



## **General Certificate in Education**

# **AS History 5041**

**HS03      Course Essays**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

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

#### *General Guidance for Examiners*

---

#### **A: INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## UNIT 3

## COURSE ESSAYS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS****Level 1: 1-4 Marks (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
<b>1-4</b>	Little understanding or reference to focus of question.	Lacking specific relevant factual information.	Generalised assertion.		Poorly structured. Limited grammatical accuracy.
<b>5-9</b> <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.		
<b>10-14</b>	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.
<b>15-17</b>	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.
<b>18-20</b>	Explicit and sustained.	Precise selection of relevant and accurate material.	Maintains a consistent argument for the greater part of the answer. Good understanding.	Reasonably balanced and offering some convincing judgement.	Accurate, fluent and well structured. Shows some maturity and conceptual awareness.

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

---

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

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

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will consider a range of ways in which the military orders contributed to the defence of the Crusader states in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, including castles, manpower and dedication. Students will analyse the contribution of the military orders within the context of the geographical and manpower problems faced by the Crusader states.

Answers should provide detailed knowledge on the defensive needs of the Crusader states after c1100 and the important role of the military orders. Key themes may include the following:

- the orders as castle garrisons and elite troops
- their military abilities/martial spirit
- their numerical contribution
- their popularity in western Europe, forming an important channel for funds to Outremer
- the link between their corporate wealth and the development of their role into castle building in particular
- their inspirational role and the manner in which they made permanent the crusading ideal.

By 1130 the two Military Orders, Templars and Hospitallers, were well-established within the four Crusader states formed in the aftermath of the First Crusade: Jerusalem, Antioch, Tripoli and Edessa. The security of these states was very fragile; they were spread out down the eastern Mediterranean and surrounded by hostile Muslim states. Outremer was

weak with limited manpower, reliant on crusading armies as a temporary source of defence. Because of these fundamental weaknesses, the Orders were arguably vital for the defence of the crusader states.

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

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

Evaluation of their importance may focus on limitations in their contribution; this could include:

- rivalry between Templars and Hospitallers
- their corporate independence and difficult relationship with secular and religious authority within Outremer, especially the crown
- their greed and their fanaticism and the Muslim response they provoked
- also the role of Gerard de Ridefort at the springs of Cresson and the Battle of Hattin will be examined as this individual did much to bring on the virtual collapse of the Crusader states between 1187 and 1188.

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 and would be expected to refer to a range of secondary sources.

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

---

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

How important is dissatisfaction with Cluniac monasticism in explaining the growth of Cistercian monasticism in the twelfth century?

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers will consider a range of reasons for the growth of Cistercian monasticism, in particular its attraction, in contrast to the prevailing and dominant form of Cluniac-Benedictine monasticism, led by the Abbey of Cluny in Burgundy. Cluny led approximately 1,000 abbeys c1100; its Abbot was second only to the Pope in prestige, while the church of Cluny was the largest church in Christendom. However, the order's elaborate liturgy and artistic ideals were coming under criticism; new ideals of apostolic poverty and preaching, and also more austere visions of monastic life, were seeking to redefine the Benedictine ideal personified by Cluny. A clear contrast will be presented between the 'New Monasticism' of Cistercian monasticism and Cluniac ideals. The debates between the leading Cistercian abbot, Bernard of Clairvaux, and his Cluniac counterpart, Peter the Venerable, may be used to highlight the issue of dissatisfaction with Cluniac practice. Focus on the contrast could highlight the Cistercian constitution and organisation and structure, especially mutual visitations as a means of preserving Cistercian ideals. Analysis could focus on the Cistercians' answers to the causes of laxity; their Carta Caritatis (Charter of Charity) and the impact of the organisation and discipline it provided, including the role of its author, Stephen Harding. Students may analyse the role of his Carta Caritatis in maintaining discipline, uniformity and austerity while expansion took place. Other elements will include mother houses, the annual general chapter, ties of love and mutual support to enforce collective discipline, and a uniformity which extended to architecture.

Evaluation may discuss such alternative reasons for growth; the role of Bernard as an inspirational figure will be central in any essay; his dynamism, by the time of his death in

1153 his abbey at Clairvaux had sent out monks to create 68 new abbeys. Issues will include topics such as the rise of the order after his entry, in contrast to earlier difficulties; his charismatic personality and personal example in austerity and asceticism; his prestige and inspirational role. Also Bernard's 'golden eloquence' in articulating Cistercian ideals, especially his letters and debates with Peter the Venerable, as a means of promoting the New Monasticism.

Also, the role of Robert of Molesme, founder of the first Cistercian monastery, Citeaux, in 1098. Robert was an inspirational figure who did much to form the ideals of the Cistercians; for example, the return to the original rule of St Benedict; their austerity and retreat to the wilderness. However, he was only at Citeaux for about one year and the expansion into a monastic order took place under the influence of Stephen Harding, Abbot of Citeaux from 1109 to 1133 and Bernard, 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. Also the impact of economic success; their focus on the wilderness; benefactors and uncultivated land; sheep farming and wool production; manual labour and the use of conversi; the flood of endowments; papal privileges; and the economic context of European demographic and economic expansion.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

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

Was the nobility the most important factor in destabilising France in the years leading to the outbreak of civil war in 1562?  
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 examine the relative influence of the nobility on events on France as compared to that of other groups and factors in creating instability and generating conflict, and draw some conclusions based on their findings.

The nobility could be seen as a destabilising factor as a result of a variety of conflicting factors:

- the 3 main groups – Bourbon, Guises and Montmorency – saw themselves as powerful nobles, linked to the Crown, each with a good clientage base which provided financial and military support; at any point in time they were a threat simply because they existed
- they had held significant positions, e.g. in the Montmorency family, one was governor of Paris, another (Coligny) was Admiral of France and a third was colonel-general of the infantry
- the accession of a boy king, Francis II, in 1559 generated a specific focus to their rivalry with potential influence over him

- their differing religious allegiances made them rivals, both with the Crown and amongst themselves; the Guises and Montmorency were Catholic, but the Bourbons had leanings towards Protestantism, thus encouraging similar divisions within the country
- they had been subject to forced loans to subsidise the war with the Habsburgs, eroding their wealth to varying degrees
- their relative wealth and power theoretically made it more possible for them to challenge the monarchy than other groups; however, against a background of rising prices in the sixteenth century, and declining incomes, they were frustrated by laws forbidding them to enter trade and enhance their income, generating further discontent
- after 1559, when peace was made with the Holy Roman Empire, their military role ended and they had to return to their estates, again reducing their role
- the noblesse de robe were beginning to infiltrate some of the major offices of state and thus depriving the nobility of additional income and prestige
- the Guises ordered the Massacre of Vassy of 1562 which sparked the first war.

However, there were other issues which generated instability in France, for example:

- the presence of 2 million Huguenots (10% of the population by 1560) was sufficient to cause problems. They were largely Calvinist and were found gathered in specific areas, for example the south west. Initially, they tended to be middle class and not very influential, but by 1560–1561 they were gaining support from lesser nobility and some important families, e.g. Navarre. 1559 saw the holding of first Synod in Paris
- the perceived weakness of the monarchy, e.g. after the death of Henry II, Catherine de Medici was concerned to maintain power for her sons. She soon became seen as manipulative and, for example, executed Huguenots for a plot to seize Francis II in the Tumult of Amboise; she appeared to be considering some kind of compromise at the Colloquy of Poissy which was interpreted as weakness; and her policy of allowing Huguenots to worship led to the Massacre of Vassy and the first war
- social and economic discontent, often felt by the urban classes, generated antipathy which could be used by religious extremists to build up support and create divisions in society. This discontent was a consequence of rising prices, difficulties in trade, etc. generated by the wars of the early sixteenth century outside France.

Answers should provide some balance between the factors and draw conclusions, for example that rivalry between the nobility was longstanding throughout the sixteenth century and therefore it was the linkage with other issues such as the weakness of the monarchy and the growth of a strong Huguenot party which destabilised France in this period.

## 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**

Examine the extent to which the Catholic League influenced the course of the French Wars of Religion in the years 1562 to 1598.

#### **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 brief background to the League to identify its general status and influence and then to consider its impact on the course of the wars, for example the League first emerged in 1576 under the leadership of Henry of Guise, largely consisted of nobility, ostensibly to support the king; later materialised as a wider group including Roman Catholic clergy, guild members, town officials and the 'lower orders' in addition to nobles. It was refounded in 1584 specifically to resist the claims of Henry of Navarre.

The League was influential because:

- broad membership (as above)
- organisation-based in Paris; run by Council of Sixteen (largely nobles, lawyers, clergy)
- links to Spain, e.g. through secret Treaty of Joinville which recognised Cardinal of Bourbon rather than Henry of Navarre as future king
- represented a danger to monarchy, provoking religious and political opposition and debate

- influenced actions of monarchs on occasion, e.g. Henry III made Treaty of Nemours with Duke of Guises; this condemned heresy and withdrew religious concessions, suggesting conversion of exile for Huguenots – generated more antagonism to the Crown from Huguenots
- responsible for specific and significant events, e.g. Day of Barricades when Duke of Guise marched on Paris and Henry III had recognised Cardinal de Bourbon as Lieutenant-General of France, eventually leading the War of the Three Henries, assassination of Duke of Guise and the Cardinal and ultimately the succession of Henry IV
- Henry IV had no choice but to become Catholic to enable him to take the throne – this is a success for the League in terms of religious issues, but ultimately brought about its demise because it then lost its power base
- In addition to its actions, the League developed a political theory leading to the acceptance of regicide (tyrannicide) as a justification for removing an unacceptable monarch – this lay behind the assassination of Henry III by Jacques Clement and also that of Henry IV. This theory also included ideas of ‘popular sovereignty’ which meant the king had to rule according to a ‘contract’ which would include ruling to a ‘Christian manner’.

However, other factors did influence the course of the wars:

- the overall diminution of royal authority which occurred ‘naturally’ because of the death of Henry II, the period of minority under Charles IX, the early years of Henry III’s reign and dislike of Catherine de Medici as Regent/Queen Mother etc.
- social and economic issues undermined political successes, e.g. rising prices generated instability across Europe, warfare interrupted economic and commercial activity and generated hardship for ordinary people – there were frequent riots and disturbances; supplies for armies were interrupted; famine and epidemic occurred regularly; the overall population of France fell and prosperity declined making it harder for the combatants to raise and sustain armies
- the death of Catherine de Medici left Henry III isolated and without an heir; the subsequent truce with Henry of Navarre, naming him as heir on condition he became Catholic, took the heat out of the struggle, although Henry of Navarre still had to prove himself religiously and militarily
- the Huguenots also had their supporting political theories which strengthened their cause, e.g. their resistance was legitimate self-defence against a government corrupted by Catherine de Medici; theories of popular sovereignty as seen in ‘*Francogallia*’ by Hotman, etc. – these theories were more political and religious and appealed to a broad spectrum, not just Huguenots.

Good answers should develop some balance between these factors to arrive at a reasoned conclusion; weaker answers may resort to more descriptive approaches outlining the events of the wars. The best should offer an overview rather than a detailed account and be aware of the developments throughout the period.

---

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03*****Alternative C: The Crisis of the French Monarchy, 1715–1743*****A: The Regency, 1715–1723**

Examine the extent to which the Regency of Orléans was successful in dealing with the problems of royal finances in the years 1715 to 1723.

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

There should be a good attempt to define the problems of royal finance, and good responses may see these problems interlinked with others such as the problem of privilege. However, the clear focus should be an analysis of the degree to which these problems were addressed. Whilst most candidates will probably focus on the major issue of Law's *Système* this is by no means the only effort made to reform finances during this period and there should be at least coverage of some other issues, although a perfect balance is unlikely considering the relative importance of the *Système*.

**Problems of Royal Finance****Long-term:**

- the long-term problem remained that of an inequitable taxation system. The Third Estate bore the brunt of the direct tax whilst the First Estate paid the undervalued *Don Gratuit* and the nobility paid virtually nothing. There was also a lack of regional uniformity. Some districts assessed their own level of direct tax (the *taille*) whilst others had it imposed by agents of central government, the *Intendants*
- indirect taxation caused further problems, especially as the most onerous was the *Gabelle*, a tax on salt; taxation on luxuries was relatively light

- there was considerable corruption throughout the tax collection system which, when combined with the farming out of this duty, ensured that the central treasury only received a fraction of the money originally collected.

**Short-term:**

- the aggressive foreign policy of Louis XIV, and especially the War of the Spanish Succession, 1701–1714, had left the Crown in considerable debt – probably in the region of 2 000 million livres at the time of Louis XIV's death in 1715. Louis XIV is attributed with the deathbed phrase 'I made war too much'
- much of this debt was financed through Billets de Monnaie which led to considerable inflation and a rapid decline in the value of paper money at the start of the Regency. In addition, currency clipping and hoarding had become rife
- troops had gone without pay and were now returning home; in addition many of the parlementaires were rentiers who had also received nothing
- the restoration of Parlement's right of pre-registration remonstrance by Orléans in 1715 put them in a much stronger position to oppose the radical financial reform that was actually needed but which might conflict with their privileges.

**Attempts to deal with the problems during the Regency:**

- to deal with the problem of corrupt tax collectors, in 1716 Orléans established a system to ascertain exactly what was being collected in at the local level. Each collector-general was to keep a record of the monies collected in his Generalite. Such money could only be withdrawn on the express instructions of Orléans. This reinforced a Chambre de Justice established in 1715 to investigate the collection of taxes by intendants
- the reasons for any future tax collection were to be formalised, and would now be raised by formal decree
- the interest on loans was reduced from 5% to 4% and the currency was debased; however, all these measures had relatively little effect, and some anyway were simply improvements that came from the ending of a period of prolonged and costly warfare
- there were efforts at genuine innovation. In 1716 the regency council approved a graduated taille, but this largely failed as it encouraged the wealthy to avoid disclosure of assets and discouraged the poor from working harder
- in 1718 a further decree established the Dime Royale which was an attempt to unify the assessment of the taille and base it on the produce from the land. This largely failed as it was limited to a few regions only and proved too complex to administer
- Orléans made some attempts to predict the income each year by demanding the intendants project the following year's income at least 3 months in advance, but again this was a minor concession and failed to deal with the problems of inequality and corruption
- Whilst Orléans did personally supervise and check claims for expenditure levied from central resources, this all relied on the personal ability of Orléans himself. Efficiency of

collection and re-distribution of funds had certainly improved under the Regency, but this was not a system, and it was likely that on Orléans' death such gains would be lost

- by far the biggest and most important attempt at reform was Law's Système
- Law had based his ideas on the British and Dutch model and especially their ability to raise money quickly in time of war, largely through the offices of a state bank
- not only was Law allowed in 1718 to establish a royal bank with right of issue, but also was granted an increasing number of trade monopolies to absorb the old trade companies of Louis XIV
- Law wanted in essence to use paper money to stimulate real wealth and in 1719 advocated the abolition of the 'unfair' taille, indirect taxation to be replaced by a new tax based on an individual's ability to pay. Yet this was never introduced due to political opposition – Law was effectively advocating the end of the Estates System
- Law did, however, win the responsibility of collecting direct and indirect tax himself, a system which he made much more efficient and less labour intensive. He also managed to get rid of a number of expensive offices in central government
- the ultimate failure of Law's système did much harm to royal finances as it seriously damaged the Crown's reputation and made future financial reform more difficult to urge. However, the collapse of the système after dire inflation actually helped the government to pay its debts, the general feeling of greater prosperity also encouraged trade and industry as did the fact that many individuals actually benefited from the système's collapse as well.

A conclusion might suggest that there had been serious financial problems at the start of the Regency, and that it is difficult to suggest that any of the fundamental problems had been resolved. Yet there had been improvement, some of it administrative and some in terms of increased revenue. Orléans had become personally involved and had given his full support to Law's système. That it failed was not through want of trying.

---

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

How important was opposition from privileged groups in explaining the failure of Cardinal Fleury's government to introduce major reform?

**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 the question is to establish convincing reasons for the apparent conservatism of Cardinal Fleury's government. Whilst a few candidates might wish to challenge the assumption of a lack of major reform, the focus of the question should not be lost. A number of reasons might be given for the lack of major reform, and many such factors will probably interlink. Candidates should be expected to give examples of actual problems facing the government and specific reasons for the lack of government action, ranging from opposition by privileged groups such as the nobility and the Parlements, to a lack of personal authority vested in Fleury.

Candidates might look at different policy areas in turn or alternatively examine each weakness on the part of the government and analyse how this impacted on a variety of policy areas.

Opposition from privileged groups should clearly be identified, although such opposition will probably be seen as working in conjunction with and not separate from other factors. Such privileged groups might be identified as the Parlements and their opposition to financial reforms stemming from a desire not to be taxed; opposition from self-interested guilds; opposition from Jansenists on religious grounds, and again Parlement but on issues of constitutional precedent.

---

**Economic:**

- the legacy of Law's failure virtually crippled successive government with a fear of radical financial experimentation. However, opposition was a considerable contributing factor. Power had passed back into the hands of the tax farmers and financiers meaning that the old, corrupt and wasteful methods of tax collection were retained, and in addition it meant the Parlementaires would continue to be needed to lend money to the Crown. Parlement was hardly likely to agree to any financial proposals that would wrest such a political advantage from them
- the biggest problem facing finance was the fundamental one of privilege and vested interest. The inequitable system in which the Third Estate took the full burden of direct taxation remained, as did the heavy burden of indirect tax on essentials; indeed the proportion of indirect tax paid during this period actually increased in comparison to the taille. This was again an issue that the Regent Orléans and John Law had tried to tackle and failed. That Fleury lacked even the title of Prime Minister, and certainly could not rely on concepts such as Divine Right to enforce his will, suggests that he would have been incapable of overthrowing privilege even if he so desired. He lacked much of the zeal for reform seen by Orléans who himself backed away from Law's suggestion of similar reform. Moreover, it is doubtful if Fleury would have obtained the support of Louis XV who seemed disinterested by matters of government and especially the problems of finance
- any improvements in the economy, for example the balancing of the books by Controller General Orry in 1739, seemed largely the result of a pacific foreign policy than major reform. Certainly nothing was done to address France's fundamental economic problems and this was a combination of vested interest from parliament and other privileged groups such as the guilds and a lack of authority vested in Fleury, along with his own personal inclinations of compromise
- caution in economic policy actually increased confidence in the economy; arguably a very important step if the monarchy was, for example, to be able to raise loans at a reasonable rate of interest. It might therefore be argued that the lack of major reform was a deliberate government ploy and was exactly what the economy needed.

**Administration**

- Fleury continued with the established system of rule through councils, largely because he found it easy to use a circle of ministers who relied on him and had been appointed by him. In addition Fleury could effectively balance one interest off against another and rise above court factions. The sheer efficiency of these professional bureaucrats such as Maurepas and Orry meant Fleury had little need to change the system of government as it worked very well for him. His eventual loss to the pro-war party of Belle Isle being more a consequence of Fleury's increasing age than a failure necessarily of the system he had established for himself. Here again, conservatism seems to stem from the top down
- Parlement needed to be appeased, and this was especially apparent in the clashes over Jansenism. Despite Fleury's own religious background, he was again keen for compromise, largely because he recognised that controlling the appointment of ecclesiastical office would enable him over time to weaken the Jansenist movement and that this was the path of least resistance. Indeed after 1731, when Fleury allowed the return of Parlement, the issue of Jansenism and the conflict with Parlement died

away – in part this was because of the changing nature of the Jansenist movement and the development of its extreme Convulsionism stage lost it support. Fleury simply allowed the issue to die away after the initial period of conflict, he certainly was not doctrinaire enough to believe he was responsible for the welfare of the souls of the king's subjects, and there was no pressing need for major reform. In part, one might argue that he could not have foreseen the explosion of Jansenism into a major political issue later.

### **Fleury as an individual**

- Fleury's age is not an insignificant point. He was seventy years old when he achieved power, and this indeed was part of the reason for the ease with which he did so. Few expected him to live long and Fleury in part worked to this image of a sound, firm and safe pair of hands who was unlikely to enact a major reform which he would not live to see implemented. In short he saw his task as caretaker and not innovator. This was a period of retrenchment and lack of major reform because there were no radical groups challenging the government or Fleury, there was no need to rise to a challenge, and with the weak support of the king who was old enough to rule but had no inclination to – all groups benefited from a period of retrenchment and stability – arguably it was also what was best for France in the short term. Candidates might also suggest that the lack of major reform was because Fleury was loyal to the king – he had no desire to provoke a challenge to his authority and assumed that tranquillity meant peace.

Candidates might well identify in conclusion that opposition to government policy from groups such as Parlement, Jansenists, Guilds and factions at court may have potentially been a problem. Indeed, it was perhaps this fear of provoking opposition that was a key motive in Fleury's administration. However, it was possibly Fleury's inherently cautious approach that not only accounts for the length of his control of government but also for the conservatism of the period 1726 to 1743.

---

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

Was the French Revolution of 1830 the most important factor in destabilising Great Power relations in the years 1830 to 1835?  
Explain your answer.

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02*

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

Mark as follows:

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

Indicative Content

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

The French Revolution of 1830 was a revolt against the Bourbon monarchy and brought to power the Orleanist monarch Louis-Philippe. It was thus a threat to the Vienna Settlement and the principle of legitimacy. Answers should clearly focus on the extent to which the French Revolution was a threat to Great Power co-operation and then consider other events which may have been an additional or more serious threat to the Concert of Europe.

**Examples of how the French Revolution threatened Great Power relations**

- it was a clear violation of the Vienna Settlement of 1815
- the eastern powers were very alarmed as they still regarded France as the main danger to European stability
- revolution spread to Belgium, Poland and Italy, thus threatening the stability of Europe; liberals in Modena looked to the French for support as did the Poles
- it threatened to divide the autocratic eastern powers who were opposed to revolution and threats to legitimacy and the more liberal power of Britain

- Metternich wanted to intervene and crush the revolution in France; Palmerston disapproved strongly and Britain welcomed the regime change in France and pursued an Anglo-French entente
- Nicholas I refused to recognise Louis-Philippe as King until January 1831, souring relations between Russia and France for twenty years.

### **Examples of how the French Revolution was not that serious a threat to Great Power relations**

- the initial fears of the eastern powers proved unfounded as Louis-Philippe acted with caution and moderation in his pursuit of foreign policy, e.g. non-intervention in Belgium, co-operating with the British in 1834 over Spain
- the divide between the autocratic and liberal powers was not rigidly set in stone and the Great Powers did co-operate successfully to resolve the Belgian revolt of 1830–1831 and although Britain and France did not agree with Russia crushing the Polish revolt in 1830, they did not take action to stop it from happening
- the Concert of Europe continued after 1830, illustrating how the Great Powers were able to co-operate in order to maintain the balance of power established at the Vienna Settlement of 1815.

### **Other events which threatened Great Power relations**

Answers may consider one or more of these events to be a greater threat to the Concert of Europe. Be wary of descriptions of the events: responses should focus on the nature and seriousness of the threat to Great Power relations.

- The Eastern Question – the Mehemet Ali crisis of 1831–1833
- The Spanish Crises 1830–1835
- The 1830–1831 Revolutions in Belgium, Italy and Poland

### **Conclusions**

On the surface the change of regime in France appeared to be a significant destabilising factor in Great Power relations as it challenged the Vienna settlement. The fears of the eastern powers proved largely unfounded once the initial shock waves of revolutionary discontent had been quashed in Europe. Louis-Philippe, although not a legitimate monarch, was still a king, who pursued cautious and moderate policies at home and abroad. French relations with Britain did initially improve as Louis-Philippe was conscious of maintaining liberal Britain as an ally, whilst relationships with the eastern powers were strained, particularly with Russia. However, at times of crisis the Great Powers were able to put aside their ideological differences and it can be argued that revolution in Belgium and the dispute over the Eastern Question posed greater difficulties to Great Power relations.

---

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

How important are divisions amongst the revolutionaries in explaining the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in Austria and the Italian states?

**Mark Scheme**

*Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, A02*

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

Mark as follows:

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

**Indicative Content**

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

Divisions within the ranks of the revolutionaries were a significant factor leading to the failure of the 1848–1849 revolutions in Austria and the Italian States. More effective responses will try to define the nature and seriousness of the revolutionary divisions, e.g. ideological, social, geographical. A range of other factors leading to the failure of the revolutions should also be considered in order to assess the importance of revolutionary divisions, e.g. the strength of the Austrian Imperial army, the strength of the conservative counter-revolution, the assistance of Russian and French troops to quash Hungarian and Italian revolutionaries. The conclusions of higher level answers will also probably consider the extent to which the 1848–1849 revolutions were a failure and cite the example of the Piedmontese constitution as a lasting liberal achievement.

**Revolutionary divisions**

The Revolutionaries' divisions partly explain their collapse. Radicals opposed conservative liberals: constitutional monarchists feared republicans. For example, in Italy the revolutionaries were torn between the nationalist writings of Mazzini a Republican, Gioberti who wanted the Pope to lead a united Italy and Balbo a federalist. The middle class revolutionaries feared the working classes. There was no coherent revolutionary agenda. Revolutionaries were also divided by national minority interests. Kossuth (Hungarian revolutionary leader) and Placky (Czech revolutionary leader) had little in common with each

other or with Italian revolutionaries or the Germans who had their own liberal and national aspirations. The peasants were disinterested in the revolution once the feudal dues had been abolished.

**Other reasons for the failure of the Revolutions include:**

**Conservative counter-revolution**

The Austrian Imperial army led by Windischgratz stayed loyal and bombarded Prague and Vienna after attempts by radicals to further the revolution. Radetzky defeated the Italians at Novarra in 1849 and the new chief minister, Schwarzenburg, dissolved the Constituent Assembly. In 1849, Franz Josef invited the Russian army to assist in the defeat of the Hungarian revolution. The Austrian Navy destroyed the Venetian Republic whilst French forces crushed the Rome Republic in 1849.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

#### **A: The Balkans, 1870–1890**

With what success were the major powers able to control events in the Balkans in the years 1870 to 1890?

#### **Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to appreciate the differing motives and ambitions of the major powers in the Balkans, with not all the states interested in successfully stabilising and controlling events

- Germany through Bismarck, without territorial aspirations, wanted to retain overall control, peace and balance of power, without being forced to take sides
- Austria-Hungary wanted to extend 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 to protect her interests in the Mediterranean and beyond
- Turkey tried to resist any further disintegration of her crumbling empire in Europe through enforced repression.

Responses should also appreciate the varied means of trying to control events, including diplomacy, international conferences, treaties, alliances and military actions. Two major

events dominate this 20-year period – the Near Eastern Crisis of 1875–1878, and the Bulgarian Crisis of 1885–1888.

**Evidence to support success in controlling events:**

- control was secured by Bismarck’s network of alliances:
  - the first Dreikaiserbund of 1872–1873 made an early start in defusing the rivalry between Austria-Hungary and Russia
  - the second Dreikaiserbund of 1881 was a practical agreement to control the Near East – Austria-Hungary was to be allowed to annex Bosnia-Herzegovina, and would not oppose the union of Eastern Rumelia and Bulgaria. Bismarck would no longer have to choose between Russia and Austria-Hungary
  - the Reinsurance Treaty of 1887 would discourage aggressive action by Russia against Austria-Hungary and promised support for Russia in Bulgaria
- the crisis from 1875 led to a positive diplomatic approach from the major powers as unrest and rebellion spread – with the Andrassy Note and the Berlin Memorandum – and a conference was held in Constantinople
- Russia seemed to have achieved some control through military action, as war with Turkey broke out in April 1877, having successfully negotiated the neutrality of Austria-Hungary. Russia gained victory in January 1878 and imposed the Treaty of San Stefano on Turkey
- the Congress and Treaty of Berlin in 1878 provides the strongest case for successful control, bringing ‘Peace with Honour’ and a balanced settlement
- the Bulgarian Crisis from 1885 tested Bismarck’s diplomatic expertise to the limit, but he successfully restricted Russia through two Mediterranean Agreements, negotiated the Reinsurance Treaty, and published the secret Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary to reassure Russia.

**Evidence which could be set against this**

- Bismarck’s alliances achieved no lasting stability or control:
  - the first Dreikaiserbund was fragile and failed to deal with specific problems such as the Balkans, and the agreement crumbled during the Near-Eastern Crisis
  - the second Dreikaiserbund shattered during the Bulgarian Crisis
  - the Reinsurance Treaty showed Bismarck’s desperation as he struggled to maintain diplomatic control
- the diplomacy of 1875–1876 failed – Britain refused to sign the Berlin Memorandum, Turkey avoided any commitment to reform and turned to repression with the ‘Bulgarian Atrocities’, as Russia began to look towards war
- Russia’s demands at the Treaty of San Stefano were unrealistic and provided no solution, provoking Britain and Austria-Hungary, and forcing Russia to back down

- The Treaty of Berlin achieved only limited success and can only be regarded as a temporary solution, providing the sources of future unrest in the Balkans, with a lack of Turkish reforms, increased Slav nationalism and Russian bitterness
- The Bulgarian Crisis destroyed the delicate diplomatic harmony established at Berlin in 1878 and undermined Bismarck's network of alliances. The crisis of 1885 began with a revolt in Eastern Rumelia for union with Bulgaria, contravening the Treaty of Berlin. The attitude of the major powers now seemed almost reversed from that of 1878, with Austria-Hungary and especially Britain regarding a stronger, bigger Bulgaria as an effective barrier against Russia.

1890 marked the start of a period of relative calm in the Balkans, but not as a result of successful control by the major powers. The Bulgarian Crisis just fizzled out, as Russia turned to Asia and the Far East. The Balkans was put 'on ice' for the next 15 years, but the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the growth of Balkan nationalism would ultimately prove impossible to control.

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

Was Serbian nationalism the main cause of conflict in the Balkans in the years 1890 to 1914?  
Explain your answer.

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Most European powers were worried about which power would profit from the death of the 'sick man of Europe' – the Ottoman Empire. The Balkans was a labyrinth of ethnic tensions, nationalist groups and great power rivalry. Serbian nationalism was important in a number of ways, providing a context and undercurrent in relation to events. It posed a direct challenge to Austria-Hungary and her status as a great power, provided a focus for Russian Pan-Slavism, and perhaps presented an opportunity for Germany's expansionist ambitions.

**Evidence supporting Serbian nationalism as the main cause of conflict:**

- after a relatively calm and quiet period in the Balkans after 1890, the issue of Serbian nationalism burst on to the scene in 1903 with a change of dynasty in Serbia, which saw the deterioration of relations with Austria-Hungary, as the pro-Austrian Alexander of Serbia was murdered and Peter Karageorge, who favoured closer relations with Russia, became king. This force sought to unite all Serbs into a Greater Serbia, and to build a strong confederation to free all Slavs from alien rule. This was a deadly threat especially to the Habsburg Empire. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the Serbian government's control over nationalistic secret societies and the Serb army would prove inadequate
- the annexation of Bosnia in 1908 by Austria-Hungary was a determined attempt to thwart Serb territorial ambitions. Serbia's humiliating climbdown clearly provoked

---

resentment and a sense of grievance, and encouraged the tsarist government to draw closer to Serbia

- Serb nationalism is evident in the hectic diplomatic activity which led to the formation of the Balkan League in 1912 (consisting of Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece and Montenegro) and the outbreak of the First Balkan War
- Serbia's victory and significant territorial expansion at the end of the Second Balkan War in 1913 constituted a major step towards war. This was a body-blow to the strategic position of Austria-Hungary, especially in Bosnia, and she now looked for a military opportunity to eliminate Serbia
- the impact of Serb nationalism reached its climax in 1914 with the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo by a member of a Serbian terrorist group. The complicity of the Serbian government could not be allowed to pass unpunished, and led to a chain of events which in the end provoked European war.

**Evidence supporting other factors as causes of conflict:**

- the Bosnian Crisis of 1908 seemed to have little to do with Serbian nationalism. Austria-Hungary's annexation was triggered by the Young Turk movement, aiming to overthrow the reactionary government of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, achieve a more liberal and efficient regime and restore Bosnia to full Turkish rule. Ultimately, the crisis was contained and conflict was avoided, because Russia received no increased support from Britain and France
- Pan-Slav (rather than Serbian) nationalism led to the First Balkan War in 1912 with the aim of forcing the Turks out of the Balkans. Significantly, the major European powers kept out of the fighting but took a keen interest in negotiations for a peace settlement, effectively defusing the situation
- the Second Balkan War of 1913 was a result of Bulgaria's initiative, as the Balkan states fought among themselves
- in the end it was the July Crisis of 1914 which led to conflict, when other factors were arguably more important:
  - 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
  - in contrast, there is evidence that Serbia was exhausted by the earlier Balkan struggles, and desired a period of stability and a peaceful settlement of the July Crisis
- the nationalist aspirations and ongoing rivalry of Austria-Hungary and Russia provide a focus for events in the Balkans up to 1914. Austrian policy aimed at the elimination of Serbia, and with the appointment of Aehrenthal as foreign minister and Hotzendorff as army chief from 1906, a gambling spirit entered Austrian diplomacy. After the Bosnian Crisis, Russia was left embittered and humiliated

- *Weltpolitik* and German military ambitions also deserve consideration – Germany encouraged Austria-Hungary to start a war with Serbia, and some historians believe that Germany was prepared to launch the First World War in order to become a great power
- the international rivalry of two competing alliances increased the prospects of conflict
- the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire remains the central long-term cause.

Candidates may well distinguish between the short and long-term causes of conflict, seeing the July Crisis in the context of the long-running 'Eastern Question'. Responses may conclude that Serbian nationalism did indeed set the context for a localised Balkan war, but that other factors are also important in explaining the broader conflict in the struggle to supplant the Ottoman Empire.

## 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 impact of the policy changes of 1921 on the development of the Soviet state by 1924.

#### **Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The main focus will be on 1921 as a watershed between two key periods of Soviet history.

#### **1921 marked:**

- the end of Civil War and war with Poland
- the end of War Communism
- NEP and prosperity
- the 10<sup>th</sup> Party Congress and ban on factionalism
- the hardening of Communist dictatorship

1921 was a crucial year for several reasons. Since the 1917 Revolution the Reds had been fighting a costly and bitter war of survival against their White opponents (Tsarist officers, other political parties, the dispossessed middle class and aristocracy etc.) and Allied armies of intervention. These latter had originally been sent to keep Russia in the First World War, but had gradually become committed, albeit half heartedly, to an anti-Communist Crusade. By 1921 the Civil War was effectively over: foreign troops had left Russia, and the White forces had been defeated or dispersed. The outside world settled for a sullen blockade of the pariah Communist state. The end of the Civil War merged with the Russo-Polish War, with the fortunes of both sides swaying back and forth until the compromise Peace of Riga in March 1921, which established the Russo-Polish border until 1939. Therefore 1921 established that the revolutionary government had survived the Civil War and could look forward to consolidating its hold on the new state.

1921 saw an important change in domestic policy. War Communism, introduced in 1918, involved a ruthless requisitioning of food from the peasantry to feed the Red Army and the towns, and whole scale nationalisation and expropriation. Resistance from the peasants, along with chaos caused by war, had caused a drastic drop in agricultural output and famine, and put the survival of the regime at stake. The Tambov Revolt and the Kronstadt Revolt of March 1921, by sailors who had previously fought for the Revolution, showed the danger to the regime. Although the Kronstadt Revolt was ruthlessly crushed, it was one of the factors which led to a major change of policy, although Lenin had already decided on NEP. Kronstadt was the last example of open, organised resistance (as opposed to unorganised peasant resistance to collectivisation) in the Soviet State before 1991.

The introduction of NEP in 1921 was significant. It signalled the beginning of economic recovery (assisted by peace), as small-scale private enterprises were legitimised and farmers were allowed to keep their grain, provided they paid tax. The semi-privatised economy (large enterprises stayed in state hands), which divided Communists on ideological grounds, began to take off. NEP showed Lenin the realist: talking both of a “strategic retreat” and of a necessary step on the path to socialism.

However, 1921, the year of economic concessions, was also a year of hardening political attitudes. The Civil War had been a time of harsh centralisation and a decline in power of local soviets, but nevertheless a certain amount of “free” discussion had been tolerated. But at the 10<sup>th</sup> Party Congress, Lenin outlawed factions within the Party. This was significant – it marked a final drive against the remnants of other left wing parties (Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks) – and hastened the development of the one-party authoritarian state. The Party became even more centralised. In the ensuing struggle for power the ban on factions inhibited open debate in the struggle to succeed Lenin, and helped Stalin, who had the best power base in the Party. The growing power of Moscow was also symbolised in 1921 by the loss of Georgian independence. Lenin’s political measures made the rise of Stalin easier.

Not everything changed overnight in 1921. For example, the USSR remained committed to fostering world revolution and the new state could not yet feel secure against foreign intervention. Yet 1921 was undoubtedly a watershed between a period of struggle for survival after the Revolution and the consolidation of a more prosperous but increasingly authoritarian state in the 1920s.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### ***Alternative F: Revolutionary Russia, 1917–1929***

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

Examine the degree to which Stalin's own strengths explain his rise to power by 1929.

#### **Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on Stalin's rise to power and the reasons for it.

#### **Candidates might include:**

*Stalin's strengths:*

- Party role
- cunning
- policies
- determination

*Role of luck:*

- Testament

*Rivals' 'mistakes':*

- opportunism
- underestimation of Stalin
- changing alliances and ideological positions

Stalin had several advantages in the struggle to succeed Lenin, not least of which were his own strengths. Even before Lenin's death he had acquired significant posts in the Party –

membership of the Politburo, Orgburo and Secretariat, and above all his role as General Secretary, which gave him power over the Party machine and a power second only to Lenin. With Lenin's illness from 1922, Stalin was probably more powerful than Lenin. Stalin's role in the Party was a very real strength. He had other qualities to build on this strength. Stalin manipulated Lenin's funeral well, and assumed the mantle of Lenin. His policy of Socialism in one Country struck a chord with Russian people better than Trotsky's Permanent or World Revolution. Stalin cleverly presented himself as a man of the centre, almost a moderate, surrounded by opportunists, especially on the Left, who changed alliances for their personal ends. Stalin used his Party position effectively to strengthen himself, and played Left and Right off against each other. He was grossly underestimated by other Bolsheviks who mistook his apparent quietness and lack of overt intellectualism as personal weakness.

Stalin was also lucky; lucky that Lenin's damning Testament was not widely published after Lenin's death, in the interests of Party unity. He was also lucky that his rivals underestimated his cunning and intelligence.

However, the mistakes and misfortunes of rivals were equally significant. Trotsky was disadvantaged in various ways: his Jewishness; fear of his potential military power; dislike of his arrogance; his lack of a Party base; his psychosomatic illnesses. He also made crucial mistakes, such as not pushing for the publication of Lenin's Testament, missing Lenin's funeral, and making alliances with Zinoviev and Kamenev, who were equally opportunistic. The mistakes of the Right concerned its naivety and its willingness to be used by Stalin against the Left, so leaving the Right itself open to attack.

Stalin's rise to power was not inevitable, and there is no simple answer as to what made it successful. Any reasoned answer should be credited.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

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

How important was Stresemann's contribution to the survival of the Weimar Republic in the years 1925 to 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.**

Answers will be expected to focus on the influence of Gustav Stresemann whose name is often associated with this era of Weimar history. However, in assessing his contribution, candidates will need to consider other factors which enabled the Republic to survive – the inherent strengths of the political system, the growth of the German economy and the role of others, e.g. Hindenberg.

Relevant material on the importance of Stresemann may include:

- called off passive resistance in the Ruhr leading to gradual removal of all allied armies (eventually completed June 1930)
- renegotiated reparations and had signed the Dawes Plan (1924) and went on to negotiate the Young Plan (1929)
- improved relations with Germany's neighbours (Locarno, 1925) and won admission to the League of Nations (1926). Increased German prestige and status
- secretly rearmed Germany (Treaty of Berlin with Russia 1926) despite his public pro-disarmament stance.

For a balanced answer, candidates will also need to examine other factors adding to the survival of the Republic in this period:

- stabilisation of the economic situation – advances in industry, higher levels of employment, increases in wages (back to pre-war output by 1927)
- more voters supported the main democratic parties from 1924, leading to the broad-based coalition of 1928
- Hitler's imprisonment after the failure of the Munich Putsch and his decision to change tactics to legal means. Extremists (including KPD) fared poorly in conditions of increased prosperity
- the election of the conservative Hindenberg to the presidency in 1925 may have rallied some conservatives to the Republic
- advances in public works schemes, social services including the 1927 social insurance scheme covering 17 million workers against unemployment and continued regulation of factory conditions and hours
- Germany was flourishing culturally and seemed a modern/progressive state.

Answers are likely to conclude that Stresemann's contribution was mixed. He aided economic recovery and helped restore German prestige and status as a great power. However, much of his work was superficial. Even he understood the limits of the economic recovery ("Germany is dancing on a volcano") and his hopes that some revision of the Treaty of Versailles would increase support for the regime do not seem to have been borne out in practice. The concessions were not perceived as sufficient to satisfy national aspiration. Nationalist groups led a campaign to reject the Young Plan leading to a referendum, which was lost, but helped to increase Hitler's profile and subsequent success in the 1930 elections.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

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

How important was middle-class support in the growth of the Nazi movement from 1930 to 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.**

Answers will be expected to focus on where the Nazis drew their support from in the years 1930–1933. The main focus should be an analysis of middle class (Mittelstand) support, and candidates should explain why groups such as civil servants, the self-employed and white-collar workers should be particularly attracted to Nazism.

Material on the reasons for middle class support might include:

- the disappointments under Weimar (especially the long term effects of the hyperinflation crisis and the Depression)
- the Nazis' stress on economic revival, order and a new future which banished the spectre of Communism.

More specifically:

- Civil Servants and teachers hoped to see an end to salary reductions
- the small traders and shopkeepers wanted economic revival with lower interest rates and the reduction of department stores
- white-collar workers also supported the Nazi promises of fair pay and full employment (with the removal of women from "men's" jobs)

- measures in 1933 (anti-Jewish; economic; restoration law and order) were welcomed by many of the middle class

To balance the answer, candidates will need to refer to other groups which supported the Nazis, including the elites and the working class.

- members of the elite intrigued to bring Hitler to power
- large landowners and industrialists saw the advantages of Nazi support for law and order and the crushing of Communism
- among the working class there were those who were unconvinced by Communism, were influenced by the diatribes against the Jewish Capitalist, sought permanent employment and saw Nazism as a way out of the hopelessness wrought by the Depression
- farmers were attracted by promises of controls on prices, imports and debt as well as help with resettlement projects using unfarmed land in the east.

The best answers will appreciate that there were changes in support through the four years in question and that it is very difficult to assess support purely on a class basis. Other factors, such as religion and the local community, also played a part. Hitler's support came more from protestants than catholics, northerners than southerners, rural than urban communities – but even these generalisations shroud many exceptions. Modern historiography suggests that many more workers supported Nazism than was once thought, but workers were very diverse in type and aspirations. "Blue-collar" workers in depressed industries were particularly attracted by Nazi economic policies, while the more aspirational looked to the promise of a "new future". Clearly middle class support was an important factor in the growth of the movement but it would be hard to argue that it was the 'most' important. Some candidates may look beyond supporters to other reasons for Nazi growth. This is acceptable provided this is used to assess the importance of middle class support.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

#### Alternative H: Decolonisation in Africa

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

Was Kenya's failure to provide Britain with the economic benefits it wanted the most important factor in the decision to grant Kenya independence? Explain your answer.

#### Mark Scheme

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the economic value/potential that Britain perceived to exist as far as its control of Kenya was concerned. The economic advantages of retaining Kenya as a colony must be considered in terms of the other factors which contributed to the achievement of independence for Kenya and some evaluation of the relative significance of all the factors should be present in the responses.

#### **Economic Issues:**

- until the late 1950s Britain attempted to undertake a colonial economic development in order to reap some economic gains from the Empire, and Kenya was part of this process. It became increasingly clear that the investment was not producing the economic returns anticipated. This raised the fundamental issue of what value did the colonies have and what were the costs of retaining them. This is very much linked to Macmillan's role in the process of Kenyan independence
- it was also becoming clear by the late 1950s that Britain's economic interests, and economic future, lay in Europe rather than in imperial interests. There was, by 1961, another attempt to join the EEC
- trade with the Empire, and Kenya, was declining. Kenya's trade was significantly greater with states other than Britain. Britain was not the primary importer into Kenya

- there were some important economic interests that existed in Kenya i.e. the plantations run by the white farmers. These were significant sources of cheap coffee for example, but this in itself was hardly enough to justify British retention of Kenya.

**Other factors:**

- **The role of the Mau Mau:** this terrorist organisation made a significant impact on British planning. There was a major economic cost involved in funding the security response to deal with the Mau Mau. This could be considered from an economic point of view. It may also be possible to suggest that the terror in itself had a destabilising effect on the Kenyan state and it raised some determination to withdraw from Kenya. The terror was largely under control by 1958 and this fact might influence the degree of importance placed on the Mau Mau as a factor in Britain's later withdrawal.
- **The role of Macmillan:** in some ways Macmillan may be regarded as a catalyst that moved Britain inextricably towards independence for Kenya. His thinking was driven by economic issues. Responses may seek to link economic issues to Macmillan and suggest that his cost-benefit analysis was underpinned by a new approach to the economic advantages of empire and a willingness to retreat from empire by the late 1950s. He was also driven by other factors in addition to economic considerations. Britain's role in the new Europe that was developing through the EEC is a very significant area here.
- **Failure to reach a working compromise:** there had been attempts to develop some power-sharing options in the mid-1950s, e.g. the Lyttleton Constitution, but these had been failures. Attempts to establish a multi-ethnic form of limited self-government had collapsed. In view of this it could be argued that the potential costs of retaining Kenya as a discreet colony were too great.

---

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

Was President De Gaulle's contribution the most important factor in the achievement of Algerian independence in 1962?  
Explain your answer.

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is on the role and contribution of General De Gaulle in the process of granting Algerian independence. In order to consider the relative importance of De Gaulle's contribution it will be necessary to consider the other factors that may have contributed to independence.

**The role of De Gaulle:** De Gaulle had his own political agenda and it could be argued that this did not include the retention of Algeria. He saw France's future in Europe and particularly through a major role in the EEC. To some extent Algeria was a distraction and a drain of valuable resources. It was also potentially politically damaging for De Gaulle, particularly through the adverse public opinion the protracted campaign against terrorism might create. There was also the reality that De Gaulle himself was under threat from extremist right-wing groups who sought to create instability in France by using the Algerian question as a political tool. One such group was the OAS. Answers might trace the apparently shifting position of De Gaulle and his conversion to Algerian independence.

**Other factors**

**The role of the army:** the terrorism of the FLN was in part reinforced by the actions of the French army. The army itself became a threat to the stability of Algeria and a political threat to De Gaulle himself. The attitudes of military leaders may be considered. It is also important to consider the reality that after the Battle of Algiers the French army had largely neutralised the impact of terrorism. This coincides closely with De Gaulle's emergence as

the new leader of the Fifth Republic. The role of the army in the OAS is also of significance in the balance of argument.

**The role of the FLN:** the terrorism succeeded in undermining the Algerian state and forcing France to commit thousands of troops to Algeria. Terrorism generated huge public response in France and this was always a threat to the already fragile state of French political stability. The terror threat was to some extent neutralised by about 1958.

---

**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 the Kronstadt Revolt in Lenin's decision to introduce the New Economic Policy in 1921?

**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 Kronstadt Revolt on March 1 1921 was a mutiny by sailors in the naval base outside Petrograd. They were angered by the Bolshevik government imposing orders on the local soviet and claimed the Party bureaucrats were taking power from the workers. They passed a resolution demanding the end to War Communism. The Revolt was serious because the Kronstadt sailors were among the strongest supporters of the Bolsheviks and had played a key role in Petrograd October/November 1917.

Part of the significance of the Revolt was its timing. It took place at the same time as the 10<sup>th</sup> Party Congress. Lenin told the Bolsheviks at the Congress that Russia was 'like a man beaten to within an inch of his life'. Delegates waited for news as the siege of Petrograd eventually lasted to 18 March. The mutiny was crushed by 45,000 Bolshevik troops led by Marshal Tukhachevsky under orders from Trotsky.

Initially Lenin assessed the Revolt as 'a very petty incident' and blamed it on counter-revolutionaries inspired by Mensheviks and foreign governments. Later he described the Kronstadt Revolt as a watershed in Bolshevik policy for it 'lit up reality like a flash of lightning'. Historians have concluded Lenin now realised he faced serious opposition and needed to safeguard the Bolshevik Revolution; as Fitzpatrick observed, 'a symbolic parting of the ways between the working class and the Bolshevik Party'. This explains his pragmatic decision to change economic policy by ending War Communism and introducing the NEP.

Besides, the Kronstadt Revolt was serious not a one-off. Lenin was not convinced a policy change was necessary by one mutiny. There were risings against requisitioning in 1920–1921 in the major grain-growing regions of the Volga Basin, North Caucasus and Western Siberia. The Tambov Rising 1920–1921 was also sparked by requisitioning, and the peasants were able to form a Green Army that was eventually suppressed by 50 000 Bolshevik troops.

In reality Lenin had already been considering changes in economic policy. Indeed some Bolsheviks had been urging this for over a year. The directives issued under War Communism had been incoherent and had led to economic meltdown. Industrial production was at 20% of 1913 levels, food production at 66% of 1913 levels, and the transport system had broken down. Over 20 million died from famine and disease (particularly typhus and smallpox). Lenin decided he needed to relax the tight economic control introduced under War Communism and allow some private ownership and trade while keeping control of ‘the commanding heights’ of the economy.

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

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

---

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

Was Allied insistence on reparations the main reason why Germany faced financial collapse by 1923?  
Explain your answer.

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany had to pay reparations to the victorious powers. The Reparations Commission fixed the sum at £6,600m to be paid in goods and/or currency in £50m annual instalments. In early 1923 Germany defaulted on payments so the French and Belgians occupied the Ruhr, the industrial heartland, to seize the owed goods. This action has been seen as the start of the hyperinflation crisis.

The Germans in the Ruhr responded to the invasion with passive resistance with government support. The German government printed money to pay the striking German workers in the Ruhr, and at the same time was unable to collect tax from the area. Government finances collapsed and money became worthless. By 1923 one egg could cost 80 million marks so Germans resorted to a barter economy.

Candidates will need to explain how the reparations can be seen as the start of the crisis, but need to examine the question more widely. Some wider causes might include:

- hyperinflation was based in mismanagement of Germany's wartime finances. The post-war governments inherited vast debt but were not prepared to cut back on spending and borrowing to cut inflation and created economic growth. Instead they relied on deficit financing to boost the economy by following a policy of low taxation giving German people more money to spend. By the end of 1922, before the Franco-Belgian invasion, hyperinflation had set in. Some historians like Holtferich conclude,

however, that deficit financing was successful by comparing economic growth in Germany to GB

- the terms of the Treaty of Versailles added to the inflation, e.g. the Saarland was placed under League of Nations control for 15 years and its coal production was to be handed to France. This created shortages of coal in Germany, adding to the price of fuel for domestic and industrial use
- there is also the question of the attitude of the French government. Poincaré was determined to keep Germany financially weak to prevent a future invasion. The French refused to allow coal from the Ruhr to be delivered to Germany, so forcing the government to buy more expensive imported coal. It is significant that the Locarno Treaty 1925 made any repetition of this Franco-Belgian occupation impossible
- there is also the attitude of the German government. The conservative German Chancellor, Wilhelm Cuno, chose to support the passive resistance despite realising that it would create hyperinflation. He was alarmed that France or any other state bordering Germany might try to annexe territory. Cuno was replaced by a right-wing Liberal, Gustav Stresemann, and a coalition that included Social Democrats. On September 26 1923 Stresemann announced the end of support for passive resistance.

---

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

Examine the extent to which Italian victory in the First World War was ‘mutilated’.

**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 candidates will need to examine why Italians felt a sense of national grievance at the terms of the post-war treaties, and to extend their answers to include broader issues. They may consider how uniform was the Italian belief in their victory being ‘mutilated’.

The answers will need to show a clear understanding of the territorial terms of the secret Treaty of London, April 1915, that preceded the Italian declaration of war on Austria, May 1915, and will need to compare those terms with the final Treaty of St Germain. At the time, many Italians claimed they had been badly treated in the ‘mutilated victory’, and Orlando walked out of the negotiations in April 1919 in protest at indifference to Italian demands. The revised view is that they were treated fairly although they did not get Dalmatia, part of the Italian Irredenta, given to the new state Yugoslavia as part of national self-determination. It did contribute to the feeling of national grievance.

The Italians had finished the war with a victory at Vittorio Veneto against the disintegrating Austro-Hungarian army. This decisive victory before the post-war negotiations began, yielding almost half a million prisoners, restored Italian pride and appeared to leave Italy as the dominant power in the Balkans after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires. Many Italians believed the myth that this victory strengthened their negotiating position.

The belief the victory was “mutilated” reflected tensions within Italian society between the men who had fought and those who remained at home. The comradeship and suffering in

the trenches partially bridged social and cultural divisions, and created a common cause. Mussolini identified this when he talked of the need for 'trenchocracy'. It suited these men to be very critical of the politicians who negotiated the peace.

Conditions for many Italians also added to the feeling the victory was 'mutilated' as social and economic conditions were very strained. Real wages fell as inflation spiralled, peasant populations had been moved to the towns to work in the war industries, and the gap between the advanced industrialised north and agrarian south had been opened wider. These tensions were magnified by the experience of war, and dominated national consciousness leading to a feeling of betrayal.

There were Italians who had benefited from the war. Industrialists making war goods had a ready market and they were able to rise their prices keeping pace with inflation because the Liberal government had no choice but to buy the goods for the war, e.g. Fiat and Pirelli. After the war these industrialists faced harder times, and a wave of trade union militancy in the Biennio Rosso, so these industrialists were critical of the Liberal Governments.

The other victorious Powers were not overly interested in rewarding Italy. They were more concerned with the issue of German reparations and the threat of Bolshevik Revolution. Wilson was determined that the new state of Yugoslavia should have a good deep-water harbour, and Fiume was the only port available. He did not respond to Italian claims to the port. This conflict between Italy and her wartime allies led ultimately to the 1919 Fiume crisis.

The answers will need to define 'mutilated', to assess whether the Italians were promised more than they were awarded in the Peace Settlement, whether they deserved to be awarded more, and which Italians in particular claimed that the peace had been 'mutilated'.

## 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 the part played by declining death rates in explaining population change in Britain in the years 1870 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.**

Some typical arguments which may be put for the importance of declining death rates are:

- the lower infant mortality rates meant more children reached an age where they were able to reproduce
- by 1900 average life expectancy had risen to 46 for men and 50 for women allowing more reproductive years
- however, the death rate was high enough to prevent greater population increase – particularly among the under-nourished and over-worked working classes.

Other reasons for population change:

- growing use of abstinence amongst working class women pre-1914 identified by Women's Co-operative Guild
- the increase in working-class women after 1920 finding means of natural contraception as well as growing awareness of artificial contraception stimulated by the First World War where the authorities distributed sheaths to soldiers

- the growing use of artificial contraception amongst the middle class after 1918, e.g. Marie Stopes's "Married Love" following on from their use of "natural methods" pre-1914, mainly abstinence and prostitutes
- the improvements in public health especially in support for pregnant women, e.g. maternity clinics in Birmingham, after the Great War.

Other factors affecting population change:

- 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 and therefore the postponement of families due to delay in marriage
- the economic decline of the lower middle class post-1919 therefore further encouraging a reduction in average family size
- average family size amongst the aristocracy had fallen to 2.5 children by 1911. This may be linked to the rising cost of education in private schools in Edwardian England and/or to the long term impact of the Great Depression on agricultural incomes for landed estates.
- the higher proportion of women getting married after the First World War.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

##### **B: The Cotton Industry in Britain, 1870–1950**

Was overseas competition the most important factor in the decline of the British cotton industry in the years 1870 to 1950?  
Explain your answer.

In your answer you need not 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 overseas competition would be seen as critical:

- 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 decision by employers to lower costs in the 1880s by using lower grades of raw cotton leading to a long term decline in the perceived quality of British goods
- the growth of the US cotton industry in the 1920s which saw its own domestic market boom behind the protective wall of tariffs created by Congress
- increased US and Japanese competition in China
- renewed competition in the 1950s from India and Japan as well as new competitors such as Pakistan and Hong Kong
- 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 WW1 which helped the Government of India to raise the money necessary to fund military expenditure.

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

- the growth of alternative fabrics such as Rayon in the 1930s which Courtaulds did develop too. Britain was world leader in rayon production
- the Great Depression in the years 1929–1939, the decline in world commodity prices reduced the income of many countries to which Britain exported cotton
- the refusal of the weavers to adopt the more looms system in 1931
- 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 low investment in the 1920s due to low profits and high interest rates, linked to the Gold Standard
- the failure of 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
- candidates may also point to the fact that industrialised countries such as Germany had introduced protective tariffs prior to 1914
- the continuation of family ownership of mills which discouraged mergers/ rationalisation.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

**A: America, 1919 to 1929**

Was easier credit the most important factor in bringing about an economic boom in the 1920s?  
Explain your answer.

#### Mark Scheme

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers are expected to consider a range of factors for the boom between 1919 and 1929.

- easier credit has a significant role to play and candidates will need to explain this role. People were able to borrow more money. Money supply had been tighter before the progressive era. People were able to get larger loans and more easily as banks and insurance companies gave consumers, farmers and industrialists credit. They were seeking to grow their business during the 1920s. It was much easier to borrow with the development of hire purchase agreements. This allowed repayments over a period of time. For industrialists it allowed them to borrow against the expectation of profits in the future. Farmers were able to lease/buy more land to increase crop production which drove down the price of food
- consumers were able to buy more goods such as cars and luxury goods (Hoovers, radios etc.) with credit which stimulated factory production. Industrialists borrowed money to expand which then created a cycle of prosperity
- easier credit allowed stock market gambling to increase as people bought shares on the margin which drove stock prices up

There were other factors and some arguably more important than others:

- mass production is most commonly associated with Henry Ford and the Model T. This was arguably one of the most important developments because it cut the cost of the car or other consumer goods. Demand was further stimulated once it became cheaper
- mass production of the car, in particular, led to booms in associated industries, e.g. rubber, gas, glass etc.
- suburbs developed and so people wanted consumer durables for their homes which were up-to-date
- development of electricity allowed consumers to use labour saving devices and home radios and of course the production line was speeded up using electricity
- development of advertising which encouraged people to buy goods and developed as an important industry in its own right
- consumerism stimulated the economy through increased demand
- cheap immigrant labour helped to keep industry costs down and was easily exploited by manufacturers by making them work long hours
- role of big business and entrepreneurs, e.g. shares were driven up, inventors created new products and people like Ford took risks
- expansion of industry and overseas markets helped to create a boom because the US could sell its products abroad and take over European companies and so expand even more.

The Republican 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. Yet easier credit did play a significant role but it is debatable as to whether or not it was the most important factor.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

#### **B: The New Deal, 1933–1941**

With what success had the New Deal helped farming in the United States to recover by 1941?

#### Mark Scheme

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Candidates will need to provide some context in order to explain what is meant by farming in the US and the particular problems that farmers faced:

#### **Problems:**

- overproduction meant that it was often uneconomic to pick the crops because they could not get good prices for their wheat etc.
- foreclosure, where they had tried to expand and could not pay off the loan to either the insurance company or bank. This could mean the complete loss of the farm
- soil erosion and poor farming techniques meant they were fighting a losing battle to produce efficiently
- share cropping was a very poor way of farming and very common in the South amongst African Americans
- lack of overseas markets for primary products such as tobacco and cotton meant poor prices
- competition for markets from other nations.

Candidates will have to consider the role of the New Deal and specific acts such as AAA. This helped to establish a base price for farmers who were landowners and so it helped those with land and not the workers or the sharecroppers (they would benefit later).

- one of the most significant roles of the New Deal was to make sure that farmers could get a fair price for their crops
- the New Deal restored confidence to the farmers
- the New Deal also helped farmers in specific areas, e.g. TVA
- the New Deal taught land conservation methods and helped to educate farmers into better methods which were less wasteful
- as industry recovered and confidence returned to the economy then people bought more food
- the repeal of Prohibition also helped farmers but this is not really part of the New Deal
- as world markets recovered and demand rose for cotton and tobacco then farmers were helped but again this is not down to the New Deal
- as the approach of the Second World War came closer then industry picked up after the Depression of 1937 and this helped farmers
- arguably the First New Deal helped farmers to recover but was often more helpful to the wealthier farmer, especially since they were the main focus of the New Deal Acts
- it failed to help some especially in Oklahoma and the Dust Bowl.

**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 the system of military feudalism 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 the exercise of royal patronage and the use of the system as a method of control and government, as well as the role of his tenants-in-chief. 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 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 the 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, through 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 were severe – both judicial (feudal penalties for felony) and social (nothing) – and had been demonstrated since 1066 (Harold, Edwin and Morcar, the revolt of the Earls)

The Domesday Book underlines the importance of both the 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 did 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 individuals in bringing about monastic change in England 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.**

Answers will be expected to consider a range of factors which contributed to the growth of the monastic movement in England in the period specified, with particular focus on the role of individuals in the religious life.

Some description of the background of monasticism in England before the conquest may be included but this should be relatively brief.

#### **Relevant factors will include:**

- the impact of the conquest
- the effects of Normanisation
- patronage
- the effects of the new Orders

#### **1. The impact of the conquest and Normanisation**

- the initial spoliation and the impact of quotas
- imposition of new practices
- racial tension
- rebuilding
- continuity of annals and English hagiography

## **2. Patronage**

- the role of royalty: William I, Henry I, Queen Matilda
- aristocratic patronage: used to mark social standing (Robert d'Oilly); used to consolidate estates (Picot in Cambridge); following the fashionable royal lead (Count Stephen at Furness); as mausolea
- 'Native' patronage: refounding of Jarrow and Wearmouth

## **3. Effects of new Orders**

- these included Cluniacs, Cistercians, Augustinian canons
- the introduction of these led to an upsurge in recruitment, as well as to the economy – a particular benefit of Cistercian foundations in Yorkshire

## **4. The role of individuals**

- the effects of the work of Lanfranc and Anselm, tightening discipline and bringing England into the mainstream of continental reform
- the impact of Bernard of Clairvaux balanced against the role of Stephen Harding in the constitution of Clairvaux
- Bernard's secretary William, returning to plant Cistercian monasticism in the North

English monasticism benefited from an amalgamation of English and Norman culture and patronage, and experienced cultural interchange on a wider scale than previously thanks to the work of individuals.

## HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

### Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529

#### A: Pretenders and Protest in the Reign of Henry VII

Explain why Perkin Warbeck remained a threat to the security of Henry VII for so many years.

#### 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 career of Perkin Warbeck in the years 1491 to 1499 and his long-running threat to the security of Henry VII's position. Answers will be expected to explain a range of factors that made Warbeck dangerous – and why Henry took so long to eliminate him.

The question implies that Warbeck was a danger for a long time – this can be challenged. Many answers may argue that Henry was mostly in control, that Warbeck got little support from English Yorkists, and that Henry was only ever really worried about foreign interference exploiting Warbeck as a pawn. Such arguments can and should be fully rewarded; but this approach is by no means essential or superior. The main focus of this question is on explaining *why* Warbeck was a threat.

Answers should be based on a direct assessment of a range of factors. One feature of good answers may be a degree of prioritising and differentiation. Narrative biographical description of Warbeck's life, especially of origins and youth, will be of limited value; the key requirement is assessment and explanation.

It should not be expected that answers will be comprehensive. Relevant factors might include:

- Henry's basic vulnerability to *any* half-credible challenger, due to his usurpation of the throne in 1485 and the weakness of his dynastic claim
- significant support for Warbeck from James of Scotland and Warbeck's Scottish 'queen', Katherine Gordon
- training and support from Margaret of Burgundy and, potentially, the Emperor Maximilian
- Warbeck's ability to threaten Henry through Spain. Warbeck attempted to get support from Isabella; and the Spanish marriage project was largely 'on ice' until Warbeck was finally disposed of
- the combination of the Warbeck threat with the Cornish rebellion and Irish issues in 1497
- the continuing danger that he might escape, even after his capture in 1497 – Warbeck's execution would not have happened if he were not still seen as dangerous in 1499.

Some answers may make valid comparisons between Warbeck and other threats to Henry VII, such as Lambert Simnel and the Earl of Warwick. But such comparisons must be selective and directly applied to **this** question, which has a specific focus on Warbeck himself.

---

**HISTORY****UNIT 3****COURSE ESSAYS****HS03****Alternative N: Aspects of Tudor England, 1483–c1529****B: The Career of Thomas Wolsey**

Was the power and prestige of Wolsey in the years 1515 to 1525 entirely due to his ability to manipulate and deceive Henry VIII?  
Explain your answer.

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

**Indicative content**

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

The focus of this question is on the personal power and prestige of Wolsey over the period from 1515 to 1525, when Wolsey's position began to be undermined by his perceived failures over the Amicable Grant. Descriptive material on Wolsey's later decline and fall can be of little relevance, though some high-quality answers may possibly make effective points about how what went wrong in 1525–1529 contrasts with the 'success' of his earlier career. Similarly, answers should not be unbalanced by excessive biographical material on Wolsey's early life and 'rise to power', although valid points can be made in explaining the extent of his power and influence already achieved by the time of the starting date 1515.

The key focus should be on Wolsey at the peak of his power and prestige and above all on the nature of the key relationship between Wolsey and the King – the 'master or servant' debate. Did the advancement of Wolsey and his importance within Henry VIII's government and court depend on his ability to 'manipulate' Henry VIII? Even within the restrictions of the key dates, Wolsey's career was wide-ranging. Answers should not be expected to be comprehensive or equal in coverage but ought to provide a range of evidence across the period as a whole. Some of the key aspects of these years might include:

- becoming a Cardinal (at Henry's urging) in 1515, and having a power base as a prince of the church
- overcoming rival personalities such as Warham in 1515 and Fox in 1516

- his role in the King's Council and his dominance over powerful magnates
- successful reconciliation of Henry with his sister Mary Tudor after her secret marriage in 1515
- his importance in foreign policy and schemes to advance Henry's prestige, both in the years from 1515 to the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520 and in the period of 'mature diplomacy' between 1521–1525
- his role in legal reforms, including Court of Chancery and Star Chamber
- his reputation as a social reformer, including actions against enclosures
- his role in financial and tax reforms and the issues associated with raising money – above all the Act of Resumption 1515, dealing with Parliament, and the Amicable Grant of 1525.

A descriptive narrative account of Wolsey's actions between 1515 and 1525 would be of only limited value. There needs to be assessment of Wolsey's methods in dominating royal government and making himself 'indispensable'. Many answers will credit Wolsey with achieving vast power and importance by skilful manipulation; others will view Wolsey as a useful instrument of power who could only be what he was because Henry *chose* to give him so much power. (Like a football manager who was dominant while the team was winning but soon sacked by the chairman when he lost a few big matches.) As usual, successful answers will present a balanced argument supported by appropriate selected evidence.

---

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

Examine the extent to which Puritanism was a threat to James I's authority 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 Nature 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 the 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 threat 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 threat. 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 threat 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, or a 'Jacobethan balance', in which moderate Puritans, the vast majority, felt they could conform and would

---

thus not pose an overt threat to his authority. This was James's central aim, the maintenance of his authority.

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. On the surface the Petition appeared a threat to James's authority as Supreme Governor as the signatories wanted reform of the church and the document was supposedly signed by 1000 ministers. Some candidates may even refer to the Millenarian context of Puritanism and the Petition with the implication that reform was necessary as preparation for Christ's second coming. In contrast and in terms of moderation particular the authors of the Petition (rather than a 1000 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 James's authority desiring him to lead reformation of the church. James was referred to as 'the physician' to heal the church. More specifically the authors stated directly that they did 'not aim at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical'. The Millenary Petition was thus important in shaping James's response as its moderate nature quickly made clear to James the difference between most English Puritans and the Presbyterianism of Scotland and therefore that the threat could be dealt with if the real radicals were dealt with, hence the importance of Bancroft's Canons.

### **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 and reinforce his authority. 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 Puritanism James was determined to separate the radicals from the moderates in order to enforce his authority. 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' church was so broad that most felt they could conform. That many of this 'Silenced Brethren' removed themselves to America or the Netherlands lessened the problem of Puritanism for James. The maintenance of a broad church (Smith's 'Jacobethan balance') and the removal of radicals was at the heart of James's approach to religion and Puritanism. Bancroft's Canons through their persecution and moderation ensured that James maintained a 'Jacobethan balance' in the church that

encouraged the conformity of the majority. It thus dealt directly with the Puritan threat to James's authority.

### **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. This broad church which could accommodate most Puritans meant that the threat of Puritanism was limited. Some candidates may link the appointment of Abbot with the issuing of the Bible.

Note that the terminal date of this question is 1611 and material beyond this date would only be relevant if used as comparison to emphasise the circumstances to 1611.

---

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

How important was the personality of Charles I in changing the relationship between the Stuart monarchs and Scotland in the years 1603 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.**

Candidates should provide an outline of the impact of personality on rule, referencing the personalities of both kings as illustration. This can be developed in the context of how their personalities shaped their definition of kingship. James was pragmatic and although he wanted to impose his divine right and rule his two kingdoms as one, his main aim was the maintenance of his authority. In contrast Charles's inferiority complex saw him enforce his prerogative and rule in a style that as regarded as absolutist by some.

Candidates may illustrate the changing relationship by dealing with each monarch in turn or thematically.

James's objectives can be outlined. At first James stated that he would return to Scotland every three years. In reality he returned once in 1617 – he thus aimed to rule as an absentee king. James claimed that 'This I must say for Scotland, here I sit and govern it with my pen, I write and it is done, and by a clerk of the Council I govern Scotland now, which others could not do by the sword'. As a result, the Scottish Privy Council became very important and should be considered as part of how James dealt with the problems of kingship. He reduced it to a core of royal officials and this increased its efficiency and authority. Evidence of the Council Register indicates James kept a very close watch on Scottish affairs. This was strengthened by an efficient postal service which James used to send lots of directions to his Council. Growing numbers of his Councillors among the Lords of the Articles helped James manage Parliament. The introduction of JPs in 1609 increased influence of the Crown in localities. James also managed the ruling of Scotland through

successful delegation to appropriate Scots. The role of the Earl of Dunbar (1605–1611) who moved between the two kingdoms frequently, ensured good direction of policy by James.

Charles aimed at uniformity and conformity across the kingdoms – part of a ‘British’ policy less to Anglicize or unite the three kingdoms as to impose his will. Charles, like James, used absentee kingship – Charles was to rule through others – e.g. Menteith, Lennox and Hamilton. Key aspects of Charles’s kingship were:

- regarded as English king
- Scottish Privy Council with nine non-resident English members
- Scots restricted from patronage
- Act of Revocation
- role of Hamilton

For both kings there will probably be more detailed focus, however, on the role of religion. Assessment of importance of religion in relation to other factors can be made. In doing so candidates will probably stress that religion was the most important problem James and Charles faced. They can argue that absentee kingship was generally successful because of the reasons outlined above but that religion proved more problematic and much of this stemmed from the different personalities, and thus kingship, of each monarch.

**For James, candidates can refer to:**

- James sought to draw English and Scottish institutions together
- Restoration of bishops, 1606–1610
- Supreme Governor 1612
- Articles of Perth, 1617–1621

**For Charles, candidates can refer to:**

- 1626 issued proclamation commanding observation of the Articles of Perth, including personal instructions for kneeling at communion
- 1633 – Prayer Book
- 1634 Baron Balmerino
- 1636 Canons
- 1637 rebellion
- 1640 Canons

Charles’s personality led more directly to his Arminianism/Laudianism and a greater stress on enforcing conformity that would provoke more reaction. At a deeper level, James, unlike Charles, had ‘an instinctive understanding of Scottish politics’ and he can be generally regarded as successful. However, candidates can also point out that problems emerged post-1617, particularly centred around religion but deriving from absentee kingship were also problematic for James but it is unlikely that he would have escalated them as Charles did. Charles’s objectives were more aggressively centralist, most visibly illustrated by his religious policies. Charles’s policies after 1637 and his reaction to the revolution can be used to highlight the fundamental different approaches of the two monarchs to ‘personal monarchy’.

**Other factors**

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

- the nature of power within Scotland may also be considered, in that the elite were able to have much more influence and many were determined to assert their authority at the expense of the crown
- in a similar vein the nature of the Presbyterian Church and its relationship with the
- Crown can be considered and the extent to which the problems caused by policies was due to James and Charles or their ministers in Scotland.

---

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

Examine the extent to which the Jacobite movement threatened the Hanoverian dynasty in the years 1714 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.**

This question covers the entire period from 1714 to 1746, therefore candidates should demonstrate knowledge of events between the two main Jacobite uprisings, as well as the uprisings themselves. Candidates will probably discriminate between English and Scottish Jacobites in their responses, and will probably also refer to the threat posed by the prospect of foreign intervention linked to the Jacobite cause.

In 1715 there was sufficient potential support for Jacobitism in Scotland for the Earl of Mar to consider it worthwhile to begin his campaign there. There was much less support in England, where the Jacobites were linked in the public mind with the discredited Tories. Potential French support disappeared with the death of Louis XIV early in 1715. Jacobite support in 1715 was mainly the result of:

- Scottish disillusionment with rule from London
- adherence to the Stuart cause
- some disenchantment in England with the new Hanoverian regime.

Prosperity, complacency and the growing acceptance of the Hanoverian regime combined to limit Jacobite prospects south of the border in the decades following 1715; ministerial uncertainties in 1722 stimulated a new conspiracy under Atterbury and Layer, but this never really showed any prospects of success. Sweden and Spain were both involved in Jacobite conspiracies in 1717 and 1719 respectively but neither had great impact. Several minor outbursts of Jacobite activity in Scotland in the 1730s served to remind the government that

there was still potential backing for the Jacobites in Scotland, but none in themselves posed any real threat.

In 1745 the Jacobites attempted to win English support with promises:

- to end the Hanoverian influence over foreign policy
- that the position of the Church of England would be protected.

English Jacobites provided little more than vocal support. North of the border, there was much more activity, with the Young Pretender rousing emotional support amongst the clans; however, the real value of relatively untrained Scots fighting against an organised British army must be questionable, as the eventual rout at Culloden demonstrated. There was the prospect of some Welsh support in 1745, but the Welsh gentry, under Sir Watkin Williams Wynn failed to deliver any real support. France had considered a naval invasion in 1744, in conjunction with English Jacobites, but storms decimated the fleet and the French played no role in 1745.

The overall conclusion is likely to be that there was some threat from Scottish Jacobites, English Jacobites and foreign countries (who used the Jacobite cause as an excuse to consider action against Britain). The threat was greatest from the Scottish Jacobites, but arguably never posed a really major threat to Britain due to a combination of factors:

- Scottish inconsistency
- well-organised government resistance
- lack of sustained foreign support.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

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

Examine the relative importance of Robert Clive and Warren Hastings in 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 would be expected to examine the impact of the careers of both Clive and Hastings on the establishment and development of British control in India from 1757.

#### **Clive's role:**

- military – Plassey and subsequent ruthlessness and determination secured the conquest of Bengal and the virtual removal of French influence from India by the end of the Seven Years' War
- political – on returning to England, he became an MP and ensured that Indian affairs maintained a high profile in British politics in the 1760s
- administrative – on returning to India in 1765, he restored stability, secured control of Bengali finances for the East India Company, and dealt with corruption amongst Company employees. Some areas not (adequately) tackled, however; 'inland trading' issue ignored, nothing done for natives, too much emphasis on increasing personal wealth.

#### **Hastings's role:**

- financial – native tax-collectors made responsible to Company officials; but later involved in financial scandal with the Begums of Oudh

- administrative – Nawab of Bengal's power subordinated to East India Company to increase efficiency
- political – Regulating Act (1773) enhanced Hastings's status (as Governor-General of Bengal), but contributed to later difficulties with the establishment of a government-dominated council
- military – support given to Nawab of Oudh against the Rohillas; in Mahratta Wars (1777–1782), British rights defended against possible French expansion; less success handling the invasion of the Carnatic (1780–1783).

Candidates should make some attempt to compare the successes and failures of both men. Clive's motivation would seem to be less pure and more driven by self-interest than that of Hastings; however, Clive appeared to have a firmer control over the course of events. Hastings's main objective was to restore stability in Bengal through administrative and financial reform rather than to expand British power and influence; Clive was much more openly committed to military expansion. Overall, similarities are more noticeable than differences, with both men attempting financial and administrative reform, both seeking control over native princes and the diminution of French influence, and both essentially servants of the East India Company.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

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

How important was the aim of reducing the burden on ratepayers in the framing of the 1834 Poor Law?

#### **Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of this question is the “framing” or **terms** of the 1834 Poor Law and the influences on these. The closer the candidate links factors to actual terms, the better the answer is likely to be. Candidates should consider financial considerations and balance these against other factors:

#### **Ways in which the Poor Law was influenced by the financial issue include:**

- growing numbers of poor after 1815 (de-mobilisation; the Corn Laws; changes in agriculture and cyclical depressions in industry)
- the poor harvests of 1830/1831 and Swing Riots had led to higher costs due to an increase in rural poverty
- the expansion of the electorate caused the change in approach especially after 1832 when the number of middle class electors doubled
- Tory support for the legislation reflected the desire of landowners to reduce poor rates.

These factors clearly had some bearing on the imposition of deterrence/workhouses but there were other reasons:

**Other factors influencing the framing of the Poor Law:**

- the changing climate of opinion due to classical economists such as Ricardo and Utilitarians such as Bentham
- the failure and corruption brought about by other systems of poor relief, e.g. the Swing Riots had occurred in areas where the Speenhamland system operated so it was clearly not a solution
- the apparently scientific investigation by Chadwick whose results had shocked the middle class and the influence of Royal Commission
- as well as costs, landowners were keen to ensure law and order by controlling the poor and thereby avoiding vagrancy.

The other factors may have had more influence on the administrative and organisational changes and played a large part in the way the act was framed.

## HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

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

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

How important was the election of Daniel O’Connell in the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829?

#### **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 is on why the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed in 1829. Candidates should balance O’Connell’s election against other reasons.

#### **The importance of O’Connell’s election:**

- O’Connell’s election was the trigger that led Peel to urge change and therefore it was an immediate cause
- the issue could no longer be ignored as O’Connell was the leader of a mass movement
- O’Connell’s election and re-election threatened violent disturbances in Ireland where tenant/landlord relations were further soured by religious divisions
- Wellington used the election to persuade George IV to agree despite George IV’s strong anti-Catholic sentiments.

#### **Other factors:**

- there had been a majority in favour of Catholic Emancipation in the House of Commons for some years and therefore it was difficult to resist in a crisis
- it was the adoption of the policy by ministers with the agreement of the King which swung votes in the House of Lords and therefore made it possible

- the death of Lord Liverpool had ended a period when Catholic Emancipation was not openly debated and, although this was maintained by George IV in regard to subsequent ministries, control weakened under Canning and Goderich
- the Non-Conformists had already benefited from the partial repeal of the Test Acts so the principle of Anglican monopoly had already been breached
- the brief premiership of Canning had already brought Catholic Emancipation to the fore
- divisions within the Tory party over Emancipation and reform had led to the resignation of Canningites which led to the reshuffle which caused the by-election in Clare
- because of Goderich's failure to give a strong lead and the defection of the Canningites when Wellington was appointed he could not simply say 'no' as this would place the political initiative with the Whigs, who could rely on Canningite support, and therefore push the Tories from power.

---

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

How effective were the Liberal welfare reforms in improving living and working conditions for the working classes in the years 1906 to 1914?

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus should be on the effectiveness of the reforms rather than just descriptions of what the reforms by the Liberal governments during these years were designed to do and aimed to achieve. Responses should cover both living and working conditions. Stronger responses may justify greater effectiveness in one aspect rather than the other. The reforms related to both aspects were designed to tackle poverty, though it can be argued that they dealt with symptoms rather more than causes. Another objective of the Liberal governments was to achieve greater national efficiency in the light of such factors as the poor health and fitness standards of recruits during the Boer War, the reports of Booth and Rowntree, and increased economic competition from other states, notably Germany and the USA.

All of the reforms achieved some effectiveness in improving conditions and responses should indicate what they were and comment. The main reforms aimed at improving living conditions were:

- Workmen's Compensation Act (1906)
- Old Age Pensions (1908)
- National Insurance (1911)

They were aimed at providing some measure of 'social security' for some of the most vulnerable, some workers and the most elderly, in the working classes by providing a basic amount of money for individuals.

---

Other measures were aimed at improving living and school conditions for children:

- school meals (1906)
- school medical inspections (1907)
- “Children’s Charter” (1908) including health and care of children, juvenile courts and borstals, ban on sale of tobacco to those under 16.

The main reforms aimed at improving working conditions were:

- those for merchant seamen (1906), miners (1908), shop workers (1911) and those in the sweated trades (e.g. tailoring, lace-spinning, and box making) (1909)
- introduction of Labour Exchanges (1908) to bring employers and particularly potential employees together effectively.

Answers may refer to increases in taxation of the wealthy in Lloyd George’s 1909 ‘People’s Budget’ which were aimed (in part) at providing funding through a fairer system of taxes to pay for welfare reforms, especially pensions.

Answers will need to assess the limitations of the reform legislation in terms of effectiveness over the whole period in order to reach judgements on individual measures and the reforms overall. The reports of Booth and Rowntree had found the main causes of poverty to be unemployment and old age. Approximately one third of the population in London and York had been found to be living in poverty. Solutions were quite beyond the scope of private charity and the Poor Law. Government action was necessary. Although Conservative/ Unionist governments did not pick up the challenge, the Liberal governments from 1906 did, although the extent and effectiveness have been criticised as inadequate. Yet it is important to emphasise that no government had intervened before on anything like the scale of that of the Liberals during these years. Limitations of the effectiveness of the reforms concerning living conditions included the following:

- Old Age Pensions were restricted to the very old (over 70) and the sums quite meagre. However, they undoubtedly alleviated poverty amongst the very old. The scheme was non-contributory and, despite its eligibility limitations, this was one of the great welfare reforms of the Liberals
- the more effective part of the National Insurance Act before the First World War was Part I, which gave cover against ill health. The scheme was contributory including a weekly sum for the employee, a cause of resentment for many workers. However, it was limited as it covered only the insured worker and not his dependants. Part II of the National Insurance Act introduced a contributory scheme for insurance against unemployment. The unemployed worker received just seven shillings (35p) a week, but only for 15 weeks. The scheme was also restricted to a few industries and was not in extensive use until just before the War
- furthermore the Liberal governments did little to tackle the problem of extensive slum housing nor did they abolish the Poor Law and the harsh reality of those reliant upon it.

Limitations of the effectiveness of the reforms concerning working conditions included the following factors:

- apart from the Workmen’s Compensation Act the employment legislation did not significantly reduce poverty *per se* despite improved conditions at work for those affected by the legislation

- Trade Boards for the sweated industries (1909) such as box-making and tailoring were established, but improvements were introduced only slowly.

Better answers will identify clearly limitations in the extent of measures in assessing the effectiveness of the Liberal governments in improving living and working conditions for the working classes. Some measures were weakened in the Lords and some Bills were defeated (or dropped), e.g. Education and Licensing Bills. Overall there was an unprecedented amount of legislation, driven by 'New Liberalism', in order to make some attempts to improve conditions and ameliorate the effects of poverty and pauperism especially for children, the elderly and the unemployed. Some have seen the Liberal reforms as the beginning of the welfare state in Britain, but most interpretations argue that it provided the basis for the emergence of that later and especially after the Second World War. Certainly Lloyd George wanted further reforms and notably extended the National Insurance Act after the First World War. The Unionists were unsympathetic in the main before 1914, but did bring in further measures, e.g. those introduced by Neville Chamberlain, to improve working class conditions during the inter-war period.

## HISTORY

### UNIT 3

### COURSE ESSAYS

### HS03

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

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

How important was the Liberal Government's Home Rule Bill of 1912 in bringing Ireland close to civil war in 1914?

#### **Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus should be on the extent to which the government's Third Home Rule Bill was important in a context of other salient factors, such as resistance by Ulster Unionists and pressure from Irish nationalism, both inside and outside Parliament. There can be background introductory material on the religious, political (and economic) divisions in Ireland, and the failure of the First and Second Home Rule Bills, but this should be brief:

The Liberal Government's decision to introduce and pass the Third Home Rule Bill was based on a number of long and short term factors which included the following.

- Liberal Party policy since 1886. The first two Home Rule Bills had failed and there was little prospect of success until a Liberal government could overcome the opposition of the Tory majority in the House of Lords
- this became a possibility only after the enactment of the Parliament Act in 1911
- consequently the Third Home Rule Bill was introduced in 1912, but could only be passed after the expiration of the Lords' veto in 1914
- dependence of the Liberal government after the Elections of 1910 on the Irish Nationalists (with their demand for a Third Home Rule Bill) for a majority in the Commons

- determination of the government to continue with the Bill from 1912–1914 in spite of opposition from Ulster Unionism and from the Conservatives in both the Commons and the Lords
- attempts to compromise to avoid bloodshed, e.g. Asquith's ill-fated proposal to exclude Ulster from Home Rule for a six-year period
- government intention to implement Home Rule in late summer/autumn 1914 in spite of the Curragh 'Mutiny' by British army officers and the expectation of civil war breaking out.

There should be explanation of other important factors and reasons for Ireland being close to civil war in 1914. In terms of the Unionists/'Protestants' these included the following:

- determined resistance to Home Rule by Ulster Unionists and Protestants intensified from 1910 but particularly from the time of the introduction of the Bill in 1912
- their sense of being British, not Irish (in direct contrast to the nationalist feeling of being Irish, not British)
- the sense of unionism, which had developed since the late nineteenth century particularly after Gladstone's two attempts to introduce Home Rule, to maintain the union with Britain
- Unionist loyalty to the monarchy and British institutions
- perceived threats to political and especially religious freedoms under Catholic hegemony ('Rome Rule')
- fear of loss of Protestant supremacy in Ireland
- threats to the economic and land ownership status quo.

Major developments in Unionist resistance to the Liberals' Bill during 1912–1914 included:

- the militant leadership of Carson and Craig
- the swearing of the Solemn League and Covenant (determination to resist by force)
- formation and arming of the Ulster Volunteers
- support from Bonar Law and the Conservative Opposition in the Commons as well as the Lords
- total intransigence on Asquith's 'Six Years Exclusion' proposal (and other attempts at compromise)
- seemingly support from British Army officer to refuse to implement Home Rule during the Curragh 'Mutiny'
- the Larne gunrunning.

Other important factors in terms of nationalist/‘Catholic’ developments which brought Ireland close to civil war included:

- the growth in support for Sinn Fein, which opposed compromise (whereas the more moderate leadership of the Irish Nationalists at Westminster and in Ireland by John Redmond was prepared to bargain)
- formation and arming of the Irish Volunteers to oppose the Ulster Volunteers
- interference with the gunrunning at Howth, seen as an anti-nationalist move from the British authorities (whereas the gunrunning at Larne by the Unionists went unhindered).

The situation of complete confrontation had come about principally because of the Unionists’ refusal to contemplate implementation of the Third Home Rule Bill and indeed Home Rule of any kind. Support by the Conservatives (and Bonar Law in particular with his possibly unconstitutional statements) was also highly significant. In the end in 1914, it was not ultimately Unionist opposition which prevented implementation of Home Rule and the outbreak of civil war, but postponement due to the outbreak of the First World War. The Liberal government had remained committed to Home Rule and was prepared to implement the legislation when it finally reached the statute book under the procedures of the Parliament Act. However, it had been prepared to consider compromise seriously and seized the ‘opportunity’ offered by the outbreak of the First World War to draw back and postpone implementation of its Home Rule Act in a situation where civil war in Ireland (and possibly in Britain) looked very likely in summer 1914.

---

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

Examine the extent to which different regions of Britain exhibited marked variations in their economic development 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 extent to which different regions of Britain had developed different economic bases in the years before 1750. By 1750 England was still a predominantly agricultural country; some diversification had taken place, both in terms of regional specialisation in agriculture and in terms of proto-industry; however, perhaps the greatest differences were still to be observed between town/city and rural areas rather than through regions.

Elements which suggest that there was a marked variation in regional development:

- there is evidence of marked differences in agricultural production beginning with innovation in East Anglia following the restoration. The use of drainage techniques, marling and the four course crop rotation placed pressure for agricultural change in the clay soil areas of the country who specialised in the fattening of stock. The area around London diversified into market gardening and other areas exploited pasture for dairy production. Agriculture in Wales, Scotland and Ireland was largely subsistence-based
- the development of proto-industrialisation was regionally based; the east Midlands concentrated on the production of lace and hosiery, Yorkshire on woollen cloth, Lancashire on cotton, Bedfordshire on straw plaiting etc. The west Midlands

concentrated on tin toys, buttons and small arms. Not only was the actual manufacture based in certain regions but the infrastructure necessary for the export of materials was too

- the development of transportation tended to follow where there was a need to move goods to extra regional markets, and with the development of turnpike roads other elements of the infrastructure were developed, such as attorneys and banks for lending and saving money
- economic activity was dominated by London as a market for manufactured goods, agricultural produce and as an exporting base for foreign markets. London also had the manufacturers of jewellery, clothes, furniture, silver, etc. It was a source of employment and enterprise. For the purpose of this essay, London could be regarded as a region in its own right. Alternatively candidates may argue that it was not in itself a region but could be regarded as confirming the division between rural/urban areas.

Elements which suggest that there were not significant differences in regional development:

- England was still a predominantly agricultural country. Not until the 1851 census did more people live in towns than in the urban areas. Even where goods were produced for sale, the majority of the produce was sold in the local markets rather than exported outside the area. Where people were involved in the production of goods in rural areas, this was in many cases a dual occupation and would be combined with agricultural production
- the most significant difference could be seen between the majority of towns/cities and the countryside. Towns were social centres and centres of production of fine goods but the significant economic variation was that they were consumers of goods. Most rural villages – even those who were involved in manufacture – produced food; towns consumed the produce of villages and created employment. Towns were also the base for merchants and the export of produce was organised by regional centres. Town developed the infrastructure which would support industrialisation. Towns were the centre of market economies without which little development could have taken place.
- much of England experienced the same vagaries of agricultural production; poor transport (prior to canals and railways) was dependent on the volatile climate and was dominated by a legal and administrative system geared towards the benefits of landed society.

Overall candidates are likely to focus on the regional developments which were taking place. Agricultural change was more advanced than manufacture by the third quarter of the eighteenth century, and it is unlikely that England would have developed without this regional specialisation; yet to focus on what was changing should not ignore what was still very much the same. The historians whom candidates may consider who stress the regional nature of change are the proto-industrialists such as Pat Hudson, Maxine Berg, Kriedte, Medick and Schlumbohm. Alternative theories of economic development are put forward by Rostow and Mathias which look more specifically at the cotton industry.

---

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

Examine the extent to which there was an improvement in the standard of living of people in rural areas between 1780 and 1830.

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

**Focus of the Question**

This question focuses on those who lived in the countryside during the period of agricultural and industrial change. Most of the debate about the standard of living has focused on those who lived in towns. However, the development of wage dependency was also a feature of rural employment. Contiguity with urban areas was important for some agricultural regions where the market for produce and alternative employment had a favourable impact on the wages paid to agricultural labourers. We should not expect candidates to focus on the standard of living of urban dwellers except, perhaps, as a counter-point to those in the countryside.

**The extent to which the standard of living did improve in rural areas:**

- the question encompasses all people living in rural areas and there were clearly improvements in the standard of living of those landowners able to benefit from the development of the market economy. Landowners who were able to invest or borrow money to finance improvements associated with enclosure benefited from greater output and market penetration. The profits made on their produce were used to build new farmhouses and to furnish them with the latest fashions. Sons and daughters were educated on these profits. A new lifestyle was developed distinct from the labourers, who were discouraged from 'living in'.

- workers in the countryside tended to be more likely to benefit from the improved nutrition, which came with improvements in agriculture. This was particularly the case in the non-Speenhamland areas. Such areas are typified by the existence of additional employment available in the villages when it facilitated opportunities for dual employment
- those agricultural labourers in areas of Cheshire and around the main manufacturing centres, and London, tended to benefit from industrial development and their wages were kept relatively high through the sale of market gardening and the need to keep labourers in the locality. Wage evidence suggests these labourers were paid more than they were in areas which lacked an industrial stimulus
- most recognised indices which judge the quality of life through mortality rates and life expectancy, such as those comparing Rutland and Manchester show that the quality of life in the countryside was better for all. It is likely that access to fresh air, clean water and the easier disposal of sewage had a significant impact on health.

**The extent to which the standard of living declined:**

- the number of people affected in a negative way by enclosure far outweighed those who benefited from the process. Labourers lost the right to glean, to catch small game, gather firewood etc. Squatters had their homes removed and the majority of the south of England witnessed a reduction in employment. Attempts to provide work through the Roundsmen System were limited. The impact of the Corn Laws was greatest in these areas and the Speenhamland System of poor relief inadequate for more than the most basic of needs
- the workers who lived in the countryside but were employed wholly in the manufacture of products for market were badly affected by their wage dependency and the increased cost of food. The frame-work knitters are a classic example of how the system of manufacture degraded the work force through spurious charges and payment through token. Other groups based in the countryside were affected by increased mechanisation, for example, the handloom weavers and the croppers, in each case an erosion of wages resulted in a significant decline in the standard of living
- as living-in agricultural servants were replaced by wage labourers, standard of living declined. Whilst living in, most had been fed the same food as the master's family, now they were only employed when needed and had to purchase their food on the open market. For many the only option they had to improve the standard of living was by moving to towns.

**Overall**

The impact on the standard of living on the standard of living in the countryside was determined by socio-economic status and also by regional variation. It is impossible to treat those living in the countryside as a homogenous group. Some generalisation is possible and it would be that those who were dependent on their own labour were those who were most likely to suffer. The historians who might be quoted beyond the standard of living debate (Ashton, Hartwell, Thompson, Hobsbawm, etc.) are Keith Snell, the Webbs and perhaps Anne Kussmaul.

---

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

Examine the degree to which the impact of the 1832 Reform Act explains the introduction of the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act and the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act.

**Mark Scheme**

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

Answers should consider the motives two of the Whig reforms of the 1830s: the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 and the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835. Answers should explicitly consider the motives behind both of these acts to achieve balance. The question focuses on motivation, therefore consideration of other motives other than the 1832 Reform Act is also necessary.

**The impact of the 1832 Reform Act could be considered as follows:**

- generally the 1832 Reform Act had established the idea amongst leading Whigs that government could intervene for the benefit of the people (defined as being people like them). This period has often been characterised as an age of Whig Reform because of their new commitment
- furthermore, the 1832 Reform Act had brought the Whigs distinct political advantages. Having been out of power since 1807, they won decisive victories in 1832, 1835 and 1837. They now sought a similar advantage in local government, replacing the 'Tory dining-clubs' with Whig municipal governments via a newly-extended franchise
- 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 made by the middle-classes under the new local poor rate compared to the inefficient and expensive Speenhamland System. It has been estimated the bill fell from approximately £7 million to approximately £4.5 million.

However, to provide balance other motives need to be considered.

The **Utilitarian principles** of Bentham (the greatest good of the greatest number) are a further motive and can be seen at work in the drive for efficiency that the PLAA represents as well as the narrow conception of the causes of poverty that the Benthamites accepted.

- they believed that the vast majority of poverty was caused by idleness and therefore the idle poor should be removed from the community, receiving relief only in workhouses, where conditions should be worse than outside to encourage people to work – the principle of ‘less-eligibility’
- the presence of Benthamites like Chadwick, Bishop Sumner, Bishop Blomfield, Bourne and Lewis on the 1832 Poor Law Commission is significant, with their emphasis on utilitarian principles like uniformity
- 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. This replaced the haphazard allocation of local representation and range of qualifications for the local franchise with a uniform system for allowing towns and cities to gain an elected corporation and a uniform franchise for electing such bodies. The principle of uniformity was also a key idea of Bentham.

**Liberal ideas** might also be considered.

- the economic liberalism advocated by Adam Smith was the central economic belief of most MPs
- this argued that government intervention was a hindrance to wealth creation, but that selfishness was beneficial to society as a whole as ‘if by a hidden hand’ the selfish pursuit of wealth would do good to the whole community
- for this reason taxation should be as low as possible
- the Poor Law Amendment Act sought to limit government intervention in terms of taxation.

**Judgement may take the form of:**

- arguing that one factor was most important, offering reasoned explanation of a factor’s primacy
- arguing that one factor was most important for one reform, but that another factor was more significant as a motive for the other reform.

---

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

How important was the part played by Fergus O'Connor in the development of the Chartist movement 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 1838/9 with meetings and a petition to parliament, in 1842 with a second petition, the rejection of which led to strikes and riots, including the Plug Riots in Lancashire and finally in 1848 with a third petition following a rally at Kennington Common in London. The famous Charter set out six specific demands, namely:

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

O'Connor's importance to the development of the movement through these years should be considered. Balanced answers should consider evidence that O'Connor was not necessarily important to the movement, either by considering other factors or by challenging his impact.

Evidence that O'Connor was important:

- O'Connor was the **most dynamic figure** within the movement, rousing crowds with a violent form of rhetoric influenced by Anti-Poor Law speakers he had shared a platform with (e.g. J R Stephens)
- Editor of the **Northern Star** newspaper

- he also staged great spectacles, like his procession on his release from prison in 1841 when he was pulled in a carriage in the shape of a conch by six stallions
- he also had access to a **parliamentary platform** for Chartism, as MP for Nottingham. His election in 1847 saw him defeat a Whig Minister, Sir John Cam Hobhouse
- **Key tactic of ‘physical force’** was O’Connor’s preferred strategy, though it often focused on intimidation, and he often prevented violence, as in January 1840 and April 1848
- **O’Connor’s land scheme** also attracted publicity and support, certainly in the years up to 1848. Chartist Land Plan was the initiative of O’Connor and attracted 70,000 subscribers. His advocacy led to the establishment of the Chartist Land Co-Operative Society in May 1845
- **Unity.** 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 also viewed with distrust the Complete Suffrage Union as a middle-class takeover of popular radicalism. Lovett supported the CSU, but even his supporters in London backed O’Connor

However, **O’Connor’s contribution has been over-exaggerated:**

- the Land Plan failed as the amount of money raised was insufficient to allow the purchase of enough land to set up subscribers as landowners. Only 250 out of 70,000 acquired a small holding
- O’Connor has been attacked as ‘the great I Am’ of politics by Lovett; indeed the first settlement was renamed O’Connorville

Furthermore, **William Lovett’s contribution** can be seen as just as important:

- Lovett’s London Working Men’s Association, founded in 1836, drew up the first Charter and it was Lovett who gave it the radical language and distinctly political appeal
- Lovett was capable of violent language, and having worked with radicals like Francis Place he understood how to move a crowd
- Lovett wrote *Chartism* in gaol in 1841, articulating the ‘New Move’ which placed the emphasis on education
- after 1841, Lovett’s ‘new move’ Chartism stressed that power was unlikely to be won through violence, and even if was, it would not be exercised beneficially unless the intelligence and morality of the people were improved.

**Other factors responsible for development may also be offered,** including:

- disappointment with the 1832 Reform Act
- the economic conditions
- the role of Thomas Attwood and Francis Place.

There is no expectation that these factors will or will not be covered. However, there is an expectation that O’Connor’s importance will be challenged in a balanced answer.

Judgement might take the form of placing arguments in the context of the historiography of O'Connor, although this is not required for the highest marks.

- Lovett's autobiography in 1872 established the view of a man who was a blight to democracy
- Dorothy Thompson's lifetime's work on Chartism concluded by arguing that O'Connor was so central to the movement it ought to have been called O'Connorite radicalism.

## 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 Aneurin Bevan succeeded in overcoming the obstacles which he encountered in achieving his vision for a National Health Service in the years 1945 to 1951.

#### Mark Scheme

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

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

Marks as follows:

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

Indicative content

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

The focus of the question is the difficulties Bevan faced in implementing his vision for the NHS and the compromises he had to make. Candidates will want to consider Bevan's vision both in its broad aim of establishing a comprehensive and universal health service free at the point of need, and in the specific aims such as nationalising the hospitals, creating a State salaried medical profession, abolishing private practice, and health centres which would integrate health and welfare services.

Amongst the obstacles Bevan faced, candidates might include:

#### **Medical obstacles:**

- opposition of the medical profession to becoming salaried, State employees
- BMA's campaign between 1946 and 1948 which threatened the whole practicality of Bevan's vision
- opposition to the abolition of all private practice
- opposition of the endowed hospitals and ancient teaching hospitals
- poor state of many hospitals – old-fashioned buildings and run-down equipment
- legacy of health neglect, especially amongst working-class wives and mothers.

**Political obstacles:**

- opposition from the Conservatives
- competing financial demands from other Labour ministers
- arguments with other ministers about NHS organisation
- struggle with Gaitskell over prescription charges.

**Financial obstacles such as the:**

- rising cost of the NHS
- sheer demand on the NHS
- treasury demands for cuts in spending 1950–1951

In assessing the extent to which Bevan was unable to overcome all of these, candidates might refer to:

- compromise on private practice, especially with the consultants
- compromise on how doctors were paid
- ‘stuffing their mouths with gold’
- continued existence of private hospitals and ‘pay beds’
- not many health centres were established by 1951 and the integration of health and welfare services has never been fully achieved
- introduction of charges for dental and eye treatment and also prescription charges in 1951
- Bevan’s resignation over the prescription charges issue which he saw as a breach of one of his fundamental principles for the NHS
- Cripps and Gaitskell diverting resources from the NHS to fund rearmament.

However, the best answers will also consider the many ways in which Bevan did overcome the difficulties and realised his vision:

- well over 90% of the public and the medical profession did join the NHS
- the sheer demand for treatment – especially for eyes and teeth – was testimony to how pre-war neglect was being addressed by the NHS
- death rates from a variety of diseases did fall significantly after 1945 though well-informed candidates will point out that there were several causes of this
- removed part of the fear of sickness by making treatment free
- the NHS became a model for how a scheme of socialised medicine could be combined with a free society
- the NHS has remained for over half a century as a monument to Bevan’s work.

## HISTORY

UNIT 3

COURSE ESSAYS

HS03

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

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

Examine the extent to which Winston Churchill's differences with the Conservative Party leadership over relations with Germany kept him out of government between 1931 and 1939.

#### **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 could argue that issues like rearmament and appeasement were crucial areas of difference between Churchill and the Conservative/National Government leadership especially in the 1935–1938 period. Others might differentiate by time, arguing that India was a more important issue in the 1931–1935 period. Well-informed candidates might argue that factors such as distrust of Churchill's personality and record remained crucial throughout the period, pointing out that other Conservative groups opposed to the leadership's policy on Germany still kept their distance from Churchill.

In support of the proposition, candidates could point to:

- Churchill's criticisms of Baldwin, and to a lesser extent Chamberlain, over the speed and degree of rearmament
- criticisms of various aspects of appeasement, e.g. Anglo-German Naval Treaty, reaction to the Rhineland and the *Anschluss*
- criticisms of the Munich Agreement and of Chamberlain's policy towards Germany, even after April 1939.

In relation to other factors, candidates might point to:

- Churchill's die-hard opposition to the India Bill and might well argue this was the most important factor in his political isolation in the 1931–1935 period
- Churchill's personality and earlier political record and how he was perceived both within and outside the Conservative Party. Well-read candidates might refer not only to differences between Churchill and the Conservative leadership but also with other dissidents such as Eden. They may point to distrust given the number of times he had changed party and to his involvement with earlier fiascos such as the Dardanelles and the Gold Standard
- his involvement in the Abdication Crisis and how this confirmed the suspicions about his political unsteadiness and unreliability.

Some candidates may challenge the assumption by pointing out that his political isolation was ending by 1939 as events in Europe seemed to confirm his warnings about Nazi Germany and that he was brought into the National Government partly due to Press and popular pressure in September 1939.