mehemet Ali Crisis on the Concert of Europe**

Following the invasion of Syria by Mehemet Ali's (Viceroy of Egypt) son and subsequent advancement of Egyptian troops to within 150 miles of Constantinople the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire appealed for aid from the Great Powers. Only Russia responded directly with several thousand troops which forced Mehemet Ali to back down and retreat. The Treaty of Unikar-Skelessi (1833) was signed between Russia and Turkey with a secret clause which implied that Russia could demand the closure of the Black Sea Straits to warships of all nations. It was Russian intervention and the Treaty of Unikar-Skelessi which had the most impact on the Concert of Europe:

- Austria was determined to prevent Russia's independent action and signed the Munchengratz Agreement with Russia (September 1833)
- Prussia joined the Munchengratz Agreement a month later, reasserting the solidarity of the eastern powers
- Russian actions increased British and French mistrust of Russia's policy in the Near East
- the reaffirmation of the eastern powers led to Britain, France, Spain and Portugal signing the Quadruple Alliance (1834) as a liberal counterbalance.

### **Conclusions**

By 1835 the Eastern Question had created a great deal of tension between the Great Powers, but conflict between them had been averted by the desire to work through diplomacy. However, the ideological gap between east and west, autocracy and liberalism had been confirmed in the wake of the Mehemet Ali crisis.

---

**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 weak political leadership in causing the 1848 Revolutions in Europe?

**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.**

There were a number of political, social and economic triggers to the 1848 Revolutions in Europe and the purpose of the question is for candidates to judge the relative importance of one key political trigger, that of weak political leadership. Candidates should draw upon evidence from the Revolutions in France, Italy, Austria and Germany. More sophisticated answers may approach the question in a thematic way, whereas weaker answers may take a country by country approach.

**Political causes of the 1848 Revolutions*****Weak political leadership***

Europe's leaders were plagued by a lack of self-confidence and failed to intervene effectively to alleviate the social distress brought about by the economic crisis. Governments and regimes became discredited amongst the rural populations and urban masses and in essence voluntarily capitulated during the Revolutions. Certain monarchs and ministers attracted an exceptional degree of personal unpopularity – King Louis-Phillipe and Guizot in France, Metternich and 'Ferdy the Loony' in the Habsburg Empire, King Ludwig in Bavaria and Frederick William IV in Prussia.

### ***The specific circumstances of the individual cities and nations***

The first revolution of 1848 began in Sicily on 12 January and peasant grievances and liberal demands for freedom drove it from Bourbon rule. Revolution spread to Naples where demands for a constitution were granted on 27 January. In France, the uprisings in Paris were a spontaneous response to the government's decision to ban the great reform banquet meeting on 22 February. In the Habsburg Empire, Kossuth's demands for constitutions and greater Hungarian independence on 3 March encouraged student radicals to demonstrate in Vienna on 12 March and Metternich's incompetent handling of the uprisings led to his dismissal a day later. In the German states, the wholesale granting of constitutional demands followed the abdication of Louis-Phillipe.

### **Economic Reasons**

#### ***Crisis in Agriculture***

Acute potato blight 1845, failure of the grain harvest 1846, steep price rises in staple food stuffs (100-150% on average), producers of cash crops (cork, olives, hemp, flax) and of silk faced dramatic decreases in demand. Incomplete railway systems prevented the import and distribution of foreign grain to disadvantaged areas; food riots in Venetia, Verona and the Low Countries.

#### ***Crisis in Industry***

Crisis of overproduction 1845–1847 saturated markets, increase in unemployment, decrease in wages.

#### ***Crisis in Financial Sector***

A sudden rise in bankruptcies – especially among the *petite bourgeoisie* shopkeepers and wholesale merchants. Crippling levels of indebtedness for many industrial and agricultural producers, investment capital plummeted, rapid decline in all construction work (especially the French railways). Governments forced to borrow heavily to subsidise food prices or to pay for imported grain.

### ***Social Reasons***

Dramatic 30% growth in Continental Europe between 1800–1850 aggravated the impact of the economic crisis. Europe's peasantry faced land hunger and semi-feudal oppression (in the Habsburg Empire). Artisans faced hunger due to unemployment and those who still worked spent 70% on their income on food. The lower middle classes felt threatened by big business and faced bankruptcy. An over-expansion in higher education led to an increasing number of unemployed university graduates who turned to liberalism and nationalism in protest at their government's ineptness.

### ***Conclusions***

There is clear evidence for the collective incompetence of Europe's leaders and governments who failed to deal sufficiently with the serious social and economic crises that faced them and most were not on the brink of collapse in 1848. For example many historians argue that the fall of Louis-Phillipe occurred almost by "accident" and that the resignation of Guizot in France and Metternich in Austria represents a loss of nerve in the political leadership of Europe.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914*

#### **A: The Balkans, 1870–1890**

How serious a threat to European peace was the Balkan crisis of 1875–1878?

#### **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 was the most serious threat to European peace in this 20-year period, which did lead to military conflict; but there were concerted efforts by the major powers to control events, especially Germany, using various methods to defuse the situation and prevent any large-scale conflict.

#### **Evidence supporting a serious threat to peace:**

- the uprisings and rebellions from 1875 marked an emerging Balkan nationalism which would no longer be easily controlled
- the crisis signified a further step towards the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire which would fuel the ambitions of some of the major powers, with little sign of reform within Turkey and an internal power struggle. The Sultan was firmly convinced that Britain would not stand by and watch Turkey be dismembered
- this in turn would highlight the divisions and rival ambitions among the major powers:
  - Austria-Hungary – wanted to extend her control into the Balkans to resist the spread of nationalism to her multi-racial empire
  - Russia – saw opportunities through Pan-Slavism for territorial gains to extend her military and commercial interests
  - Britain – aimed to bolster Turkey to withstand pressure from Russia, and protect her interests in the Mediterranean and beyond
  - Germany – wanted to avoid taking sides, but would be forced to choose

- the Bulgarian atrocities of 1876 marked an escalation in the situation and forced the crisis onto the European stage
- the Russo-Turkey War (April 1877–January 1878) increased the likelihood of European interference and emphasised Russia’s inconsistent approach – while caution was the official Russian policy, Ignatiev, the Russian ambassador to Turkey, worked for unilateral intervention
- the resulting Treaty of San Stefano, with the creation of ‘Big Bulgaria’, was clearly unacceptable to Austria-Hungary and Britain, with the latter mobilizing troops and moving her fleet into the Straits.

**Evidence which could be set against this:**

- in the early months, as the Serbs rose in rebellion, the major powers seemed largely indifferent
- by the end of 1875, the main concern was to end the fighting through an assertive diplomatic approach, with the Andrassy Note and the Berlin Memorandum
- on the eve of war with Turkey, Russia managed to negotiate Austro-Hungarian neutrality
- after the Treaty of San Stefano, Russia knew that there was no option but to renegotiate – she was in no fit state for further military action
- the Congress of Berlin removed the threat of war, with many decisions reached even before it met, through the careful manoeuvring and skilful diplomacy of Bismarck and Disraeli
- the Treaty of Berlin restored the balance of power.

“Peace with honour” was achieved but nothing was solved and the hopes of the Balkan nationalities were disappointed. Relations were bound to deteriorate given Russia’s climb-down, but there was no major war for the next 36 years.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative E: The Balkans, 1870–1914*

#### **B: The Balkans, 1890–1914**

How important was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in explaining the outbreak of war in the Balkans 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.**

In isolation, one could not expect the assassination to lead to the outbreak of a full scale war, but of course the fatal shooting cannot be seen in isolation. Candidates will need to explain why, for some, this murder was very much the last straw, by analysing earlier Balkan events and by linking these to the international context.

#### **Factors supporting the importance:**

- the assassination could not be allowed to pass unpunished by Austria-Hungary (although arguably if the Austrians had taken swift retaliatory action, a European war might have been averted)
- the murder led directly to an unpredictable chain of events which followed at such speed that diplomacy had little chance to avert war
- the complicity of the Serbian government and support from Russia in 1914 resulted from the Bosnian crisis of 1908, provoking a significant over-reaction in 1914
- with Serbia's growth after the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913, Austria-Hungary took the decision to eliminate Serbia – the assassination was that all important spark

**Factors qualifying the importance of the assassination:**

- war might have started in 1908 as the Bosnian crisis provided an ominous forewarning of the events of 1914; on that occasion, Russia backed down, and could have done so again
- the Wars of 1912 and 1913 were successfully defused especially by Anglo-German co-operation; diplomacy could have worked in 1914
- for the 3 weeks following the assassination, there was little indication at all that Europe was moving towards a major crisis
- however, key events then occurred which were arguably more important in causing war than the assassination itself:
  - Austria-Hungary's provocative ultimatum to Serbia with a 48-hour time limit
  - Germany's 'blank cheque' of unqualified support
  - Russia's full mobilization
  - Germany's declaration of war on Russia and France
  - the significant influence of military leaders over politicians in controlling events.

Candidates should make the important distinction between a Balkan and a European war, and should assess the importance of other factors in the outbreak, including Balkan nationalism, Weltpolitik and the military ambitions of Germany, and international rivalry signified by two competing alliances.

---

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

Examine the extent to which Lenin had established Communist control over Russia by the time of his death in 1924.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

As the victor of 1917, Lenin's position as leader was never seriously challenged by colleagues until his death, but his struggle to establish and maintain Communist control was a difficult one. In October 1917 the Bolsheviks had carried out a *coup d'état* in Moscow and Petrograd and did not have control of the country. They dissolved the newly elected Constituent Assembly in January 1918 because it had an anti-Bolshevik majority. They then won the Civil War because they controlled the industrial and strategic areas, and because of Trotsky's Red Army and the disparate nature of the Bolshevik opposition. Ruthless measures like War Communism kept the Red cause alive. By 1921 victory over the White opposition and its many foreign allies was secured.

However, Communist control was not yet secure. Victory came at great cost. In order to keep the Red cause afloat in the war, the Communists had enforced the ruthless policy of War Communism, with its nationalisation and militarisation of industry and requisitioning of grain. This was so unpopular with peasants in particular, that there were serious revolts, notably in Tambov Province and at Kronstadt. Although crushed, the revolts showed that Communist control was not certain. Hence Lenin introduced the compromise of NEP with its toleration of private enterprise. However, this was accompanied by a tightening of Bolshevik control at the Tenth Party Congress in 1921. The ban on factionalism stifled debate within the Party except at the highest level. The policy worked in that the Russian economy recovered and discontent declined. Ironically opposition to NEP came from hard liners within the Party itself, disapproving of the concessions, but this opposition was not directed at Lenin or the Party itself.

Communist control was also gradually asserted after 1917 in other ways. Initially, local soviets had considerable power. However, mainly because of the exigencies of war and the need for unity, local power declined and the Party machine increasingly established control from the centre. Top bodies like the Politburo and the Secretariat became increasingly significant. The ban on factionalism simply completed the process of centralising power. The measures of 1921 were accompanied by the suppression of remaining centres of opposition to the Bolsheviks: the remnants of the SRs and Mensheviks who had survived the revolution were now arrested. The Cheka, established after the Revolution, was the sharp edge of the revolution and suppressed all real or potential opposition.

Kronstadt was the last example of open resistance to the Communists. However, their control was not complete. For example the Communists did not have a strong power base in the countryside: this did not come until collectivisation at the end of the 1920s. The Party was still establishing firm control over the republics which had started to go their own way at the time of the Revolution. But the Party was increasingly centralised and had eliminated all serious opposition by 1924. The ensuing arguments were conducted within the Party, but the Party itself was securely in control, at least in the industrial and urban areas.

---

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

Why were debates over economic policies so important in the struggle for leadership in the Soviet Union between 1922 and 1929?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

It is not surprising that debates about the economy were crucial to the struggle for leadership. The Communist Party was an urban-based, industrial party, dedicated to establishing socialism, the precursor to Communism and the classless society of the future. The economy was also crucial because of the situation following 1917. Already backward and disrupted by war, the economy had been further wrecked by the Civil War. The Communist policy of War Communism had provoked widespread unrest and had almost brought the regime down. Lenin had been forced to compromise with capitalism in 1921, and this, combined with the end of the Civil War, helped the economy to recover. But the growth of successful speculators and Nepmen, and a class of more prosperous peasants, was anathema to hard-line Communists. The Scissors crisis of 1923, caused by a disparity of growth between the agricultural and industrial sectors, showed that the economy was still not stable. When peasants proved reluctant in 1927 to sell grain to the state at low prices, the regime was forced to revert to food requisitioning. The peasant could not be allowed to hold the regime to ransom. There was also the issue of national security: the USSR had been under foreign attack between 1918 and 1921, and a weak economy might encourage foreign opposition again from countries which hated Communism and the threat of revolution exported from Russia.

All Communists believed in industrialisation, as the necessary precursor to socialism. The argument was only about the methods of getting there, not the end itself. However, the issue was complicated by the leadership struggle which followed Lenin's death in 1924. Supporters of a gradual approach to industrialisation were associated with the Right. Its leaders, including Bukharin, believed that by encouraging peasants to prosper would

gradually pave the way for industrialisation: rich peasants would be taxed and buy goods, and the profits would pay for industrialisation. This was too slow and ideologically dangerous for the Left, which distrusted the peasantry. The Left, represented by Trotsky, believed in rapid, forced industrialisation, the policy eventually adopted in 1928. Alliances changed and there was frequent manoeuvring: the Left, represented after Lenin's death by Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, was opposed to Stalin, who was advocating Socialism in one Country, but presented himself as a man of the centre. Stalin allied with the Right to defeat the Left, which was forced out of office in 1926 and 1927. However, Stalin then turned on his allies on the Right, notably Bukharin, and advocated hard line policies himself. The decision for forced industrialisation and a planned economy was taken and implemented from 1928. The Right was forced out of office and the leadership struggle was over.

It is tempting sometimes to consider the struggle for leadership in the 1920s as one just of personalities and personal ambition. This was certainly a factor. But it would be inaccurate to portray the economic arguments purely as cynical ploys to gain power. For most of the protagonists, the economic arguments came from deeply held views, even if some like Stalin appeared ready to change their position. There was bound to be a struggle for leadership after Lenin, because no clear line of succession or procedures had been established. Equally, there was always in Russia a debate about economic progress and the need to modernise Russia. These two factors were particularly intertwined in the 1920s. Candidates must consider how significant were the links between the two factors.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938*

#### **A: The Weimar Republic, c1925–1933**

Examine the extent to which stability and prosperity in Germany between 1925 and 1929, were dependent on foreign loans.

#### **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 apparent economic stability and prosperity of the period 1925–1929 and must try to assess the part played by foreign loans in bringing this about. Balanced answers will also look at other factors creating the economic “golden age”, and/or will question the economic stability and prosperity achieved. Some may legitimately argue that, far from bringing stability, the foreign loans were economically disastrous. It does not matter which view is taken provided a coherent and supported argument is presented which balances different viewpoints.

**An examination of the part played by foreign loans in the creation of stability and prosperity might include:**

- the influence of the Dawes Plan (passed August 1924) which reorganised the Reichsbank, reduced the burden of reparations by giving a longer time to pay and provided loans to aid recovery. The Young Plan of 1929 cut the bill further
- more money entered Germany through loans than left through reparations which boosted industrialisation and social expenditure
- real wages rose, standards of living increased. 5 years of economic growth and low unemployment
- American loans helped finance industrial expansion and scientific management and mass production were techniques introduced

- the government was able to sponsor public works schemes (football stadiums, opera houses) helping maintain high levels of employment
- the government was able to provide new welfare schemes (comprehensive unemployment insurance, 1927)
- loans encouraged the development of cartels – permitted greater co-operation between firms and industries.

**Relevant material on other factors leading to economic prosperity and stability might include:**

- the use of industrial tribunals and compulsory arbitration which helped maintain good industrial relations and reduce the number of strikes.

**Relevant material on the limitations to economic prosperity and stability might include:**

- middle classes never fully recovered from the hyperinflation of 1923–1924 which had destroyed savings and had been met by 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
- slow and erratic rates of industrial growth – 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%, 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 prices up and the cost of living rose
- powerful trade unions hindered progress and by 1928 tension between employers and worker was high (e.g. 1928 Ruhr lockout)
- welfare schemes were attempted without sufficient finance to support them
- reliance on short-term loans was highly precarious and not a sound basis for growth
- unemployment went from 2 million in 1926 to 1.4 million in 1928 but back to 1.9 million in 1929 before impact of slump – recovery was only superficial
- German governments had placed the country in a position where she was highly vulnerable to the Wall Street Crash in 1929.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative G: Germany, c1925–1938*

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

Examine the relative importance of the use of the law and of violence in the Nazi establishment of power between 1932 and 1935.

#### **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, and consolidation of, power 1932–1935 and will need to compare the use of legal methods and violence. These should be balanced against one another to allow for a reasoned argument showing the comparative importance of each element. Candidates may consider other factors (and balance these against the two mentioned in the question) and this can be credited as a legitimate approach, although it is not the expected one).

**The following material might be used to indicate the importance of legality:**

- Hitler came to power by legal means at the invitation of the President
- the use of decrees was legal and the Enabling Act was passed by the required two thirds majority. Many actions against opponents, e.g. banning of political parties followed normal legal processes
- Hitler acted as the legal statesman, e.g. in relations with Hindenburg and in establishing himself as Fuhrer and receiving the oath of allegiance from the army.

**The following material might be used to indicate the importance of violence:**

- the SA deliberately fomented trouble against the Communists and then claimed credit for helping impose order

- the Reichstag fire was probably encouraged by the Nazis and exploited to provide for anti-communist measures
- political and other opponents were treated violently and removed to aid the establishment of power (e.g. TU offices broken up)
- anti-semitic actions (e.g. boycott of Jewish shops)
- the SA was disposed of in the Night of the Long Knives.

**Candidates who examine “other factors” may refer to:**

- the economic circumstances and the effect of unemployment coupled with the Nazi economic promises and success to 1935
- the appeal to the nationalist right through Hitler’s attack on Versailles and the association of the Weimar Republic with wartime defeat
- fear of Communism
- the inadequacies of the Weimar governments
- Hitler’s own leadership and personal qualities.

In conclusion, candidates will probably suggest that violence did play an important role but that the apparent “legality” of Hitler’s actions was what enabled him to consolidate his power. Whatever the line is taken, reward according to the quality of the argument and depth of support.

---

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

Examine the extent to which Harold Macmillan's support for Kenyan independence explains its achievement.

**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 significance of Macmillan's support for Kenyan independence. What factors determined Macmillan's thinking in justifying this radical departure from the political norm and how did these factors compare in terms of their relative importance?

**The failure of political solutions up to 1957**

A number of attempts had been made to arrive at a political compromise before Macmillan became Prime Minister. The most notable of these was the Lyttleton Constitution which attempted to establish a joint power sharing system which included the indigenous black Kenyans and the Asian population as well as the ruling whites. This failed, as did other attempts, to set up power sharing structures. Macmillan was fully aware that compromise was not a direct solution to the problems Britain faced in Kenya.

**The role of the Mau Mau**

The Mau Mau had maintained a continuous terrorist campaign since the early 1950s. By 1959 this had been largely undermined through the aggressive tactics of mass arrest used by British forces in Kenya. Despite this Macmillan was influenced by Mau Mau activities. A good example of the influence of the Mau Mau, even in its deteriorated state, was the Hola Camp Massacre (1959). This had significant political fall out in Britain and was potentially very damaging to Macmillan's government.

### **Pan-African Nationalism**

Reference may be made to the ‘wind of change’ speech. Clearly Macmillan was influenced by the impact of wider African nationalism and he acknowledged its importance in this 1960 speech in South Africa. This detail could be linked to the role of Mau Mau in Kenya.

### **Economic Factors**

One of Macmillan’s priorities was to establish a sound economy in Britain. He quickly set up a cost-benefit analysis of the value of Kenya as a British colony. This concluded that the economic costs of maintaining Kenya outweighed the economic gains. Reference could be made to the Colonial Economic Development programme that Macmillan inherited and its apparent failure to deliver the economic gains that empire appeared to offer. In effect Kenya was not contributing to the wider role that Macmillan envisaged for Britain in terms of its international status.

### **Macmillan’s Priorities for Britain’s Future**

Candidates may consider Macmillan’s priorities in terms of Britain’s future. These could include Britain’s relationship with the USA, the role of Britain in Europe and the nature of British economic development and the place of empire within these. Candidates may suggest that Macmillan acknowledged the fact that empire in general, and Kenya in particular, was not delivering what Britain needed. Kenya was a redundant asset and Macmillan was willing to break from the traditional Conservative Party approach and recognise this.

---

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

How important was the part played by France's loss of Indo-China in 1954 in the achievement of independence for Algeria 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 what factors contributed to Algerian independence. The implication of the question is that the experience of having to grant Indo-China its independence either strengthened France's resolve not to allow any other parts of its empire to win independence, or alternatively, suggested that France's days as an imperial power were numbered. Particular reference may be made to the role of the military when considering the anti-independence position. These options must also be set in the context of other factors which also contributed to independence. These could include the role of Algerian nationalists (the FLN), French public opinion and the importance of new political thinking, particularly that of Charles de Gaulle.

- **The Loss of Indo-China:** Brief reference could be made to the circumstances, such as Dien Bien Phu, which damaged the Army's status. Links could be made between the defeat in Indo-china and the army's ruthless determination not to succumb to Algerian nationalist efforts. There is a wide range of material which illustrates the army's extremism. Answers may refer to military atrocities. Some may suggest that the actions of the army successfully undermined the FLN and neutralised it as a terrorist nationalist force. Others may have a reverse view and suggest that the army posed an increasing threat to France's stability, particularly after de Gaulle came into office. The only way to remove this threat was to end the issue of Algerian nationalism through granting independence. Reference may be made to the role and contribution of the OAS in this process.

- **The FLN:** Despite the apparent limitations of the FLN, particularly after the Battle of Algiers, answers may suggest that the FLN ensured that the momentum of nationalism continued. The tactics of the FLN in creating martyrs could be usefully explored and the impact of these tactics on deepening French military extremism. Consideration of the developing structural strengths of the FLN may suggest that it was a formidable terrorist nationalist movement which could not be permanently damaged. It was a popular and representative nationalist movement with considerable support amongst ordinary Algerians.
- **De Gaulle:** Charles de Gaulle's role may be considered as pivotal in the achievement of independence. He had an agenda that went beyond Algeria. He wanted to establish greater political stability in France and develop France's role as a leading European power, particularly in terms of the development of the EEC. Answers may suggest that his part in the process was crucial in terms of achieving stability by leaving Algeria and bringing in the army under some level of control. Links could be made to the specifics in the question by suggesting that without the experience of imperial defeat the army would not have developed into such a serious threat and this in turn would not have focused de Gaulle's thinking so clearly towards independence for Algeria.
- **French Public Opinion:** This is the consequence of the violence and apparent stalemate in Algeria. De Gaulle was particularly sensitive to this and the negative impact it had on the stability in France.

---

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

How important was Lenin's acceptance of 'peace at any price' in explaining the outbreak of the civil war in Russia in 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.**

Lenin was determined to end the war against Germany and, against the advice and wishes of many, negotiated a very punitive peace with Germany. Candidates will need to show understanding of the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and how they explain the start of the civil war. The terms were so severe that some Bolsheviks refused to agree but Lenin argued he had no choice but to sign. These included:

- Russia lost one third of her European land including her part of Poland that she had held since the Napoleonic wars, and the Baltic states – Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to Germany, Turkey took the Caucasus and Finland, Georgia and the Ukraine were to become independent
- Russia lost half her industrial capacity and had to pay six billion marks in reparations to Germany.

Some patriotic Russians joined the Whites because they opposed the government that had betrayed "Mother Russia".

There is no specific date that marks the start of the civil war and candidates may well consider this as part of their answer. In January 1918 the Bolshevik-Left SR coalition had issued a decree to set up a Workers and Peasants Red Army to meet the growing threat of counter-revolution, but nothing was done until April 1918 when Trotsky took steps. The White Guards were also forming armies, while foreign armies were establishing themselves on the borders. In May 1918 events became more critical when the Czech Legion (a group of

about 40, 000 Austro-Hungarian POWs formed to fight the Central Powers) feared they were to be handed over to the Germans by the Communists and revolted. They took control of a large part of Asian Russia then joined up with the Whites. In July 1918 the Left SRs left the coalition with the Bolsheviks. Two Left SRs began an insurrection taking Cheka chiefs prisoner and occupying key communication posts. The insurrection was crushed in three days. The civil war began in the summer of 1918 but had been preceded by months of armed resistance. There had also been several attempts on Lenin's life.

Answers would be expected to consider the relative importance of other factors that explain the start of the civil war making links between those factors and the Treaty where relevant. Other factors **might** include:

- the all-important issue of food: the new regime failed to end hunger despite promising “Bread” and this led to opposition. Under the terms of the Treaty Russia lost the Ukraine, a key “bread basket”
- the break-up of the Russian empire: some fought the civil war to secure self-government and others fought to resist the break up of “Russia, one and indivisible”. The Ukrainians and Georgians are known as the “Greens” and clearly link to the terms of the Treaty
- political opposition to the Bolsheviks especially after the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly created many enemies, e.g. Mensheviks and SRs joined the Whites when they were banned from the Executive Committee of the Soviets, June 1918
- Lenin's own role: candidates may well be aware of Dominic's Lieven's conclusion that Lenin actually wanted civil war in 1918. Lenin had made it clear, and he had support from some leading Bolsheviks, that he was not prepared to share power; though some Bolsheviks and other socialist parties (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries) were, to avoid civil war
- the role of the Allies: after the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk the British and French governments were willing to support any group that wanted to open up the fighting on the eastern front again, e.g. the French sent 7 million francs to the leader of the Don Cossacks, January 1918
- the Tsarists: e.g. ex-Tsarist General Yudenich formed a White Army of resistance in Estonia. This encouraged the Whites to come out openly against the regime. They had some important military support from other ex-Tsarists, e.g. General Denikin in the Caucasus, and Admiral Kolchak in Siberia
- requisitioning: the loss of the “bread basket” Ukraine added to inflation. Lenin sent out squads of worker, soldiers and Cheka to requisition grain and so made more enemies.

Candidates will need to evaluate the relative importance of several factors to explain why the civil war broke out and are not expected to consider every issue in this list. The answers may put great stress on “peace at any price”, or may focus elsewhere. One good paragraph on the peace and critical examination of other factors developing links to build coherence might prove an effective approach to the question.

## 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 weak political leadership explains growing political extremism in Germany 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 recognise the different sources of political extremism – the left wing and right wing. Many answers, especially good ones, will find different causes for political extremism at different times within the four year period.

Candidates will need to examine the issue of “weak political leadership” finding evidence for apparent weakness, for example:

- the system of Proportional Representation led to a succession of coalition governments
- the elections for both Reichstag and Presidency were destabilising
- the powers vested in the President, especially Article 48, weakened democracy
- conservative political tradition undermined new, democratic political leaders, e.g. the role of conservative judges and inadequate police/army loyalty 1919–1921.
- financial mismanagement culminating in the hyperinflation crisis in 1923.

Some candidates will also look at individual leaders – particularly Ebert in these years. Yet candidates should also see the political leadership as having strengths, for example:

- coalition government would prove robust, as under Stresemann

- modern historians regard Ebert's Presidency as a period of growing stability
- talented politicians and constitutionalists believed in the political system.

Candidates will need to examine some mistakes made by the political leadership, e.g. reliance on the Freikorps, leniency towards the right-wing opposition such as the "soft" sentence handed out to Hitler after the 1923 Putsch, and the government role in the Ruhr crisis.

Candidates will need to consider other reasons for political instability 1919–1923:

- Left wing opposition began in December 1918, some three weeks after the transition of power from the Kaiserreich to the new republic, with demonstrations. The Spartacists broke from the USPD to form the KPD in January 1918 led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. They were motivated by internal difficulties within the USPD, their revolutionary links with Bolshevism in Russia, and by social and economic grievances in the German towns and cities. The Spartacist revolt was crushed but strikes were common across Germany, and workers attempted to set up independent socialist republics. In the spring of 1921 the KPD was encouraged by Comintern to try to seize power in Saxony, but failed. They were only successful in Bavaria
- Right wing opposition focused on the terms of the Treaty of Versailles signed by the Weimar government in June 1919. They objected to the dictated peace, the variance with the 14 Points especially national self-determination, the war guilt clause and demilitarisation. The Freikorps and the Kapp Putsch were particularly incensed by the terms; assassinations of signatories such as Ertzberger and Rathenau by right wing opponents, and eventually the emergence of the NSDAP committed to revoking Versailles are all evidence of political instability caused by the Treaty.

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

- Left wing opposition – in October 1923 the KPD tried to seize power in Saxony and Thuringia. The army crushed the uprising
- Right wing opposition – an attempted Putsch under Major Buchrucker in North Germany was put down by the army
- Right wing opposition – Hitler tried to take advantage of Stresemann's unpopularity after the decision to end passive resistance (and apparently capitulate to the French and Belgians) by starting the Munich Putsch.

Candidates may well conclude that the political leadership was weak at times, but the economic conditions in Germany were so strained, and the political culture so anti-democratic, that it was difficult to prevent political extremism.

---

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

How important are the post-war treaties in explaining the emergence of fascism as a political force in Italy in the years 1919 to 1920?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates may well argue that the cause of the emergence of fascism lies in the years before 1919. Reference to the instability in Italy from 1915 is valid provided the focus of the question is sustained. This might include:

- the political situation on entry into the First World War. Italians and their leaders did not even agree on entry into the war. Prime Minister Salandra secretly negotiated terms for land in South East Europe before joining the Triple Entente and defaulting on the Triple Alliance. Giolitti wanted Italy to remain neutral, and his neutrals became the targets of street demonstrations and press campaigns. A strange coalition of Italians developed who wanted Italy to enter the war including ex-socialists like Mussolini, Nationalists, and the democratic left
- the experience of trench warfare hardened soldiers’ attitudes against war profiteers and industrial workers who stayed on the Home Front and gained from rising wages. Hence the fascist appeal for trenchocracy
- the events leading up to, and the consequences of, Caporetto. The defeat had massive domestic implications because the disaster was blamed on subversion of the war effort by defeatist and pacifist forces. The government restricted the anti-war labour movement and Socialist party so strengthening both and providing a target for the emerging fascists

- the government presented a better post-war world as a reward for Italian wartime sacrifices. This raised the expectation of wide-ranging reform, and so fanned instability when the reconstruction proved insufficient. The fascists were able to play on the resulting disillusion.

The post-war peace treaties added to the sense of betrayal and so fed into fascist hands: the peace treaty agreed at St Germain. At the time, many Italians claimed they had been badly treated in the “mutilated peace”, being denied Fiume and North Dalmatia. The treaty agreed at Versailles denied Italy any colonies in Africa. The Fascists could play on this feeling of national grievance.

The main focus of the essay explaining the emergence of fascism should be the years 1919–1920 as specified in the question. Candidates should explore a range of factors finding links between each and perhaps prioritising.

- social and economic factors helped the emergent fascists, e.g. food shortages and food riots in Turin 1917 where workers opposed the war. Fascists could point to ineffective government
- discontent among the industrial and rural workers led to increased membership of the Socialist Party. They talked of using force. Rising unemployment led to a wave of strikes – the Biennio Rosso (two red years). This provided an opportunity for the fascists to appeal to the industrialists
- the Fiume incident highlighted the bold action taken by d’Annunzio in contrast to Giolitti’s government
- political instability in the post-war elections.

The leader of the Liberal Government tried to find a way of working with the fascists bringing the party in to the parliamentary system, but Mussolini knew his strength lay outside parliament. Some historians believe Giolitti actually strengthened fascism rather than contained it.

Besides all these factors candidates will need to balance the political appeal of fascism, especially the character and role of Mussolini and the increasing use of terror and propaganda after 1919. The best answers will show understanding that fascism changed hugely across the two-year period, e.g. the emergence of a more popular party programme, increased use of violence to the establishment of squadristi by 1920.

## 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 was female emancipation in explaining population change in Britain between 1870 and 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.**

**Some typical answers which may be put for the importance of female emancipation:**

- the changes in divorce law (1923)
- the passing of the Sex Disqualification Act (1919)
- the growing use of artificial contraception amongst the middle class after 1918, e.g. Marie Stopes “Married Love” following on from their use of “natural methods” pre-1914, mainly abstinence and prostitutes
- the increase in working class women after 1920 finding means of natural contraception as well as growing awareness of artificial contraception due to wartime policies
- increasing job opportunities for women which enabled them to pursue independent careers without marrying or re-marrying and/or increased the desire to limit family size
- more opportunities at school and university level permitting greater female independence.

**Other explanations:**

- the fear of repeated pregnancies due to a very high peri-natal deaths between 1919 and 1939 due to poor diet
- the fall in death rates which accompanied the fall in birth rates
- the improvements in public health especially in support for pregnant women, e.g. maternity clinics in Birmingham, after the Great War
- the higher proportion of women getting married after the First World War

- the postponement of families due to wartime and therefore the loss of potential births to fertile women
- the impact of the post-war Depression and the Great Depression on economic prospects
- the economic decline of the lower middle classes post-1919.

## 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 was lack of innovation in the decline of the Cotton Industry in the years 1870 to 1950?

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

#### **Reasons why lack of innovation would be seen as critical:**

- the refusal of the weavers to adopt the more looms system in 1931
- the introduction of the Toyoda automatic loom by Japanese manufacturers in 1924. The impact of Japanese competition may be quantified by estimates of approximately two-thirds of lost British sales going to Japanese manufacturers
- the low investment in the 1920s due to low profits and high interest rates
- the decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton
- the growth of alternative fabrics such as Rayon in the 1930s which Courtaulds did develop too.

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

- detail may be provided on the rate at which the £ returned to the Gold Standard in 1925 (most commentators agree it was overvalued by 10%)
- the failure of the government attempts to encourage industry rationalisation, e.g. the Cotton Spinning Industry Act of 1936
- only £2.8 million out of the £12 million available under the 1948 Cotton Industry (Re-equipment Subsidy) Act was used by the mill owners

- general descriptions of the loss of markets such as India due to the First World War may also appear with reference to the increase in duty on imported British cotton during the First World War which helped the government of India to raise the money necessary to fund military expenditure
- renewed competition in the 1950s from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong
- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany had introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914 and that the United States also operated tariffs during the period 1924–1939.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941*

#### **A: America, 1919 to 1929**

Was the use of mass production techniques the most important factor in bringing about the economic boom of the 1920s? Explain your answer.

#### **Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers are expected to cover a range of factors for the boom between 1919 and 1929. Candidates will also need to show they understand what is meant by mass production techniques i.e. the use of an assembly line: workers repeating the same action. Cars/goods were produced more quickly. Ford opened the doors of his system c1913.

- mass production is most commonly associated with Henry Ford and the Model T. This was arguably one of the most important developments because it cut the cost of the car or other consumer good. Demand was further stimulated once the car or other consumer good became cheaper
- mass production of the car in particular led to booms in associated industries, e.g. rubber, gas, glass etc
- suburbs developed as did roads and hence infra structure
- advertising of consumer goods boomed

#### **Other reasons for the boom:**

- development of electricity allowed consumers to use labour saving devices and home radios and of course, producers, the production line
- consumerism stimulated the economy through increased demand
- cheap immigrant labour helped to keep industry costs down and was easily exploited by working long hours
- role of big business and entrepreneurs, e.g. banks loaned money, inventors created new products and people like Ford took risks

- advertising helped to create markets both in the US and UK, e.g. Hoover products
- expansion of industry and overseas markets helped to create a boom because the US could sell its products abroad and take over European companies and so expand even more.

However, the Republican Party, the first two presidents and Herbert Hoover in particular laid out the conditions for industry to do well through the stimulation of investment, and without this an economic boom could not have flourished.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative L: Inter-War America, 1919–1941*

#### **B: The New Deal, 1933–1941**

Examine the extent to which the USA remained in a serious economic depression at the end of 1933.

#### **Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

- context – candidates need to explain what is meant by a serious depression and the economic situation at the beginning of 1933. Also there needs to be an understanding of why there was a depression
- unemployment was very high; businesses were going bankrupt or laying off workers. There was a crisis in the banking sector. The price of farm goods had dropped and farmers were finding it uneconomic to pick crops. Also they were losing their farms through foreclosures. Workers were being paid less and less. Hoover, who was President at the beginning of 1933 had tried to bring the US out of the depression but his measures had failed to significantly alter the situation because he wanted industry to bring itself out of the depression
- the US depression was part of a world that saw many markets in depression such as Great Britain, i.e. part of a larger malaise
- the US could not export to their traditional markets such as Europe to get out of a slump
- when Roosevelt came in he offered hope to the unemployed and began emergency measures. These were known as the first 100 days where he shut down the banks and only opened the solvent ones. Also he repealed Prohibition in 1933. Candidates need to discuss the measures of the 100 days and then look at the impact that they had on the economy

- the banks opening and confidence in both them and the currency were the most basic results of the 100 days and this began to have an effect as it stopped the runs on the bank and encouraged people to make deposits. This had a knock on effect because as the currency stabilised so did the Stock Market. Also credit and lending could begin and hence help industry. The end of prohibition may be discussed because this had an impact psychologically, and on the grain and brewing industries
- however, the US did remain in a severe depression, although psychologically it was not as deep as before because people could see the government and Roosevelt acting
- arguably one of the most important reasons for remaining in a serious depression was that key sectors of the economy, such as farming, had not improved and in fact were getting worse because of increased production
- the problems in farming were deep seated, e.g. falling prices, mortgages too large etc. which took more than one year to solve
- industry was continuing to lay off workers in 1933 and so reducing spending power and therefore demand was falling because it took time for measures to filter through and solve unemployment
- some candidates may wish to argue that the problems were so immense at the beginning of 1933 that it was going to be difficult to lift every sector of the economy within a year. Therefore it was inevitable that the depression was still extensive.

---

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

With what success did William the Conqueror organise his baronage to provide for his military needs in the years 1066 to 1087?

**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 focus on the importance of William's military needs and the part played in this by his tenants in chief, but there are other aspects to consider. These include the exercise of royal patronage and the use of the system as a method of control and government. The system was also to prove dangerous to William, given the nature of the structure and it is necessary to consider the safeguards which he employed to keep these powerful men in line.

It is not expected that well-structured answers will concentrate on describing the feudal pyramid and the services involved in detail but some aspects of this may be included. 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 might be expected to refer to chronicles where necessary.

- **Military factors**

The nature of the conquest meant that William needed an army, but could not afford to finance and supply a purely royal force that was large enough (4000–7000 estimate). Military quotas based on land holding patterns were at the heart of the system.

The apparent timing of the introduction suggests that the need became paramount as threats grew (c1072, view of Orderic Vitalis). At first William was prepared to use influential Englishmen (Edwin, Morcar) but when this failed, he redistributed lands to provide greater military protection (north). The system incorporated castles held by appointed castellans and these were used as a means of extending the conquest, though

pacification and colonisation (the north, the marches), against native rebellion (York, Durham) and against invasion (Sussex Rapes).

Such roles were given to men of proven skill and military ability (Odo of Bayeux, Robert of Eu, Robert of Mortain, William fitzOsbern, Roger of Montgomery).

- **Other factors**

Land was given in return for service and this was the reward he had promised his followers (Lillebonne). The main beneficiaries were those who had supported William in 1066 (the Ship List).

A small group of less than 50 men held 37% of England (his half-brothers, fitzOsbern, fitzGilbert). This was to ensure much needed support.

The system also acted as a form of government which he was familiar with. It brought in revenue (incidents, Aids, scutage) and had judicial functions (honorial courts)

- **Control**

The system gave a great deal of military and political power to these men and it was necessary for the king to control their power through a series of measures.

The barons' compulsory attendance at 'crown wearings' (Curia Regis) at given times (Christmas, Easter etc.), and the king's judicial role there, underlined ducal and royal power.

The ceremony of enfeoffment (homage and fealty) set up a structured society bound by oath to the king and was necessary for maintaining order. The penalties for breaking such oaths was severe, both judicial (feudal penalties for felony) and social (nithing), and had been demonstrated since 1066 (Harold, Edwin & Morcar, the revolt of the Earls).

The Domesday Book underlines the importance of both military and financial functions of these men and gave the king necessary information about the extent of their power.

William made sure all important rear vassals homage to him (Oath of Salisbury) as a method of ensuring control.

Military feudalism increased the power of the monarchy (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle) and every vassal was a link in the chain that led to the king.

---

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

How important was the role of the Norman kings in the development of English monasticism in the years 1066 to 1135?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates would need some familiarity with the nature of English monasticism before the conquest but it is not envisaged that any real depth of knowledge would be required pre-1066. Answers should be focused on the condition of monasticism in England in 1066, the degree of change and continuity afforded by the nature of patronage, and the influence of monastic reform in Europe generally at this time.

At the highest levels answers will show understanding of the interaction of various factors and will be expected to arrive at a reasoned, well-supported conclusion. The range of relevant factors includes the effects of Normanisation, of increased patronage on the status and economy of the monasteries, the degree of continuity afforded up to 1135 and the beneficial effects of the new Orders, bringing England into the mainstream of continental reform.

Answers should be supported by a range of well-chosen factual examples and might be expected to refer to the views of monastic chroniclers where appropriate.

- **Royal Patronage**

There were not a great number of monastic foundations in England as a result of the conquest. It was not until the second half of the reign of Henry I that royal patronage really took hold. Battle Abbey was endowed by the Conqueror but it was unusual in that it was under the special protection of the ducal house; it was treated as the personal territorial church of the Conqueror, his profitable act of penitence for Hastings.

Cluniac influence was not strong in the first place as its strong monarchical constitution did not fit well to the needs of the Conqueror, but William Rufus was to endow the Cluniacs house at Bermondsey.

Henry I's main endowments came after the death of his son William (1120) and he patronised fashionable movements. There was some rebuilding by the Benedictines, settlement of Augustinian priories and new communities of Cistercians. Reasons for his endowments ranged from the political – organising tracts of land of uncertain loyalty (Carlisle, South Wales, Selby), to the penitential (Reading).

- **Aristocratic patronage**

The monasteries made much greater progress due to their patrons among the aristocracy. The first Cluniac house was that of Lewes, founded by William de Warenne (1077); others such as Roger of Shrewsbury and William of Mortain followed so that by 1100, there were 8 Cluniac foundations in England. Foundations were often used to mark a rise in social standing (Robert d'Oilly at Osney) – or to consolidate estates granted by royal patronage (Picot in Cambridge, de Clinton at Kenilworth).

When the reformed orders became fashionable, many of the nobles of Henry I's court followed the king's lead (Count Stephen, Furness). The Cistercian order in particular benefited because of their preference for 'desert' sites; such poor land was of little use to the barons but could be traded in for spiritual reward (Waverley, Garendon, Tintern, Rievaulx, Fountains).

Monasteries were also used as mausolea. In an age where violence was largely the norm, they eased a warrior's way to salvation

- **English patronage**

There was a native element to the founding of religious houses after the conquest. Monks went north after the harrying and refounded several houses (Jarrow, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Whitby, York, Melrose).

One of the most important foundations after the Battle was that of Bermondsey founded by Alwine Cild with the assistance of William Rufus

- **Change through time**

There were many changes in English monasticism after the conquest, not all of them beneficial, including spoliation of English abbeys, imposition of servitia, the impact of Normanisation and the violence and culture clash caused by the introduction of new liturgies; but within a generation English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of cultures. While English saints still protected their churches, English monasteries attracted endowments from colonists for whom they provided mausolea and Norman reformers collaborated in monastic revival.

---

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

How serious a threat to Henry VII's grip on power in 1487 were Lambert Simnel and his supporters?

**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 provide a balanced assessment of the degree to which Simnel's rebellion was a serious threat to Henry VII's throne. It is possible that some answers may pick up the implicit comparative focus on other threats that were more or less 'serious' than Simnel – done well this could be valid and effective. But the unmistakable core focus of the answer must be Simnel.

The key date 1487 puts the focus on the Battle of Stoke and events leading to it – but the assessment of Simnel's threat needs to be in the context of how secure, or not, Henry VII's grip on power was in 1485–1487. Many answers will see Henry as being already firmly in the saddle after Bosworth, able to consolidate his power swiftly and with relative ease. Others will see Henry as being highly vulnerable, especially in the early stages, so that any credible threat could have led to disaster. Explaining this context will be a necessary part of any judgement about the actual events of 1486 and 1487.

Analysis of the rebellion and its defeat at the Battle of Stoke might cover a range of factors.

**Arguments in favour of a 'serious' challenge could include:**

- Simnel did not need a very convincing claim to legitimacy because Henry Tudor's own claim was so weak in the first place
- Simnel's challenge came at the ideal time – early in the reign when Henry was at his weakest

- Simnel got backing from Ireland, where Henry then had little influence
- Simnel was a figurehead for powerful elements backed from abroad. The German mercenaries in his army were a significant factor; so was the energetic support from Margaret of Burgundy
- Stoke was a major battle. Looking back, Henry's victory might have seemed a foregone conclusion but Henry's small invading army in 1485 did not look a massive threat to Richard III until there were key desertions on the battlefield at Bosworth. Perhaps Stoke could have been similar.

**Arguments for the essential weakness of the Simnel rebellion might include:**

- nobody really believed he was who he claimed to be
- he had no major foreign princes openly supporting him
- the actual fighting at Stoke was one-sided and quickly resulted in decisive defeat
- the amazingly lenient treatment of Simnel after his 'high treason' showed how apparently unconcerned Henry was.

As usual, literal description of events will be of only limited value. Effective answers will have a consistent focus on assessment, supported by precisely selected analytical evidence.

---

**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 pursue his aims in domestic policy in the years 1513 to 1529?

**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 would be expected to provide a range of evidence, and to place Wolsey's domestic reforms in the context of the whole period between 1513 and 1529. Answers should also be able to explain the importance of the personal relationship between Wolsey and Henry VIII and thus the extent to which Wolsey was able to initiate and to control domestic policies. A descriptive narrative account of Wolsey's actions would be of only limited value. The framing of the question allows for many effective answers to focus exclusively on Wolsey as a central figure, arguing that he was the all-important co-ordinator of government – but some answers may score equally well by taking a wider view and differentiating between Wolsey's contribution as compared to other factors. Differentiation between the earlier years and the 1520s should also be rewarded appropriately.

This question requires analysis of aims, policies and outcomes. Some answers, often good ones, will show differentiation in defining what 'domestic reforms' Wolsey was attempting to introduce, and what were his motives. Most answers will provide an appropriate range of evidence about the implementation of these reforms. The key issue will be the assessment of the success, or not, of these reforms – and the extent to which they should be assessed as 'important'. (Many answers will make effective points here about the difficulties and obstacles Wolsey had to face and which influenced his success and/or failure).

**Relevant issues might include:**

- Wolsey's power and ability to dominate events, including not only the role of Henry VIII but also Wolsey's relations with the nobility – and with Parliament

- legal reforms, including the Court of Chancery, the enhancement of the Star Chamber, encouraging ordinary subjects to bring cases against great nobles, etc. (Some historians claim that Wolsey laid the foundations for the modernization of the legal system)
- economic reforms, such as the attacks on enclosure and engrossing (leading to the laws of 1514–1515, the national enquiry of 1517, and Wolsey’s climb-down when opposed by Parliament in 1523), and Wolsey’s campaign in favour of the principle of the ‘just price’
- financial reforms, including tax reform and raising finance for the Crown through parliamentary subsidies – this is likely to lead many answers towards an in-depth account of the Amicable Grant
- church reforms, including attempts to reduce clerical abuses, and measures to keep the Crown in a dominant position through taxes on the clergy and reforming the Church hierarchy – many answers may cover the dissolution of some smaller monasteries between 1524 and 1529; and the foundation by Wolsey of new seats of learning (such answers may also be quick to point out that Wolsey was not so much a reformer in this area as an evil example of the abuses that needed to be reformed).

There is a mass of potentially valid material here and answers cannot be expected to be comprehensive. Effective answers will apply selective specific evidence to an argued assessment of aims, policies and results.

---

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

How important was the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 in James's response to the problems posed by Puritanism in the years 1603 to 1611?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The problems posed by Puritanism in the years 1603 to 1611 should be outlined. This should be used as context for James's response/attitude to Puritanism and their actions in the period. There should be some direct consideration of the Hampton Court Conference but to assess its importance it will be set in the context of James's general approach to Puritanism.

**The problem of Puritanism**

Candidates should attempt some definition of Puritanism – extreme Protestants who sought the further reformation of the Church; the 'godly;' or 'elect' who through predestination could perceive themselves as better than others. Collinson has provided the most accepted definition of Puritans as 'the hotter sort of Protestants'.

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

Stronger responses will illustrate, however, that the majority of English Puritans were essentially moderate and James's swift recognition of this, coupled with his own pragmatism, shaped his response. Many might therefore argue that the problem of Puritanism was not actually that great in real terms, even if the potential problem remained.

## **James's response**

James was a Calvinist and thus had some sympathy with some of the Puritan agenda. Stronger answers will recognise that James responded to Puritanism as part of his general way of dealing with religion – moderation for moderates and persecution of radicals who posed a more serious problem. James aimed to maintain a broad church in which moderate Puritans, the vast majority, felt they could conform and would thus not pose an overt problem.

The Hampton Court Conference was part of this response. James wished to deal with the moderate Millenary Petition but also outline his general religious position. This would then be reinforced by Bancroft's Canons. Thus both should be seen as part of the same process – establishing a broad church but with the machinery to remove those who could really pose a threat.

In illustrating their argument candidates will make use of the following key 'events' of the period: the Millenary Petition; the Hampton Court Conference; Bancroft's Canons; the appointment of Abbot as Archbishop.

## **The Millenary Petition**

Distinction can be made between the potential threat of the petition and how it was shaped to appeal to James's authority. In particular the authors of the Petition (rather than being the work of a thousand it was actually mainly the work of Henry Jacob) wanted to stress to James that they were not Presbyterians. This was done through an appeal to his authority desiring him to lead reformation of the church. They stated directly that they did 'not aim at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical'.

## **The Hampton Court Conference**

James's immediate response to the Petition, but also to outline his religious position was the Hampton Court Conference. It was thus important in his response to Puritanism. James used it, by inviting only moderate Puritans, to shape what he expected. This was particularly clear in the 'no bishop, no king' episode where James made clear that he would never tolerate Presbyterianism. The most lasting outcome of the Conference was the King James Bible (1611). The vast majority of Puritans were happy with an English Authorised version. This was, like the Conference itself, another example of James's essential response being focused on maintaining his authority. By removing the need to use the Geneva Bible and its problematic, potentially republican marginalia James was shaping the language of political discourse open to Puritans. James saw the Conference as a settlement and was determined to impose his authority. Thus Bancroft's Canons were designed to do this and were thus part of the same process as part of James's response to ensure that moderates could recognise his authority and radicals dealt with.

## **Bancroft's Canons**

As a response to Puritans James was determined to separate the radicals from the moderates. Bancroft as a proto-Arminian was chosen deliberately as the means to do this. The key measure was Canon 36 which enforced the 39 Articles. By this 1% of ministers were removed from the church. This illustrates that most Puritans were moderate but also that James's church was so broad that most felt they could conform. That many of his 'Silenced Brethren' removed themselves to America or the Netherlands lessened the problem of Puritanism for James. As the measure to deal with all Puritans and a form of enforcement

candidates can justifiably argue that Bancroft's Canons were the most important part of James's response to the problems of Puritanism in this period. The maintenance of a broad church and the removal of radicals was at the heart of James's approach to religion and Puritanism.

**Abbot**

The appointment of Abbot in 1610 is symptomatic of James's maintenance of a 'Jacobethan balance'. A broad church would allow as many to conform as possible and thus not push many into opposition. Abbot was an orthodox Calvinist who had real sympathy with Puritans. That he could be Archbishop, alongside other bishops like the Arminian Lancelot Andrewes, was part of James's response to Puritans and all groups; a church to which all moderate Protestants could feel they belonged.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative O: Aspects of Stuart History, 1603–c1640*

#### **B: The Union of the Crowns, 1603–1641**

Examine the extent to which Charles I achieved his objectives in Scotland in the years 1625 to 1640?

#### **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.**

Charles's objectives in Scotland should be clearly outlined. In particular his priority was to assert his authority. This can be illustrated through:

- 1625 Act of Revocation
- use of Scottish Privy Council
- relationship with Lennox and Hamilton
- use of Earl of Menteith
- Charles's visit of 1633.

With regard to success Charles ruled effectively until 1637 and candidates can justifiably stress the lack of open opposition. Before 1637 candidates can, however, comment on a range of issues to indicate how Charles's rule, although superficially successful, created discontent that contributed to the rebellion after 1637:

- protests against Revocation
- Haig's Supplication
- Balmerino's Case
- clan feuding.

Candidates in particular should outline the nature of Charles's religious policy and why it caused problems in Scotland.

Religious policy was central to his objectives and reaction to his rule in Scotland. The Canons and Prayer Book illustrate his religion and desire for uniformity.

There may be some distinction about Charles's objectives across the whole period but particular focus will be on the period 1637–1640 for assessment of success. Better candidates will examine other factors as well as religion in assessing this post-1637 period. While fundamentally religiously based the covenanting movement was also a national reaction showing the self-interest of the Scottish ruling classes and their feeling of alienation and loss of power under an essentially English absentee king.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714–1802*

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

How important was the part played by British governments in responding to the Jacobite threat in the years 1715 to 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.**

Candidates should concentrate on the role played by the Whig governments in 1715 and 1745, and the military commanders whom they employed. However, they should contrast these with other factors in order to reach a balanced judgement.

In 1715, the new Hanoverian regime was far from popular with the general public, but enjoyed the firm support of a determined Whig government. Tory leaders such as Ormonde and Bolingbroke had fled the country under pressure from the Whigs, leaving the Tories demoralized and capable of little realistic opposition. The Whig government, with Stanhope and Townshend taking the main initiative, adopted a determined approach in the face of possible Jacobite activity:

- troops were raised
- an arrangement was made with the Dutch for further help if necessary
- the arms and horses of known Catholics in the London area were seized
- relatively few government troops were in Scotland, but these proved adequate to cope with the ineffective Earl of Mar
- when a West country conspiracy was discovered in late September, the government acted decisively and swiftly arrested the presumed leaders.

Candidates may make some reference to the role of government in dealing with the relatively minor incidents between 1715 and 1745. The arrest of Count Gyllenborg and the search of the Swedish legation effectively ended the prospect of Swedish support for the Old Pretender in 1718. Swiss and Dutch battalions were brought in to deal with the Spanish invasion in

1719. The Atterbury Plot of 1722 resulted in the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and the imposition of a large fine on English Catholics, together with harsh treatment of Layer and Atterbury. By 1745 the Hanoverian dynasty and the Whig oligarchy were much more securely established than in 1715. Main features of government role in dealing with the 45 rebellion:

- the British army was too large for the Young Pretender (although initially taken by surprise)
- the Duke of Cumberland showed ruthless determination in his pursuit of the rebels, culminating at Culloden
- George II's refusal to consider flight to Hanover was an indication both of his determination and his confidence in government preparations, and generally stimulated morale.

Candidates should contrast the above factors with other considerations, such as the unreliability of promised French support in both 1715 and 1745, the limitations of military commanders such as the Earl of Mar and the Young Pretender himself, the less than inspired leadership of the Old Pretender himself, and (not least of all) the weather.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative P: Aspects of British History, 1714–1802*

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

How important are the divisions between Indian princes in explaining the expansion of British influence in India in the years 1757 to 1785?

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

Substantial advances in British influence were possible during the Seven Years' War, with Clive determined to exploit any weaknesses among Indian princes. When the Nawab of Bengal, Siraj-ud-daula, attempted to take advantage of British pre-occupation to expel British influence ('Black Hole of Calcutta'), Clive's response was a series of victories culminating in the Battle of Plessey (1757), after which Siraj was executed and replaced by his disloyal commander, Mir Jafar. He in turn was later deposed by the anti-British Mir Kasim, but Mir Jafar was restored after Hector Munro's victory at Buxar (1764). On his return to India in 1765, Clive placed a British puppet on the throne in Oudh. With corruption in Madras leading to a major challenge to the authority of the pro-British Nawab, Hastings was sent to India to introduce reform and stability. He marginalised the position of the corrupt Nawab of Bengal, supported the pro-British Nawab of Oudh in the Rohilla Wars (1774), interfered decisively in a disputed succession in the Mahrattas against a pro-French candidate (1775), and acted decisively to protect the fortune of the Nawab of Oudh against the Begums (his mother and grandmother) in 1782. Most important of all, he had defeated a hostile coalition of Indian powers under Haider Ali at Bombay and Madras in 1780, after which he skilfully

split the coalition. Although his priority had been consolidated, the corruption, ambitions and unpopularity of native princes had opened the way for further expansion.

Thus in the early part of this period the rivalries and ambitions of the Indian princes was a major factor, fully exploited by Clive; in the latter part, native corruption forced Hastings to take a more expansionist role than intended, but once embarked on this course of action he followed Clive in deliberately exploiting divisions and rivalries.

The importance of divisions:

- Moslem-Hindu split militated against unity
- most princes sought links with one of the European powers, rather than seeking co-operation against foreign influence
- deliberate exploitation of divisions by Clive
- widespread nature of corruption left co-operation much less a priority.

Other important factors:

- the military/diplomatic skills of Clive
- the impact of the Seven Years' War
- the support of puppet rulers demonstrated by both Clive and Hastings
- the cautious/determined approach of Hastings
- the collapse of French influence.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841*

#### **A: Government Response to Poverty**

Was the Royal Commission of 1832–1834 the most important influence on the terms of the New Poor Law of 1834? 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 dates in the question are designed to focus candidates' minds on the role of the Commission in influencing the creation of the Poor Law.

#### **Yes it was important:**

- Chadwick and his colleagues were selective in the evidence they gathered
- it was difficult to argue with the apparently scientific investigation by Chadwick whose results had shocked the middle class
- the key decision on outdoor relief was put forward by the Royal Commission
- the act was framed on terms as suggested by the Commission.

#### **No it was not the most important:**

- the changing climate of opinion due to classical economists such as Ricardo and Utilitarians such as Bentham
- the ever growing cost of Poor Law rates meant an Act which would reduce these whatever the Commission said
- the expansion of the electorate and Whig government were influences on the change and of greater importance (without them – no Commission)
- the failures of the Old Poor Law necessitated administrative change and the Act was a response to widespread dissatisfaction, not to particular findings in 1832–1834.

Some candidates may argue that the Royal Commission was **effectively** the sole influence on the terms of the Poor Law Amendment Act. Such an argument can be valid if appropriately explained, e.g. by arguing that the key influence of, for instance Bentham, lay in Chadwick. However, in a wider context, the Act was the product of a multiplicity of factors and many will argue that the Commission merely set out to verify and support issues which were already clear cut and give credence to terms already decided upon, e.g. cutting costs; removing outdoor relief; centralising administration; establishing the workhouse system.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

#### *Alternative Q: Aspects of British History, 1815–1841*

#### **B: Religion and Politics in England and Ireland c1820–c1841**

With what success did the Anglican Church meet the challenges it faced in the years c1820 to c1841?

#### **Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the success of the Church of England in meeting the challenge of Non-Conformists and Catholics in this period.

#### **Evidence of success:**

- the Ecclesiastical Commission carried out many important reforms which helped to hold the Church of England together despite the rival attraction of Catholicism
- the Gorham Decision forced the Church of England to remain a broad church
- interest in religion was stimulated by the *Tracts For the Times*
- it maintained the High Church traditions of Anglicanism
- the work of Pusey
- it stimulated the interest of bright graduates in the Church of England – until the 1870s 50% of Firsts were ordained into the ministry
- Gladstone and many other High Anglicans in the Church of England and acted as major benefactors
- the Anglican clergy increased from 12 000 in the 1820s to 21 000 in 1871
- Rubenstein suggests that the Oxford Movement was a vital energising force.

#### **Evidence of limited success:**

- Anglicanism declined in popularity versus its main rivals
- both the Non-conformists and the Roman Catholics were emancipated
- the conversion of Newman to Roman Catholicism increased internal strife
- Wesley and the Methodists had already stimulated a renewal

- the influence of the Clapham Sect
- the key role of evangelical writers in increasing the output of Christian works
- Ker, in his biography of Newman, makes the point that the Tractarians deepened the divisions within the Anglican Church in the period prior to Newman's conversion because evangelicals were suspicious of what they saw as incipient "popery".

## 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 important were the parts played by David Lloyd George and Winston Churchill in putting ‘New Liberalism’ into practice 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 should focus on an assessment of the importance of contributions of both Lloyd George and Churchill in the work of the Liberal governments from 1906 to 1915 in putting ‘New Liberalism’ into practice. This involves making some definition of the concept. Essentially it entailed breaking away from Gladstonian Liberalism with its emphasis on the rights and responsibilities of the individual to add a considerably more active role for the state and government in dealing with social deprivation and the drive for national efficiency through social/welfare reforms. Initially the Liberal government of Campbell-Bannerman from 1906 had no overall programme of reform and the early ‘welfare’ legislation, such as the Merchant Shipping Act and Workmen’s Compensation Act continued late nineteenth century trends. However, the government responded (as the Conservatives had not done) to the concerns about the health, diet, and to some extent living conditions, of the nation, and particularly those of the working classes (e.g. condition of recruits in the Boer War, 1904 government enquiry on *Physical Deterioration*, revelations of Booth and Rowntree). Reform was aimed mainly then at the young with measures which were largely reactive to conditions.

The main initial measures were:

- the ‘Children’s Charter’ (health and care of children, juvenile courts, borstals and ban on sale of tobacco to those under 16)
- introduction of school meals
- medical inspection in schools.

These measures were not initiated by Lloyd George or Churchill, but they were relatively young M.P.s who backed the measures. Their opportunity to put ‘New Liberalism’ into practice came under Asquith’s ministry from 1908 with Lloyd George at the Treasury and Churchill at the Board of Trade. Between them they were the driving forces for introducing the most significant of the Liberal welfare reforms. Lloyd George was directly responsible for the most important of all:

- Old Age Pensions (1908)
- National Insurance (1911)
- provisions in his ‘People’s Budget’, not least in the objective to raise revenue to support the non-contributory pension scheme. (National Insurance had employer and employee contributions as well as those from the state.)

Churchill was directly responsible for:

- limiting the hours of miners (1908), the first time a government had legislated in this respect for men (as opposed to women and children)
- limiting shop assistants’ hours of work (mainly through half-day closing)
- introduction of the Trade Boards to determine minimum wages in the sweated workshops
- introduction of Labour Exchanges.

Churchill’s role in promoting welfare reform and thereby the New Liberalism approach to domestic issues essentially came to an end when he went to the Admiralty, though as a member of the cabinet he continued to have collective responsibility for government policies. Lloyd George’s influence on domestic matters, and especially welfare reform and the drive for national efficiency, lasted through to the First World War. However, further welfare provisions (e.g. improved health and maternity care), which were enacted partly under the auspices of DORA, came largely after 1915. Responses may question the extent of reform and thus the importance of the parts played by Lloyd George and Churchill in implementing New Liberalism. There were limitations to the effectiveness of some of the reforms and extent of government action, for example:

- conditions for receipt of a pension limiting the number eligible
- National Insurance payments beginning only in 1913
- housing improvement largely ignored
- the Poor Law retained.

On the other hand social service spending doubled over the period from 1906–1915. Undoubtedly Lloyd George and Churchill were the main instigators of important and original (for Britain) welfare measures in the central crucial period of 1908–1911. However, their new Liberal approach had the support of Liberal governments during the whole period and especially under Asquith from 1908. The measures for children did, however, come in the earlier years of Liberal government before Lloyd George and Churchill became highly prominent in major cabinet posts. Undoubtedly these two politicians were responsible more than any other individuals for translating the concept of “New Liberalism” into concrete actions by government affecting and improving the lives of large sections of the under-privileged and poor in Britain. There were also Party political considerations in the motivation for reform, especially noticed by Lloyd George, in the competition for the working-class votes with the emerging Labour Party, which looked to government and the state for measures to improve conditions for the working classes.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative R: Aspects of British History, 1895–1921*

#### **B: Unionism and Nationalism in Ireland, c1895–1921**

How important were the conflicts in the years 1918 to 1921 in explaining the decision to partition 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.**

Focus should be on events and developments from 1918 to the 1921 ‘Settlement’/compromise of Partition. The violent conflict had begun with the 1916 Easter Rising, but some may argue that the pre-1914 tension between Ulster Unionists and nationalists (of various kinds) meant that only partition was a possible realistic outcome in Ireland. Unionists would not accept Home Rule and nationalists would accept nothing less, with many demanding complete (republican) independence from Britain especially from 1916. The events and developments from 1918–1921 finally determined the precise nature of a compromise, which had its roots stretching back to before the end of the First World War. The 1916 Rising was by a small group of Republicans including Connolly and Pearce. They demanded total independence from Britain. The Rising was soon defeated, but the British government made the crucial mistake of executing, and thereby making martyrs of, 15 leading rebels in Kilmainham Gaol. As a result, by the end of the war, Sinn Fein, which had made little headway until that time, gained extensive support. Its leader, Eamon de Valera, who had been involved in the Easter Rising, and Michael Collins, who was to lead the fighting against British forces, both wanted nothing short of a totally independent Republic. Home Rule was no longer an option for them. Their opportunity to show the new mood amongst most of the Irish electorate came with the General Election following the end of the First World War. The most significant events and developments over the following three years included:

- the election of 73 Sinn Fein Members of Parliament in the 1918 ‘Coupon’ Election
- the reduction of Redmond’s Irish Nationalist M.P.s to just seven

- 
- the Sinn Fein members' refusal to go to Westminster and their formation of the Dail in Dublin instead
  - during 1919 the de facto existence of two rival governments, one in Westminster and the other in Dublin sitting in uneasy co-existence
  - the Ulster Unionists' determination, continued from pre-1914, not to accept any change in the political status of Ireland, not even Home Rule and certainly not an Irish Republic. The greater demands made for a republic intensified Unionists' determination to resist with force
  - the decision of Lloyd George's Coalition government in 1920 that it must suppress what was an illegal Sinn Fein government and its military support, the Irish Republican Army (IRA) previously called the Irish Volunteers
  - the tactic of violent repression by the British government in using the irregular Black and Tans, and 'Auxis', as well as the regular army
  - failure of either side to win 'militarily' leading to stalemate
  - Lloyd George's decision to find a political solution based on partition, given the irreconcilable positions of Unionists and nationalists. Politically he headed a coalition containing not only Liberals like himself, who had previously been committed to Home Rule, but also members of the now stronger 'Conservative and Unionist' Party, a political reflection in Britain of the division within Ireland
  - the 1920 Government of Ireland Act, which divided Ireland into six counties in the north with a government in Belfast and the other 26 counties with a government in Dublin. This was Home Rule for both parts of Ireland, but with Westminster still in overall control. The solution was accepted in Northern Ireland (paradoxically as this was the only part of Ireland to adopt Home Rule in the end), but rejected in the south
  - Sinn Fein's rejection of separation of six counties in Ulster, as well as continued control by Westminster
  - recognition of the realities in the north by Collins and Griffiths who negotiated a final agreement with the British government by the end of 1921. The 26 counties became the 'Irish Free State' with dominion status, but with some ports still under British control. There was de facto acceptance of the six Ulster counties' exclusion. Final agreement was both an achievement for Lloyd George and a problem as the head of a Conservative dominated coalition
  - the division in Sinn Fein with De Valera refusing to accept the Treaty. Civil war followed for over a year in the new 'Irish Free State' before the 1921 Settlement was accepted, at least for the time being.

Clearly the conflicts in Ireland between 1918 and 1921 played a crucial role in leading to Partition. There was no practical possibility that the whole of Ireland could remain as a single political unit. However, the conflicts had stemmed to a considerable extent from the 1916 Rising and its suppression and, it can be argued, from long-standing political, economic, religious and cultural divisions in Irish society. The use of force by both sides (or all three if the Unionists and Ulster Volunteers are included) was crucial in determining the decision to partition Ireland as the solution, but also its form. Military stalemate led to

compromises. Also crucial were the parts played by leading politicians from 1918–1921 including Lloyd George, Bonar Law, De Valera, Collins, Carson and Craig. The 1916 Rising was perhaps the catalyst for the divisions in Irish society and politics leading to open conflicts, and the decision for partition as the outcome in 1921.

---

**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 relative importance of domestic industry and of agriculture to the British 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.**

**Focus of the question**

The question asks candidates to examine the importance of domestic industry in the British economy. On a simple level this can be presented as a comparison with agriculture in terms of employment and wealth creation. It is also possible to place domestic industry in the proto-industrial debate and consider the extent to which it contributed to widespread economic growth and industrial change.

**Evidence of domestic industry being important:**

- domestic industry; production within the home for sale rather than private use was widespread. Woollen cloth was produced in East Anglia, the Cotswolds, Essex and Yorkshire. Silk was produced in London and Coventry, straw plaiting was done in Bedfordshire, lace making in the East Midlands and Devon, fustian in Lancashire, tin toys and small arms in the West Midlands. These industries provided employment in areas where employment on the land due to pastoral farming was limited
- production in domestic industry provided for wealth creation. Although difficult to quantify, goods were for the export market and brought wealth into the country. They also provided the workers with money to buy agricultural products which stimulated agricultural change and specialisation. Without the support of such domestic production population growth could not have been sustained

- historians who support the proto-industrial model demonstrate that its four main features: production for extra-regional markets, cheap labour which made no demands on fixed capital, creation of a market for food and the stimulation to trade and commerce were essential for later industrialisation.

**Evidence of the importance of agriculture:**

- England was primarily an agricultural economy. Most people were employed primarily in the production of food, most domestic industry was used as a supplement to employment in agriculture. Wealth was created through the ownership and exploitation of landed property. Landed property was used to underpin investment in industrial change. The export of wheat was significant.

**Evidence against the contribution of domestic industry:**

- There is limited correlation between areas of domestic production and later industrialisation. Yorkshire and Lancashire may have seen their textile industries develop from the putting out systems of the 1700s but other areas such as the Cotswolds, East Anglia and Essex failed to develop. It is not the case that domestic industry was the platform for later development.

**Overall**

The overall conclusion is likely to be that domestic industry provided an important source of income to supplement income for agriculture and was significant in terms of the wealth created through exports but in wider economic terms it was much less important than agriculture in 1750. The correlation between domestic industry and later economic growth is debateable.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

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

Examine the degree to which working practices changed for the worse for the working classes 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.**

The focus of this question is working practices. The traditional view is that working practices declined dramatically due to the advent of factory production. This view is clearly focussed on those who were employed in such industries. This question should encourage candidates to examine the wider issues of employment to recognise the regional differences, gender differences and the differences between the skilled and unskilled.

#### **Significant decline in working practices:**

- the employment of young women and children in textile mills represented a significant break with the past. The conditions and hours worked alongside the mechanisation of production are well-documented and clearly forced significant legislation to be passed to prevent the exploitation of these groups in factories and mines. The legislation was mainly passed outside the period of the question
- the working practices of men employed in domestic industry, handloom weavers, framework knitters and those employed in cropping shops were undermined by the mechanisation of production to the point where their skill was compromised and to continue in their employment they needed to work longer hours for lower wages
- women employed in agriculture found the role in the fields was limited by the replacement of the sickle by the scythe. This central role in harvesting saw female labour replaced by male labour. Male labour in agriculture was also affected by the

changes to living in and, in the Speenhamland counties, the reduction of employment and the introduction of roundsmen systems etc.

- for skilled workers conditions may have improved, certainly the wages available to such workers saw a considerable increase. Whilst many in supervisory roles may have experienced the poor conditions of mills their actual working practices may not have actually deteriorated. Skilled engineers and draughtsmen were the elite and were protected from the worst excesses of exploitation
- over the period conditions in factories did improve as machinery became more secure and the balance of employment moved away from the pauper apprentices to more skilled employment and the employment of adults
- women involved in dairy production enjoyed good conditions and their working practices were unchanged. Little of this type of employment was affected by mechanisation. Living in opportunities still continued. Not all regions experienced a decline in agricultural practices, the market gardening around London remained a major employer as did agricultural production in areas around the industrial cities, living in continued in East Yorkshire until the First World War. Mechanisation of threshing and ploughing did not occur in a major sense until after 1830.
- for the bulk of the working classes employed outside of the industrial processes little changed during the period 1780 to 1830. Wage labour increased but the majority of those employed in trade, transport and manufacture of goods such as shoes, furniture, pottery experienced very similar working practices to those employed in similar areas prior to 1780.

### **Overall**

Whilst it is possible to argue that working conditions changed for the worse for the working classes this is to take a narrow view. The wider perspective would suggest that for the majority of those employed for wage labour outside of the industrial areas conditions did not alter dramatically in the period 1780–1830. Significant change occurred later in the nineteenth century.

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

Was utilitarianism the main reason why the Whigs introduced so many reforms in the 1830s? Explain your answer.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2*

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should consider the motives behind the Whig reforms of the 1830s. The reforms specifically identified in the specification are the Factory Acts, the Poor Law Amendment Act and the Municipal Corporations Act. Answers should explicitly consider the motives behind each of these three acts to achieve balance. However, whilst all three pieces of legislation should be assessed and a range of motives considered, it is not expected that each piece of legislation will be assessed with reference to all three motives – a motive based analysis drawing on examples from the legislation as appropriate would be suitable.

Candidates should consider a range of motives, though the three most significant identified in the specification are the influence of the consequences of the utilitarian movement 1832 Reform Act and the influence of the humanitarian movement.

**1** The **Utilitarian principles** of Bentham (the greatest good of the greatest number):

- 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
- these principles can be seen at work in the drive for efficiency that the Poor Law Amendment Act represents
- they are also seen in the narrow conception of the causes of poverty that the Benthamites accepted. They believed that the vast majority of poverty was caused by idleness and therefore the idle poor should be removed from the community, receiving relief only in workhouses, where conditions should be worse than outside to encourage people to work – the principle of ‘less-eligibility’
- the presence of Benthamites like Chadwick, Bishop Sumner, Bishop Blomfield, Bourne and Lewis on the 1832 Poor Law Commission are significant, as they placed great emphasis on utilitarian principles like uniformity.

**Judgement may take the form of:**

- prioritising the motives
- arguing that politicians are more concerned with being elected than any general principles like utilitarianism
- answers may also challenge the relevance of certain motives, for example the reality of the 1833 Factory Act was that unscrupulous owners easily circumvented the Act, as there were only four unpaid overseers for the whole country. It is difficult to see humanitarian influence behind the **1834 Poor Law Amendment Act**. The commissioners were **utilitarians**, not humanitarians; the principle of less eligibility made the workhouse the very last resort for any right-minded person, where humiliating and degrading conditions existed. Husbands were separated from wives, regardless of age, work was hard (picking apart old ropes etc.) and at Andover inmates were found to be eating ground up bones.

**2 The consequences of the 1832 Reform Act may be considered:**

- the 1832 Reform Act had established a principle of uniformity in political institutions, which was now applied in other areas – this led to the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act
- representation for new cities (cities could apply for corporation status) was first seen in the 1832 Reform Act
- destruction of previous Tory dominance was also first seen in the 1832 Reform Act, with the Whigs reforms benefiting themselves – exactly the same thing was seen with the destruction of the Tory dining clubs that had been municipal government

- there is also the possibility that the Reform Act transferred **political power** from the land-owning elite to the **middle-classes** and therefore reforms reflected their concerns and interests – it is possible to see the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act in this light, given the savings in local rates paid by the middle class compared to what they paid under the inefficient and expensive Speenhamland system – the effect of the Act was to reduce the bill for poor relief from £7 million to £4.5 million

**3 Humanitarianism** was also a key factor:

- there was a growing influence of **humanitarian thinkers and campaigners** both inside and outside Parliament
- humanitarianism was a factor behind the **1833 Factory Act**, with its attempts to prevent the exploitation of children
- children under nine were banned from working in the factories, those aged between nine and thirteen had their hours limited and two hours of compulsory schooling had to be provided
- the Act certainly was not passed for any party political reasons, as the newly enfranchised middle-class factory owners, natural allies of the Whig governments, would lose out by the measure
- the compulsory registration of births in 1836 might be used as evidence that the former measure was a genuine attempt to tackle the issue of child labour.

## 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 disagreement among Chartists over their aims in explaining why their campaigns failed 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. The Chartist aims were the six points of the famous Charter, namely

- secret ballots
- universal suffrage
- equal constituencies
- annual elections
- payment for MPs
- the abolition of the property qualification for MPs.

Where reference is made to the aims, answers should demonstrate secure understanding of the terms, but thematic considerations of reasons for failure are appropriate, rather than necessarily taking each of the aims in turn. Some answers may address specific reasons for the failure of each wave.

**Possible reasons for failure include:**

**The divisions within the movement over aims**

- reference is likely to be especially made to the division between ‘physical’ and ‘moral’ force Chartists, between Fergus O’Connor and William Lovett and between

North and South. 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 middle-class takeover of popular radicalism. Lovett supported the CSU, but even his supporters in London backed 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
- the Chartist movement was also divided between geographical regions generally, 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. This was because individual regions had slightly different grievances.

### **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 of the Corn Laws and ensured cheap food, whilst a Factory Act restricted hours of work of women and children. For those supporters of Chartism as a 'knife and fork' movement in response to economic depression and unemployment, the government was addressing their concern. Furthermore, the ending of import duties was a great symbol of government intervention for the good majority
- 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 failure to win over Parliament**

- 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
- the reformed **House of Commons was still dominated by aristocratic interests**. Having created an aristocratic/middle class alliance in 1832, the aristocracy were keen to prevent any further reduction in their power. The unchanged power of the aristocracy in the House of Commons (in the 1841 election, 71% of MPs returned were British Landed Elite) meant that the House happily rejected the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> petitions. Thomas Babbington Macauley was a key opponent of the second petition in 1842, despite having been in favour of reform in 1832.

### **The divided nature of radicalism**

- 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, Trade Unions).

**Judgement may take the form of:**

- prioritising the motives
- arguing that certain factors have been over-exaggerated, for example, the gap between O'Connor and Lovett is not as wide as may first appear – 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
- arguing that Chartism was essentially motivated by economic suffering in periods of unemployment and depression was therefore of little significance once the economy improved, or that the government never had its monopoly of physical force challenged, or that Chartism had too narrow a base of support to succeed.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951*

#### **A: The Making of the Welfare State, 1942–1951**

Examine the extent to which the National Health Service of 1948 was the product of wartime ideas and policies on health and welfare.

#### **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 involves candidates in assessing the degree to which the National Health Service was the product of wartime ideas and policies as compared with other factors. Candidates might begin their answer by outlining the concept and structure of the National Health Service which became effective in the summer of 1948. They might bring out its key principles of universalism, comprehensiveness and treatment free at the point of need as well as referring to the structure which delivered these principles, e.g. the nationalisation of hospitals, local health boards, the vast majority of the medical profession within the system, etc. They may well contrast this with the variations, complexity and inadequacy of the system before the Second World War.

In considering the extent to which the NHS was the product of wartime ideas and policies candidates may refer to some or all of the following general points:

- the greater sense of national unity and need for greater equality which the war encouraged
- how mass evacuation of children during 1939–1941 made the middle classes more aware of the poor health of the lowest income groups
- how the war encouraged a more favourable attitude towards State planning and State run services.

More specifically, candidates may refer to some or all of the following:

- the reorganisation of hospitals in London and other major cities in the early 1940s under the threat of mass bombing and worries about huge civilian casualties
- the unification of public and voluntary hospitals by 1943 which became part of the consensus for health reform after the war
- the widening of the scope of health insurance in 1942 to cover about half the population
- the creation of a National Blood Transfusion Service
- the work of the Ministry of Food under Lord Woolton further emphasised the role of the State in health promotion.

Well-informed candidates would probably also make reference to ideas which from 1942 onwards began to shape the form of the post-war health system, for example:

- the Beveridge Report published in December 1942 with its argument that a comprehensive health service would be a necessary part of any social policy designed to end poverty
- candidates may stress the great impact of Beveridge with over 600,000 copies bought during the war years
- the White Paper published by the Ministry of Health in February 1944
- the draft legislation drawn up by the Conservative Minister for Health in the War Coalition, Henry Willink
- both the above proposed a free, comprehensive health service.

Very good answers might differentiate however, between some of the proposals in the Willink scheme and Bevan's NHS, especially in regard to the administration of the NHS, its relationship with doctors and consultants and the continuance of private practice.

Other factors which helped create the NHS which candidates might consider would include:

- memories of the inadequate and uneven access to health care in the interwar period especially in areas of high unemployment
- the pent up demand for medical treatment of all kinds which resulted from these defects can be seen in the figures for treatment of patients and the numbers of patients going to GPs, dentists and opticians in the first working year of the NHS.

However, candidates might argue that although the above factors created a desire for, and expectation of, a reformed health service which would be more comprehensive and universal than before 1939, the actual system constructed between 1945 and 1948 owed much to the work and vision of Aneurin Bevan.

- the views of Bevan, based on his experiences in South Wales, the arguments of the Socialist Medical Association and his passionate commitment to a free, universal and comprehensive health system of social medicine, were crucial to the NHS which finally emerged
- Bevan's skill in either overcoming or in compromising with the opposition of the BMA
- these compromises especially over the issues of private practice and how doctors were to be paid, was central to the successful establishment of the NHS in 1948
- Bevan's political skill in Cabinet in securing the huge funds required from the government during a time of austerity and rival claims on scarce resources
- support from Chancellors Dalton and Cripps, was particularly helpful.

In evaluating the reasons candidates will need to differentiate between a ‘national health service’ and ‘the National Health Service’. By 1945 there was broad consensus on the need for major changes in the hospital and general practitioner systems and to make better quality health care available to all. This can be seen in Conservative proposals like those of Henry Willink. However, candidates may well argue that although the 1944 Willink scheme was broadly a forerunner of the Bevan 1946–1948 NHS, there were major differences of detail and principle due partly to the concessions Willink made to the BMA. They will also need to evaluate the commitment and role of Bevan in creating the kind of NHS which appeared in 1948 despite all the difficulties.

High level answers will show an understanding of the philosophical and structural differences between the Willink and Bevan approaches. In turn candidates might well point to the importance of Labour’s victory in 1945 and argue that though a national health service would probably have emerged following a Conservative victory it would have been different in several ways to the NHS which began in 1948.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### *Alternative U: Aspects of British History, 1929–1951*

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

How important was the relationship between Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt in the success of Britain's war effort between May 1940 and April 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.**

Candidates may well outline the close relationship which developed between these two leaders referring perhaps to speeches, letters and meetings.

In arguing for the importance of the relationship candidates will probably refer to several of the following points:

- the way Churchill saw the great importance of creating a close relationship with America and Roosevelt even before he came prime minister, and certainly afterwards. His regular broadcasts to America, his interviews with American journalists, his visits to America and meetings with Roosevelt all attest to this
- the 'destroyers for bases' deal in the autumn of 1940 providing additional warships to protect the vital Atlantic convoys carrying the food and raw materials upon which the British war effort depended was an early example of how helpful to the war effort his relationship with Roosevelt could be
- Lend-Lease from 1941 which enabled Britain to finance her prolonged war effort on extended US credit was another crucial result. Some candidates may point to the severe financial difficulties which faced Britain when Lend-Lease was suddenly withdrawn in 1945 as evidence of just how vital it was

- the morale boost, even before America came into the war, that Britain was not entirely alone and then the tremendous relief when the USA did enter in December 1941, to belief in eventual victory
- the close personal relationship between Churchill and Roosevelt was a factor in America's decision to give priority to the European rather than the Pacific Front and this was of great importance to the success of the British war effort
- increased collaboration in the Atlantic and its importance in the defeat of the U boat threat by the end of 1943
- in the mid-war period candidates could refer to Churchill being able to persuade the Americans to defer a Second Front in Western Europe and diverting effort to North Africa, Sicily and Italy
- shared intelligence and close co-operation between the British and American military especially in the lead up to D-Day 1944
- importance of the relationship in defusing rivalries between generals, over strategy and in dealings with allies
- joint co-operation in regard to air warfare against Germany.

In seeking to argue for the limitations on the importance of the relationship candidates could refer to the role of 'other factors' and also to periods when the relationship was not that helpful to the British war effort:

- the relationship was not very helpful in the crucial months for Britain between May and November 1940 – strong isolationist tendencies in the US; Roosevelt and many Americans were not sure Britain could survive; the US Presidential Election 1940; until the end of 1941 Roosevelt was hindered by US Congress and public opinion in giving help to Britain. Lend-Lease was a clever way around the constitutional and public opinion difficulties
- Churchill's determination not to surrender, his ability to inspire Britain and foster a sense of national unity; the support of the Dominions, it could be argued, were more important to the success of the war effort in the Battle of Britain period than the relationship with Roosevelt
- candidates might also point to other factors in the success of Britain's war effort – the rearmament programme begun under Neville Chamberlain; the effectiveness of the War Cabinet, e.g. the work of Bevin at the Ministry of Labour and Beaverbrook in air production; technical inventions such as radar; the breaking of German codes; Churchill's constant stream of ideas
- candidates might also argue that the relationship with Roosevelt became less important, perhaps even detrimental, in 1944 and early 1945 as the balance of the war effort swung from Britain to America. At Yalta Roosevelt seemed to be more concerned with maintaining good relations with Stalin and Russia than with Churchill and Britain. It could be argued that Roosevelt under-estimated the potential Russian threat to Western Europe already visible by late 1944-early 1945 and that Churchill was unable to prevent him making mistakes which were to have serious consequences for post-war Europe.

Some may argue that the story of atomic bomb research also illustrates the way the relationship had moved against Britain

- some candidates may argue that Lend-Lease though vital to Britain's war effort undermined Britain's economic and ultimately political independence
- some might argue that Churchill interpreted the relationship with Roosevelt too generously failing to see until 1944–1945 that American goals and British goals in the war were not the same and in the case of the future of trade and the empire were actually opposed.