

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/13

Paper 1c (British History Outlines 1689–2000),
maximum raw mark 90

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

SECTION 2: 1760–1815

6 ‘Nothing more than a minor irritant.’ Assess this judgment on the political influence of John Wilkes.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of politics in the 1760s and 1770s, and particularly the role of John Wilkes. The focus will be on Wilkes’ career, and particularly the role of his ‘brutal journalism’, especially his direct attacks on George III and Bute, involving allegations of a sell out over the terms of the Peace of Paris. His arrest on a charge of ‘seditious libel’. The key Wilkes ‘causes’ are: attacks on privilege and the **assertion of the liberties of Englishmen; general warrants** and the limits which should be applied to the **powers of arrest**; the London and – more important – the Middlesex elections of 1768 and the over-turning of the latter result to prevent Wilkes taking his seat; reporting of parliamentary debates; religious liberties; support for the American colonists.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Wilkes’ influence. Good candidates need to argue precisely about how important his contribution was to political and constitutional developments. They may argue that he was a key figure in articulating Englishmen’s rights and in asserting the supremacy of the choice of the electorate in determining the composition of the House of Commons – issues, they might argue, which suggest that he was more than a ‘minor irritant’. In that context, he could be said to anticipate more focused, and perhaps more incisive, attacks on privilege and calls for parliamentary reform in the late 1770s and early 1780s. Some candidates might argue that he was a catalyst for reform. Against that, it might be contended that Wilkes fled the country and spent time as an exile, so had limited impact in the mid 1760s. Some candidates might also adversely contrast the lack of theoretical underpinning to Wilkes’ campaigns with the opposition Whig attack on court privilege led by Edmund Burke. The extent of Wilkes’ radicalism can also be questioned, especially after he became Lord Mayor of London. Wilkes’ influence was much less by the early 1780s. Candidates might also suggest that he lacked the ability to bring down governments and, despite his influence on the American colonists, effect permanent political change. Less able candidates are likely to produce an over-biographical treatment which articulates what Wilkes did. Some may also concentrate on only one of the ‘causes’.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on later eighteenth-century radicalism which rather marginalises the influence of Wilkes.

AO3: [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4: – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

7 Why, in the period 1763–75, was there substantial support in Britain for the grievances of the Thirteen Colonies of North America?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the course of events leading up to the declaration of independence by the American colonies. The focus will be on support in Britain for the colonies in their opposition to taxation in the 1760s and in their moves towards a declaration of independence in the early & mid 1770s. Candidates should know about: the political situation in the 1760s, leading to unstable governments and opposition groups anxious to exploit the government; the significance of Stamp Duties and their repeal (1765); the Declaratory Act (1766) asserting that British authority was the same in its colonies as in the Mother Country; Sugar Act (1764) and American Mutiny Act (1765) and the vigour of colonial reaction; the Tea Act, the ‘Boston Tea Party’ (1773); North’s Coercive Acts (1774). They should also be aware of the arguments of Edmund Burke and other leading Whigs relating to: the legitimacy of taxing the colonies; what they saw as the folly of alienating one of Britain’s most lucrative expanding overseas markets; their hostility to George III and his ministers, especially North, often characterised as the King’s puppet. Additionally, many in Parliament believed that conflict with the colonies would bring a crisis in trade, which might provoke a slump and widespread unemployment in Britain.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about causation: why did substantial numbers of British citizens support America in its conflict with Britain in the 1760s and 1770s? Good candidates will be aware that the sympathies shown for the Colonists began with opposition to taxation policies and moved into a more radical phase in the 1770s, which brought many to support what were in effect rebels against the crown. Key causal issues were: perceptions of the appropriateness, and even legitimacy, of the British government’s taxation policies; opposition to George III’s attempts to ‘be a king’; the political instability of the 1760s which led to the formation of groups and factions, particularly among the Whigs, opposed to the government on a range of issues; opposition to what was considered to be Lord North’s intransigent position over the Colonies, despite his attempts at compromise with the Colonies in 1774–5. Good candidates should evaluate a range of arguments and the best should show either how they were connected or should evaluate the relative importance of the factors adduced. Less able candidates are likely to write descriptively about the key legislation and the perceived grievances of the Colonies with only limited concentrate on the nature and extent of opposition to government policy in Britain. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work which argues that concern over the risk to trade in one of Britain’s most profitable and extensive markets was more important in explaining British support for the colonists than were arguments about constitutional rights and liberties.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

8 What best explains political stability in Britain in the years 1783–89?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of domestic policy in Britain during the early years of the Younger Pitt's prime ministership. The focus will be on identifying factors conducive to greater stability after the disturbed period immediately preceding Pitt's appointment as prime minister. Candidates are likely to know about: Pitt's abilities as an administrator and policy maker, including his economic policies, trade agreements and tariff policies; taxation and other policies – Sinking Fund etc. – designed to reduce the National Debt. Foreign policy as such may not figure strongly in most answers, but it is relevant to mention both how the return of peace aided stability and also Pitt's attempts to establish an effective alliance system, which culminated in the Triple Alliance (1788). On factors other than Pitt himself, candidates might mention: the impact of the expansion of overseas trade in increasing government revenue; the importance of the industrial revolution; the coherence of the Foxite opposition which (since they were insufficiently strong to mount a direct challenge on the Pittite majority in the Commons) also conduced to stability rather than to a continuance of infighting and family feuding.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about which factors were most important in explaining stability. Most candidates are likely to concentrate on Pitt himself, including his abilities, his appetite for work and his concern to make the governmental machine leaner and more efficient. Good candidates will weigh these against other factors (see AO1 above). Weaker candidates are likely to offer little, if anything, other than an assessment of Pitt's abilities and leadership. Many weaker answers will lack specificity, especially on Pitt's administrative and fiscal reforms. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent biographies of Pitt, particularly those by Turner and Hague, which stress what has become the dominant view – that Pitt's abilities were substantial and his policies generally very effective.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

- 9 'British political life in the 1790s underwent conservative reaction rather than radical upheaval as a result of the impact of the French Revolution and the Revolutionary Wars.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of British political life in the 1790s. The focus will be on the impact of events in France and of the Revolutionary war to which they led. Candidates should have knowledge which relates to both 'conservative upheaval' and 'radical reaction'. On the former, candidates may mention: the role of government propaganda such as Canning's *Anti-Jacobin*, especially in attacking radicalism and stimulating patriotic responses in wartime; the Association Movement from 1792; the Volunteer movement; anti-radical legislation, the impact of the Seditious Meetings and Treasonable Practices Acts (1795); Whig divisions, leading to the formation of a coalition between Pittites and Portland Whigs (1794) are also relevant since this produced overwhelmingly 'conservative' majorities in Parliament. On the latter, candidates may mention: the radical upsurge in response to the overthrow of absolute monarchy in France; the impact of Tom Paine's *Rights of Man*; middle-class and working-class radical associations including the London Corresponding Society & Scottish Society of the Friends of the People; Whig radicalism and calls for parliamentary reform; the aristocratically-directed Society of the Friends of the People.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the impact of France, with special reference to the stimuli for both the development of radical politics and also a conservative reaction in Britain during the later stages of Pitt's first ministry. Drawing on material such as that in AO1, candidates are expected to judge which of two contrasting results of the French Revolution was the more important. Candidates who argue the importance of the conservative reaction are likely to lay stress on the effective propaganda produced by, and on behalf of, the government. They will also mention patriotism as a factor especially once Britain joined the revolutionary wars in 1793. Those who argue the importance of radicalism are likely to lay stress on: the growth of radical societies; the success of the democratic and republican propaganda produced by Tom Paine; the impact of Paineite radicalism; increased pressure for parliamentary reform; radicalism not just in London but in manufacturing and artisan towns such as Birmingham and Norwich. Some will argue that pressure for radical reform did not go away after the 1790s, whereas support for the conservative position relied on particular circumstances especially, perhaps, a patriotic response in support of a nation at war. Good candidates will weigh the two reactions to reach an informed judgement. Weak candidates are more likely to produce either assertive, or overly descriptive, accounts, many of which will also be unbalanced with little material on factors other than those which support the primacy of either the 'conservative' or the 'radical' response.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work stressing the importance of the conservative reaction after a long period in which historians concentrated on the development of middle-class and artisan radicalism, stimulated by first the taming and then the overthrow of monarchy in France.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

10 Why did it take so long for the campaign to abolish the Slave Trade to succeed?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the course of opposition to the Slave Trade. The focus will be on the length of that campaign. Candidates are likely to have knowledge about: the role of William Wilberforce; the Committee for the abolition of the Slave Trade (est. 1787); importance of evangelical religion in bringing the plight of the slaves to wider public attention, including specifically the importance of some key ‘Saints’ such as Thomas Clarkson, Henry Thornton and Zachary Macaulay; nonconformist support for abolition; the campaign for abolition in Parliament, including lobbying and the production of anti-slavery propaganda designed to inform readers of horrendous conditions on slave ships. Candidates also need to have knowledge of factors which delayed the passing of the Act of 1807. These include: the power of vested interests, especially in major slave-trade cities, such as Liverpool; the strong mercantile influence in Parliament, not least because many of the wealthiest slave traders had links (sometimes family links) to powerful landowners with seats in parliament; arguments in favour of free trade and against any restrictions which might jeopardise profits and prosperity; the importance to the British economy of ‘slave states’, including those in the United States; the fact that priority was often given to successful prosecution of a lengthy war.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the causes which explain why the anti-slavery campaign needed to be a long one. Candidates will make use of material on the development of the anti-slave trade movement. Good candidates should concentrate on selecting material which helps to explain how a strong moral case, urged with passion and power by well-connected and (for the most part) prosperous and respectable citizens, encountered delays. Good candidates will therefore need to deploy knowledge about the power of economic ideology as well, perhaps, as those related to timing (see AO1 above). Weaker candidates are likely to produce overly descriptive accounts of the development of the anti-slave-trade movement which may offer insufficient material which shows understanding of the power and influence of the ‘anti-abolition’ case. Some candidates may inadvertently include material on the abolition of slavery itself, rather than of the slave trade.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent re-interpretations of the role and importance of the evangelicals, and especially of the growing significance of evangelicalism within the Church of England.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

SECTION 4: 1815–1868

17 Did Liverpool's strengths as prime minister outweigh his weaknesses?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Lord Liverpool and of the manner in which he governed. The focus will be on an identification of strengths and weaknesses. In terms of *strengths*, candidates are likely to have knowledge of: his prior experience as a minister; his ability to get abler, and often more fractious, colleagues to work together; his recognition of the abilities of others; sometimes able to take a firm line – as in facing down George IV over the divorce issue and in insisting that Catholic Emancipation was not be considered a party issue, thus preserving more unity in the Tory party than would otherwise have been the case; increasingly, the authority which goes with longevity in office. In terms of *weaknesses*, candidates are likely to have knowledge of: his reputation for indecisiveness; evidence of short-temper; lack of a clear strategy or direction for the Tory party; dependence for economic policy and administrative competence on others, notably Huskisson and Peel.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the balance between strengths and weaknesses. Drawing on examples from AO1 above, they can legitimately argue either way. In terms of *strengths*, Liverpool survived as prime minister for fifteen years, with many much abler politician leaders around; he did gain respect (albeit sometimes grudging); he recognized the abilities of ministers and let them do their jobs, although he did have the strength to recast his ministry after Castlereagh's suicide. In terms of *weaknesses*, most candidates are likely to weave patterns from the fustian cloth of Disraeli's famous 'arch-mediocrity' jibe; indecisive; lack of strategic vision; dependent on others; presiding over a period of economic weakness after 1815; perhaps mishandling the challenge of radicalism.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of the partial attempt at rehabilitation in Gash's biography and Boyd Hilton's rejoinder which reasserts the negative aspects of his leadership.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

**18 ‘George Canning charted both a new, and a successful, path for British foreign policy.’
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Canning as foreign secretary. The focus will be on the objectives of his foreign policy, with particular concentration on whether it was new and successful. Candidates should have knowledge of: Canning’s retreat from Congress diplomacy; his links, via Liverpool, with commercial classes and his concern that diplomacy should be formulated with trading implications in mind; his diplomacy in respect of nationalist movements in Spain and Portugal; attempts to block concerted activity by France & Spain; Canning’s special concern for the ‘informal empire’ and the priority given to the Americas – support for nations ‘struggling to be free’ – recognising independent nations (e.g. Colombia & Mexico in 1825); the Greek revolt and Canning’s attempts to preserve neutrality, then support for Greek autonomy over internal affairs in the Treaty of London (1827).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about both the ‘newness’ and the success of Canning’s foreign policy. Good candidates will see that it is necessary to make two evaluations (concerning ‘new’ and ‘successful’) in presenting a balanced argument. By referring to some of the themes identified in AO1 above, most candidates are likely to argue that foreign policy was successful, especially in the Americas, where Canning’s priorities accorded well with the Monroe doctrine. Also, Canning managed to negotiate a viable peace over the Greek question just before his death. On ‘new’, candidates may be more ambivalent. On securing a balance of power in Europe, they might argue that this merely continued the policy of Castlereagh (and indeed most of his predecessors), albeit by different means and showing less respect for Congress Diplomacy. They are more likely to see a foreign policy which concentrated on opportunities in the Americas as ‘new’, and particularly so in the detailed attention Canning paid to them. Weaker candidates may provide unbalanced answers, with little on one of ‘new’ and ‘successful’. They may default to a comparison of Castlereagh and Canning which will be largely off-beam as a response to the question set. Weaker candidates may also offer excessively generalized material, deficient in accurate detail.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent reinterpretations of Canning and his concern for trading opportunities in the Americas by Bell (2002) and Marriott (2010).

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

19 'Unthinkable in 1815; irresistible by 1832'. Discuss this view of parliamentary reform.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of pressure for the passing of a reform bill, including specific consideration of circumstances at the beginning and end of the period. The focus will be on support for reform in 1815 and by 1832. On 'unthinkable', candidates are likely to have knowledge of: the end of the war and the apparent triumph of monarchy and authoritarian rule in most of Europe; the hostile attitude of the Tory majority to parliamentary reform, with its potentially 'revolutionary' overtones; the extent of support in parliament for reform (limited even in the Whig party) and outside (where pro-reform agitation continued, especially in London and the industrial areas until the early 1820s). On 'irresistible', candidates are likely to have knowledge of how the situation had changed by 1832: the split in the Tory party, and the arrival of a Whig-Liberal Tory coalition which was not ideologically opposed to reform; the importance of key Whig supporters of reform, especially Grey and Russell; the changing situation in parliament from November 1830, when Wellington's government fell, to August 1832, when William IV reluctantly gave the royal assent to the First Reform Act; the revival of radical and pro-Reform agitation in the wake of economic depression; widespread fear of revolution within the propertied classes in 1830 and, especially, 1831–2.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the 'unthinkability' of reform in 1815 and its 'irresistability' by 1832. Good candidates will see that this requires them to make a judgment about the extent of change over the time covered by the question. They should see that they need to make two separate judgements – of the situation in 1815 and then in 1832. Good candidates will also see that an informed judgement requires them to evaluate the extent of change both in extra-parliamentary public opinion and in opinion at Westminster and in the propertied elite over the period in question. Most candidates are likely to offer broad agreement about the judgement at both periods. It was difficult to see how extra-parliamentary radicalism could mount a successful assault on Westminster in the late 1810s, although some candidates might argue that there was sufficient support for rebellion or assassination to suggest that a lucky strike might have had important consequences in 1815–20. On 1832, most candidates will aim to explain why parliamentary opinion had changed so radically and they might concentrate on the Tory problems after the resignation of an ailing Liverpool in 1827. They should make use of factors both in Westminster and outside, where radical pressure had reached unprecedented heights by the early 1830s. Weaker candidates are less likely to offer two informed judgements and may produce overly descriptive accounts of the route to parliamentary reform and may pay insufficient attention to the need to take the 'temperature' relating to reform at two dates. Levels of knowledge, especially about opinion on parliamentary reform in Westminster, may also be limited.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of more recent interpretations which indicate that, if parliamentary reform were irresistible by 1832, that owed more to splits within the anti-reform Tory party than to any step change in external pressure or public opinion.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

20 What best explains why the Conservatives won the general election of 1841?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the Conservative victory of 1841. The focus will be on causation. Candidates should have knowledge about: the Tory position immediately after the 1832 Reform Act; its revival in the years to 1835, including the importance of Ireland and the defections from Whig ranks which this caused. They will also have material on the role of Peel as, in effect, leader of the opposition after 1835; the nature of Peel’s attacks on Melbourne’s government, especially on grounds of waste and poor financial management. Candidates should also be aware that the Conservatives won a large majority (76 by most counts), so a substantial victory has to be explained.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for the Conservative victory. Good candidates should offer comment both on the reasons for a Tory revival and on the increasing difficulties of the Whigs in fashioning a parliamentary majority in the Commons. Good candidates will see that they need to offer judgements on the nature of the Conservative revival as well as the weaknesses of the Whigs. They are likely to give weight to: defections from the Whigs in 1834, leading to a Conservative revival; the Whigs’ need for support from radicals and Irish members from 1835; the impact of the economic downswing after 1838 and the fact that the general election was held during a deep depression which also saw substantial support for Chartism. The Whigs seemed to have lost the support of much public opinion by 1841. Good candidates will see that they are expected to make a judgement on relative importance, and some will interpret this as determining whether Whig weakness or Conservative strength is more responsible not only for the election victory but for its size.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work which has argued that the Conservatives did not win because of a rising tide of electoral support but more because of a consolidation of strength in particular areas and an increase in the number of uncontested elections, which favoured Peel’s party.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 15	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

21 Assess the view that Palmerston achieved more as prime minister than he did as foreign secretary.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Palmerston’s political career from 1830. The focus will be on Palmerston’s achievements in the two offices of foreign secretary and prime minister. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of Palmerston’s career as:

a foreign secretary (1830–4, 1835–41, 1846–51). Candidates should have knowledge of: Palmerston’s overall objective, which was to increase Britain’s power & influence in world affairs. They are likely to select information relating to: the separation of Belgium and Holland (1831) and Belgium’s full independence (1839); the Quadruple Alliance (1834) initially preserving amity with France; Palmerston’s concern about Russian expansion and the influence of the ‘Holy Alliance’. Mehmet Ali and the crisis in the Near East (1838–41), the alienation of France and the Convention of the Straits; attempts to check Russian expansion in the East and the threat to British interests in India; the First Afghan war (1839–42); Opium War with China (1839–42) and expansion of British trading influence; continued distant relations with France on his return to office; continued concern about Russia and Palmerston’s attempts to buttress Turkish strength to resist it (1849–51); the Don Pacifico affair and perceptions of Britain’s power to protect its citizens; Palmerston’s often fraught relations with Victoria & Albert over (among other things) the direction of foreign policy.

b) prime minister (1855–58, 1859–65) Candidates are likely to select information from the following: Palmerston’s handling of the later stages of the Crimean War; his leadership of the Liberal party; his popularity outside Westminster but what was seen as his overly aggressive foreign policy caused rifts within the Liberal party and led to his fall in 1858; Palmerston’s return to office (1859) and the remodelling of the Liberal Party; Liberal dominance after the election victory of 1859; Palmerston’s often difficult relations with Gladstone over defence policy and Church questions; Palmerston’s lack of enthusiasm for further parliamentary reform; the extent to which Palmerston exercised leadership in domestic affairs; neutrality (though sometimes severely tested) during the American Civil War; Palmerston’s attempt at intervention in the Schleswig-Holstein question; large Liberal victory in the 1865 general election, three months before Palmerston died, and the extent to which it indicated that he had retained popular support and had been a successful prime minister.

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a comparative judgement about Palmerston’s achievements as foreign secretary and as prime minister. Good candidates will offer developed judgements on achievements (or lack of achievement) in both posts linked to an overall judgement about the post in which he achieved the more. It is likely that most strong candidates will argue against the proposition by developing arguments along the lines of Palmerston’s ‘patriotic’ foreign policy, its popularity at least outside Westminster and the Court and Britain’s apparently growing influence over affairs in the Near East. It can also be argued that Britain was more feared during the time Palmerston was foreign secretary and, had he been in charge of foreign affairs, he might have avoided war with Russia in 1854. As prime minister, many candidates will argue that Palmerston achieved relatively little, not least because his main interests continued to lie in foreign affairs. His 1859–65 ministry saw disagreements on a number of key issues for the Liberals, including the wisdom of substantial intervention in foreign affairs, defence policy and the continued lack of cordiality between Palmerston and Russell. Against that, Palmerston’s national popularity seems to have played a role in the relatively narrow election victory of 1859 and the much more decisive one of 1865. Weaker candidates are likely to produce descriptive accounts of key events in foreign policy and may well unbalance their responses by offering relatively little on Palmerston as prime minister.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of discussion about the weaknesses of Palmerston’s foreign policy, including threats of war to which his belligerence led. Candidates may also be aware of his increasing lack of attention to detailed domestic policy initiatives, especially after 1859.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 17	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

SECTION 5: 1868–1914

- 22 (Candidates offering Paper 5h: Gladstone and Disraeli should not answer this question.)**
Why was support for the Liberal party in the general election of 1874 so much lower than it had been in 1868?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the work of Gladstone’s first government and of its impact. The focus will be on the substantial election victory of 1868 and how that was overturned in 1874. Candidates are likely to cover: domestic policy (administrative reform in public health, law, army, education, trade unions etc.); Ireland (disestablishment of Anglican church and land reform) and foreign policy (poor relations with USA & the Alabama case; inability to intervene to prevent Franco-Prussian war from which a strong united Germany emerged).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about why the Liberal party was unable to prevent a substantial Tory revival in the early 1870s. Among the key factors likely to be adduced are: Disraeli’s famous speeches of 1872 (attacking ‘harassing legislation’ passed by a range of ‘exhausted volcanoes’); Gladstone’s concentration on administrative efficiency above presentation which cut little ice with the new electorate (Liberals lost 23 seats in by-elections held from 1871–3); discontent with what many saw as a feeble foreign policy; lack of effective political organisation (trailing behind Gorst and the Tories); a disunited Cabinet (probably too many Whigs and insufficient harmony between great landowners and business-based MPs and voters); the darkening economic situation. Even so, some good candidates may argue that the scale of the Tories’ 1874 victory surprised the victors as much as it devastated the Liberal leadership and owed much to first-past-the-post anomalies. Some candidates may know (and perhaps more should!) that the Liberals got a substantially larger proportion of the vote (52% to 44%) in 1874 but accumulated them in the ‘wrong’ places.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware that recent interpretations have hardly suffered from hero-worship of Gladstone. The oddities of Gladstone as a man and his determination to find ‘great moral causes’, it has been suggested, militated against Liberal unity. On this analysis, both Ireland and Education became unnecessarily divisive issues for the Liberals in the early 1870s.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 18	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

23 (Candidates offering Paper 5h: Gladstone and Disraeli should not answer this question.) 'Bold yet highly successful.' Assess this judgement on the foreign and imperial policy of the Conservative government of 1874–80.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of foreign and imperial policies. The focus will be on selecting of areas in which policy might be considered bold and/or successful. Candidates are likely to know about: The Eastern Question, threat of British involvement in war and resolution of the crisis at the Treaty of Berlin; acquisition of Cyprus in the Anglo-Turkish Treaty (1878); the Purchase of Suez Canal shares; British rule in India and the Royal Titles Act (1876) making Victoria Empress of India; Second Afghan war & peace treaty (1879); South Africa.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the boldness and success of Britain's foreign and imperial policies in the period 1874–80. Good candidates will appreciate the need to make two judgements: on the boldness of such policies and also on the degree of their success. Specifically on 'bold', candidates can discuss Disraeli's apparent willingness to go to war to keep Russia from increasing its influence in south-east Europe. They should also refer to imperial, as well as foreign, policy. Disraeli's intervention in south-east Europe was also bold in that it divided the Conservative party and led to the resignations of both Derby and Carnarvon because they thought Disraeli too aggressive towards Russia. A third reason for considering the policy 'bold' might be that Britain had no strong allies while German power was increasing. On the other hand, imperial initiatives, though eye-catching especially concerning India and Afghanistan, were not particularly novel or bold. On 'successful', most candidates will argue that the purchase of the Suez Canal shares proved to be a success, since Britain's interest in the Middle East was strengthened, to the benefit of trade. Candidates might also note the triumph which Disraeli claimed over his handling of the Turkish crisis and the degree of public support for the Treaty of Berlin and the agreement with Turkey over Cyprus. On the other hand, diplomacy had not produced a permanent settlement of a key crisis and it would be difficult to argue that Britain's diplomatic influence with other European powers (especially Germany) had increased during the years of the Disraeli government. On imperial policy, candidates are unlikely to argue that it was especially bold, despite conflict in Afghanistan. Few new initiatives were taken and the Afghan war, though successful in the short term, did not produce a permanently beneficial settlement for Britain. Candidates may consider the Royal Titles Act a success, although its practical value was limited.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent debates over the role of Empire in Britain's overall perception of itself in the later nineteenth century.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 19	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

24 How much did trade union achievements in these years owe to its leaders?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the development of trade unionism in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The focus will be on trade union achievements with emphasis on the role of the leaders. Candidates are likely to know about: the establishment of Trade Union Congress (1868); the growth of trade unions both in numbers and membership (from 750,000 in late 1880s to over 4m by 1914); the development of unionism on a national level and the increasing emphasis on recruiting unskilled and semi-skilled workers (both male and female) into new-style trade unions. Candidates should also have some knowledge of the use of the strike weapon (both successfully and unsuccessfully) and of successful campaigns to protect Union funds against legal action by employers (reversing the Taff Vale Judgment, 1901) and to ensure that a portion of a member's trade union subscriptions could be used to support a sympathetic political party (reversing the Osborne Judgment, 1909) unless the member specifically 'contracted out' of the arrangement. The trade union leaders candidates are most likely to know about are J.Keir Hardie (1856–1915), the Scottish miner who became leader of the infant Labour party, Ben Tillett (1860–1943) the London dock workers' leader and socialist, Will Thorne (1857–1946), the Birmingham-born leader of the London-based Gas Workers' Union, John Burns (1858–1843), the engineer who played a major part in the London Dock Strike (1889) and was influential in the London County Council and Thomas Mann (1856–1941) the mineworker and engineer who also played an important role in the London Dock Strike.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the importance of the role of leadership in explaining the success of the trade union movement in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Good candidates will present an argument grounded in understanding of how the Union movement grew (see AO1 above) and what new rights it was able to gain. Such candidates may also argue that the role of leadership was enhanced by the work of the infant Labour party in which many union leaders played a significant part, not least as MPs. It can also be argued that effective leadership was an important reason why so many strikes enjoyed at least partial success in this period. Leaders frequently exercised informed judgement in both the timing and the targets of the strike weapon. Candidates may also argue that after the rash of strikes in 1911–12, both Liberal and Conservative MPs acknowledged, as much as many resented, the increasing significance and economic power of trade unionism. Arguments which might be used to qualify the importance of trade union leaders in explaining the movement's success include: the role of the Labour party, many of whose most prominent figures were intellectual socialists rather than trade union leaders; the recognition by Conservative and Liberal parties that the needs of what after 1884 was a very substantial working-class electorate required attention; economic factors (such as an increasing demand for labour) which gave trade unions more power. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate on predominantly descriptive accounts of strikes and/or biographical knowledge of leaders such as Hardie and Thorne. They may also seek to explain why trade unions were often successful rather than, as required, evaluating the importance of trade union leaders in explaining that success.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work on the role of trade unions, including their impact on party politics in the early twentieth century.

Page 20	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 21	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

25 Why was Joseph Chamberlain such a divisive figure in British political life?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Joseph Chamberlain. The focus will be on those aspects of his career which might be considered as divisive. Candidates are likely to know about the key features of his career: campaigning for expanded educational opportunities for the working class, which included attacks on the influence exerted on education by the Church of England; urban renewal and ‘gas & water socialism’ as Lord Mayor of Birmingham (1873–6); political organiser in Birmingham; President of the Board of Trade (1880–85); his reaction to Home Rule proposals; work with Salisbury; Colonial Secretary (1895–1903); campaign for tariff reform (1903–6).

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about causation: why was Chamberlain so divisive? Good candidates will make use of information about Chamberlain’s personality and ambitions in order to show the importance of his commitment to, among other things, a united Ireland within the Empire and to the Empire and imperial preference. He was a ‘larger-than-life’ figure committed to the causes he espoused and was politically powerful enough to create a stir over them. He was also divisive because he was an outsider in both parties but especially, perhaps, to the Liberal Party where nonconformist urban radicals from a manufacturing background usually found a less than engaging response from Gladstone. Weaker candidates are likely not to concentrate on the reasons for divisiveness, but on a general biography of Chamberlain which may be unbalanced in treatment of key themes, ignoring or giving scant attention, for example, to Chamberlain’s career before the 1880s.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of new biographical work on Chamberlain by Dennis Judd, which concentrates on his internal contradictions.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 22	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

26 'Their radicalism was only skin-deep.' How far do you accept this verdict on the social and constitutional reforms of the Liberal governments in the years 1905–14?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the Liberal governments of 1905–14. The focus will be on constitutional and social reforms which might be considered radical. Candidates are likely to know at least in broad outline about the key aspects of Liberal policy in these years: in **industrial relations**: workmen's compensation, trade boards & minimum wages in many 'sweated trades'; in **local government and public health**: opening all local government roles to women; establishment of a school medical service; old age pensions; schemes for compulsion slum clearance; national insurance covering workers in some occupations against sickness & unemployment; enabling local authorities to provide children with school meals; in constitutional matters, the **Parliament Act** (1911) – Lords may not reject money bills, and their power of veto over other legislation restricted to two years; the maximum life of Parliament reduced from seven years to five; payment of a salary (£400 a year) to MPs.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the radicalism of the key social and constitutional policies enacted by the Liberals in these years. Good candidates will reach a reasoned judgement which examines the case for, and against, 'skin-deep' radicalism and will discuss both social and constitutional issues. Given the extensive agenda tackled by the Liberal governments (see AO1 above), most candidates are likely to argue that the Liberal commitment to social reform was extensive and that reducing the powers of one of the two Houses of Parliament was a radical step, particularly since, in associated legislation payment of MPs addressed one of the key demands of the Chartists. Yet, as some able candidates might argue, there is an argument for seeing these reforms, considered as a package, to be limited or even 'skin-deep'. The Liberals did not push conflict with the Lords over the 1906 education bill into a constitutional crisis (as happened over taxation in 1909). A radical government might have introduced compulsory legislation to improve the housing stock for the working classes. Old Age Pensions were paid only to over 70s (when life expectancy was below 50). National Insurance legislation covered only the more vulnerable trades and it was based on contributions rather than, as many in the Labour party urged, paid for by redistributive taxation. Overall, although the government included genuine radicals like Lloyd George and – on some issues – Asquith, selectively sentimental ones like Winston Churchill, it can be argued that the radicalism of Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith's government was vitiated by social conservatism in both government and on the Liberal backbenches. Weaker candidates will not enter this territory. Their answers are likely to concentrate on the legislative achievements of the governments, perhaps in broad outline. Some candidates may be much stronger on social than constitutional issues, and *vice versa*.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the extent to which the Liberal party was driven by a desire to maintain office after a long and difficult period in opposition.

Page 23	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 24	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

SECTION 6: Themes, c.1815–c.1914

**27 ‘Standards of living grew surprisingly slowly while the economy grew very rapidly.’
Assess the validity of this judgment as applied to the period c.1815–c.1870.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The focus here should be both on standards of living and on growth of the economy. Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of: the nature of economic growth, especially for the textile industry and mining during the first half of the nineteenth century and for heavier industries from c the 1840s; changes in prices and in wage rates; pressure on living standards during periods of economic difficulty or crisis (particularly, perhaps 1815–20 and the later 1830s) and boom (particularly the 1820s and the later 1850s & early 1860s); implications of economic change for employment prospects, including employers’ need for casual and ‘surplus’ labour to maximise opportunities at times of boom; the impact of environmental issues on living standards – particularly the limited public health provision in rapidly growing towns; implications for living standards of rapidly increasing growing birth rates in the first half of the nineteenth century) and of death rates which remained obstinately high throughout with infant mortality especially high in urban areas.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about living standards during a period of overall economic expansion associated with the earlier phase of the industrial revolution. Candidates may argue that the general trend is for profits to outrun wages and for prices to rise during periods of boom. Thus, the so-called ‘trickle-down’ benefits of economic growth tend to be substantially over-stated. On the other hand, and counter-factually, it is legitimate to speculate how a population which virtually doubled in fifty years could be fed, or found jobs, without substantial economic growth. Candidates may note that large numbers of working people were vulnerable, mobile and, in some cases, rootless. Increased birth rates – augmented by immigration from Ireland – produced ‘surplus labour’ which tended to hold down wages. It is legitimate to argue that some sectors of the workforce did much better in this period than others. Thus, for example, skilled workers in metals and in the printing industry experienced generally rising living standards while the unskilled and casual labourers were usually under pressure with frequent period of short-time working and unemployment. In agriculture, labourers employed in the predominantly pastoral north and west were paid higher wages than those working on arable farms in the south and east.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, most candidates will know about ‘optimistic’ and ‘pessimistic’ interpretations of living standards and may be aware of recent work which has tended to interpret complex statistical data as leading to more ‘pessimistic’ conclusions than had been made in much of the literature from the 1970s and early 1980s.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 25	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

28 Why was the Church of England able to remain the ‘established church’ during this period?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The focus here will be on the Church of England and its establishment status. Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of: the implications of the Church of England’s role as ‘the established church’; its sources of income, including its landed wealth; the challenges which it faced from nonconformity, especially in urban and mining areas where Methodism expanded particularly rapidly in the first half of the nineteenth century; the growing challenge of ‘free thought’ and secularism from the mid 19th century; the challenge to ‘establishment status’, especially in the 1820s and 1830s, led by political radicals who saw the Church as a bastion of support for the *status quo*; church reform in the 1830s and 1840s, including the work of the Ecclesiastical Commission and reduction in inequality between stipends; reduction in the number of plural livings; evidence of the religious census (1851), which showed that the majority of the population did not attend worship on census Sunday and that less than a third of those who did went to a Church of England service; the implications of this evidence for the challenge to establishment status; pressure on the Church lessened as the challenge of political radicalism was reduced from the later 1840s; the practical significance of the Church of England as a provider of education for the poor.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons why the Church of England remained the Church ‘as by law established’. Making use of some of the themes identified in AO1 above, good candidates will understand why the Church’s establishment status was under pressure from nonconformists and political radicals and also, perhaps, why that challenge was at its height in the 1820s and 1830s. They may argue that Church reform had an effect on morale from the 1840s, after which it was better organised and its pastoral mission strengthened. Good candidates may, however, argue that the Church of England retained its political status before the 1870s because those in power at Westminster were overwhelmingly Anglican and regarded the Church as having a vital cultural and educational role as well as helping to symbolise stability and order. Also, increased recognition of the status of nonconformist churches had lessened pressure for disestablishment by the 1850s. Good candidates should attempt to argue which of these factors were the most important in explaining why the Church preserved its status. Weaker candidates are likely to write descriptive accounts of the state of the Church of England’s position without sustaining a focus on the challenges it faced and limited understanding of the significance of establishment status. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of work which argues that the Church was generally effective and increasingly rose to the challenges presented by nonconformity in many urban areas. Thus the need for radical reform which included ‘free trade in faith’ lessened after the 1840s.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 26	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

**29 ‘Novels of the period are an indispensable source for the historian of Victorian Britain’.
Discuss this judgement.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The focus here will be on the nature of Victorian novels. Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of the themes dealt with in the novels, including discussion of: social conditions (especially, perhaps, via Dickens); attitudes, beliefs and ‘manners’ (for example, via Elizabeth Gaskell & George Eliot) and the political, ecclesiastical and financial worlds (for which Trollope is an especially rich source). Candidates have a very wide choice of novels available to them and no mark scheme can be prescriptive. However, good candidates will see the need to discuss the work of more than one author and also to discuss a range of themes, since the question is not restricted to ‘social’ novels or to ‘political’ novels.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the value of novels for the historian. Good candidates will reach judgements about the insights novelists convey concerning key themes in the history of Victorian Britain. It is acceptable for candidates to concentrate on the work of a small number of authors but good candidates will see the need to examine a range of social and/or political issues to determine how valuable novelists might be in helping historians to reach their judgements. It is also acceptable for candidates to give more attention to some themes than to others, since the pace and direction of social change in a rapidly industrialising society were central to the concerns of many Victorian novelists, especially in the period from the 1830s to the 1870s. However, good candidates will see the need to provide some degree of thematic range. Good candidates might also debate the significance of ‘indispensable’ in the question. Few will attempt to argue that novels are of no real importance for the historian but candidates may note that some excellent writing on the Victorian period is much more informed by the period’s literature than others. Weaker candidates are likely to give more attention to describing important themes and to summarising plots, especially perhaps of the social novels, than to analysis about the utility of contemporary novels for the historian. Some candidates may also range too narrowly, drawing their evidence from only one or two novels.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of the nature of debates about the links between literary evidence and historical analysis.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 27	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

30 'The main focus of the education provided for upper-class males in the period c1850–1914 was not learning but leadership.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The focus here will be on the purpose of public school education. Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of the curriculum of public schools, both in terms of formal academic study and of the attitudes and beliefs which the schools attempted to inculcate. Candidates should know that many new public schools were founded in the second half of the nineteenth century. They should have knowledge of: the key elements of the curriculum; religious knowledge, (especially in most public schools with an Anglican slant) the role of sport, especially team games; how schools attempted to give lessons in leadership, including what was expected of privileged young men; how education in public schools prepared young men for administrative and other leadership roles in the Empire, the armed services and the established Church; how the ethic of 'service' was put across. Candidates should also note that the academic curriculum developed in the public schools was generally grounded in the classics and that pupils were expected to develop an understanding of Latin (especially) and Greek language, literature and culture. Within those, themes related to heroism, military valour, patriotism, self-sacrifice, order and notions of citizenship tended to be given considerable prominence.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the role and purpose of public schools in the second half of the nineteenth century and, in particular, whether these schools were more concerned with inculcating moral attitudes and beliefs than in the quality of formal academic learning. Candidates can, of course, argue either way. On the one hand, it is clear that many of the 'brightest and best' were expected to choose careers involving public service, especially perhaps in the colonies or the civil service, there to provide leadership. On the other, many schools developed a rigorous academic curriculum which took precedence but out of which the ethic of self-sacrifice and leadership was expected naturally to grow. Some good candidates will argue that the two elements of the curriculum were, in practice, inseparable. Weaker candidates are likely to provide descriptive material on the growth of the public schools and may note that the great majority of these were male-only. Discussion of the purposes of the curriculum is likely to be both limited and generalized. There may also be imbalance between discussion of the 'learning' and 'leadership' aspects.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on the importance of 'ethic of service' and self-sacrifice in public-school curricula.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 28	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

31 Why, in the period c. 1840–1914, did the Irish not gain Home Rule?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The theme is relations between Britain and Ireland and the focus here is on Irish nationalist objectives and the obstacles standing in the way of their achievement. Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of: the nature of pressure from Ireland and how this changed over the period, including some of the following: Daniel O’Connell’s campaigns for full Catholic Emancipation and the repeal of the Union; the Famine and its implications for growing anti-Union pressure; the role; the Irish Confederation (1847); the growth of sectarianism and the Irish Republican Brotherhood; the importance of Gladstone’s campaigns for Home Rule, including the impact of his Home Rule Bills in 1886 and 1893; the nature of political and religious division in Ireland; the growth of terrorism, including attacks and assassination by Fenians and other groups from the 1860s; the role of nationalist leaders in the Westminster parliament, including Davitt, Butt and Parnell; the growth and strength of opposition to Home Rule in Ulster; support for Ulster Unionism within the UK, particularly in parts of Scotland and within the Conservative and Unionist party at Westminster; the Ulster Unionist Council and the Ulster Covenant.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for the failures and frustrations of the cause of Home Rule. Good candidates will reach an informed judgement about the factors standing in the way of Home Rule and of the objectives of Irish nationalism. Using some of themes along the lines of those indicated in AO1 above, good candidates should concentrate on the factors which explain the failure of pressure for Home Rule before 1914. Good candidates may note that Gladstone’s initiatives were concerned with what amounted to devolution not full independence. The key factors which good candidates are likely to include are: in the early period, greater emphasis by British politicians on land reform rather than the challenge of nationalism; the ambivalent impact of the Famine: it greatly increased pressure for radical change, but it saw mass emigration and a temporary weakening nationalist agitation in Ireland; divisions within Ireland itself, increasingly on religious lines; the strength of opposition to Home Rule within Ulster; the residual power of wealth and propertied opinion against Home Rule; the split in the Liberal party from 1886, which led to a long period in opposition for the party which could have sponsored Home Rule; Conservative opposition to Home Rule, substantially strengthened from the 1880s, on both political and ideological grounds; the sense that Home Rule for Ireland would substantially weaken Britain’s Empire and/or work as the thin end of an anti-imperialist wedge. Some candidates might also argue that the Irish nationalist cause was sometimes weakly led and usually beset by internal disagreement. Weaker candidates are likely to provide overly descriptive – and perhaps rather general – accounts of the rise of nationalism in Ireland. These accounts are likely to offer relatively little on the problems associated with achieving Home Rule.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work on what made Unionism, especially in Ulster, such a powerful movement.

Page 29	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 30	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

32 How important were financial services to the performance of the British economy in the years c.1880–c.1914?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of an important theme. The focus here will be on the link between the British economy and the **expansion of financial services**. Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of: the organisation of banking and increased extent of regulation and amalgamation, especially after the crises of 1866 and 1878; the central role in financial services of the City of London ('the world's clearing house') and provision for investment, both at home and abroad; large growth in numbers of those working in the City; the impact of railway development and the need to raise finance for railway construction at home and, increasingly importantly, abroad. On key aspects relating to **economic performance** more generally in late Victorian Britain, candidates should have some knowledge of: the continued importance of the expenditure of manufactured goods (representing almost 90 per cent in 1880), though with more emphasis on metal-based and engineering exports. In late 19th century, the economy shows some shifts with a greater emphasis on commerce. Candidates should have some knowledge about: increasing levels of investment overseas; the impact made by newer industries such as chemicals and, particularly, electrical goods; the maintenance of free trade (uniquely among the Great Powers) and its impact on economic performance – cheaper, and wider varieties of food, much greater imports of manufactured goods affecting levels of British debt; the variable level of the so-called 'Agricultural Depression'

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. In addition to sustaining an analytical focus on the question asked, good candidates should be able to select their material from across its broad chronology. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the relative importance of banking and other financial services within an economy which faced difficulties, especially in the agricultural sector. Good candidates are likely to argue, using some of the information in AO1 above, that London established itself in this period as the financial capital of the western world and so became a core element in Britain's economy. London status as much the largest and wealthiest city in the UK was consolidated, though the relative importance of manufactures in the capital declined. Good candidates may also argue that – considered on a national level – the expansion of the banking and insurance sectors offered some degree of protection against adverse terms of trade for many British manufacturers and the losses suffered by an agricultural sector struggling to compete against protected industrial competition from the USA and Germany. The financial sector was also geared to process ever larger amounts of British investment overseas. Some strong candidates may argue that it is possible to overestimate the importance of the financial sector, since the British economy was increasingly affected by the expansion of larger retailing enterprises, while the small, independent manufacturer was still making a substantial contribution to overall economic performance particularly in the northern industrial towns. Weaker candidates are likely to write descriptively about the performance of particular sectors of the economy, particularly manufactures, mining and agriculture and many weaker candidates may have limited knowledge of banking specifically. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work by David Kynaston on the City of London and of a greater emphasis on commerce and investment opportunity as the key elements of Britain's late nineteenth century economy.

Page 31	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 32	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

SECTION 7: 1914–1951

- 33 (Candidates offering Paper 5i: *The Campaign for Female Suffrage should not answer this question.*) ‘The greatest social change brought about by the First World War was the improved status of women.’ Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the role of women during World War I. The focus will be on changing occupational opportunities and the support work done by women. Most candidates will concentrate on: nursing and other roles at or near the western front; women’s work in munitions factories; the various opportunities for work in factories and workplaces especially after conscription was introduced, including roles previously considered more or less exclusively within the male preserve, such as doctors and transport workers; the role of women as home managers. Candidates should also identify other key social changes such as: The Defence of the Realm Act; the use of state power to effect change which had substantial implications for post-war social policy; more opportunities for social advancement as old practices of social reciprocity, based on hierarchy and inheritance broke down.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the impact of the First World War, particularly in respect of the improved status of women. Good candidates will present a reasoned argument leading to a conclusion about the relative importance of the selected factor. Here, of course, the focus should be on the *impact* of war, so it is legitimate to concentrate more on the 1920s than on 1914–18. It is possible to argue that, although the work done by women was more diverse and centrally concerned with the national war effect, this did not significantly improve the status of women. Also, many apparent ‘gains’ from 1914–18 were lost again after the demobilisation of the troops. Using specific examples as indicated in AO1, most will argue that women’s war work was important, though good candidates will also produce nuanced interpretations. Thus some may argue that women’s work in the home was important but that there was as much continuity as change during the First World War. Similarly, it is difficult to deny that the War saw a larger proportion of women engaged full-time in the workforce. However, this work was mostly manual rather than managerial. Leadership in both workplace and, for example, hospitals continued to be provided disproportionately by men. Many women felt that they were being asked to ‘fill up’ important gaps as part of the war effort, rather than that they were being invited to grasp new opportunities. The speed with which many were discharged when ‘the men came home’ in 1918–19 can be used as evidence to confirm that women’s work was disproportionately in a supporting role rather opening up a large number of new opportunities. Good candidates will need to weigh the relative importance of the role of women when set against other significant social changes engendered by the War (see AO1 above). Weaker candidates are likely to stray away from the impact of war and to produce descriptive writing about what roles women played during the war itself.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work which, while indicating the importance of women’s war work, and to an extent its longer-term impact on women’s status, has stressed its temporary nature and has made distinctions between important ‘job-filling’ in 1914–18 and new directions for women thereafter.

Page 33	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 34	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

34 Why did the Conservatives dominate British politics in the inter-war years?

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of party politics in the interwar period. The focus will be on the Conservative party, with special reference to the advantages which it held over the other political parties. Candidates should have knowledge of: the long period during which the Conservatives were in office, either alone or in coalition (1918–22, 1922–4, 1924–9, 1931–39); overall Conservatives were out of office for barely more than three years from the end of the First World War to the beginning of the Second; Conservative government policies; the nature of leadership; the nature and extent of opposition to the Conservatives from the Liberal and Labour parties; the outcomes of the general elections of 1918, 1923, 1924, 1929, 1931 and 1935; public opinion and the extent of its support for Conservative policies.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the reasons for Conservative political success in this period. Good candidates will concentrate on the Conservatives but will see the need to explain ‘domination’ by reference also to the fortunes of the Labour and Liberal parties. Using some of the themes identified in AO1 above, good candidates should reach a conclusion about whether the long period of domination depended more on Tory strengths or the weaknesses of the other major party. Those arguing for the relative **importance of Conservative strengths** are likely to stress: the value of long experience in government, ensuring a ready supply of experienced ministers for the coalition governments of 1918–22 and 1931–40; broad support for ‘orthodox’ economic policy based on reducing debt and attempting to support the currency on foreign markets during the long Depression; in the 1930s; consistent support outside Parliament for the policy of Appeasement rather than policies which risked another war so soon after the ‘war to end wars’; the shrewd, avuncular leadership of Stanley Baldwin (leader of the Conservatives from 1923–37) generally gained trust and considerable popular support. In general, the Conservatives were seen as more unified and more experienced than were their opponents. Those arguing for the relative **importance of the weakness of other parties** are likely to stress: Labour’s intrinsic weakness as a new party which had, until 1918, been the third party within what was in effect a two-party system; Labour’s apparently narrow base of support and excessive dependence on trade union funding; Labour’s inexperience resulted in a lack of trust in its ability to govern; what proved to be almost the terminal weakness of the Liberals; the long-term impact of the Lloyd-George Asquith split; Liberals’ slipping to ‘third party’ status continued throughout the 1920s and was confirmed in the general election of 1929 when the Liberals, despite more than a veneer of unity and reasonably adequate funding was unable to dislodge the Labour party, which emerged as the largest party in the Commons. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate more or less exclusively on the Conservatives and will not discuss, in any sustained way, the relative importance of the different factors explaining Conservative domination of politics during the inter-war period.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work ‘three-party politics’ during the inter-war period.

Page 35	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 36	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

**35 'Britain's economic problems in the 1930s were more regional than they were national.'
Discuss.**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of Britain's economy in the 1930s. The focus will be on regional issues. Candidates should know about: the key features of economic performance: deflation & depression, growing debt, downward pressure on the pound; long-term unemployment. They should also know: that economic growth was substantial higher in the south and midlands than in the North of England, central Scotland and South Wales; that performance in the various sectors of the economy showed considerable differences. Candidates will need to select but most will at least mention the different fortunes of: the service and growing leisure sectors; electronics; mining; shipbuilding; other heavy industries; transport. On 'regional', candidates will choose the ones on which to concentrate, but it is likely that areas of particular long-term depression will include South Wales, the North-East of England, South Yorkshire and central Scotland.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the nature of Britain's economic problems in this period. Good candidates may well argue that one of the key characteristics of the economy was sharp regional diversity and that the overall picture of economic performance between the wars was one in which substantial regional diversity was particularly prominent. They can discuss: differential rates of unemployment, with particular problems of long-term unemployment in the mining areas of South Wales and the mining and shipping industries in the North East; the much shorter periods of depression in London and much of the South-East (although agriculture in the South East endured long-term depression with many landowners forced to sell up); the West Midlands as an area which recovered quickly from the national depression of 1929–31, partly because of the growth of the motor car industry and associated services. Strong candidates may develop the 'regional' case by suggesting that the substantial differences in economic performance provided powerful evidence that the British had a series of inter-locking regional economies rather than a fully integrated national economy. Those concluding that economic problems were indeed 'national' are likely to argue that poor economic performance in one 'depressed' sector, such as ship-building, had a knock-on effect throughout the economy. In particular, the inter-war period was, for the most part, one of falling prices – generally an indicator of depression. Also, the government introduced a series of measures, particularly 'the Dole' which attempted to deal with what was widely considered to be a national crisis. Weaker candidates are likely to concentrate on the problems of the inter-war economy in a rather general way, perhaps giving excessive attention to its social consequences rather than to indicators of economic health or otherwise. Information about regional diversity is likely to be patchy and under-developed.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of recent work which confirms earlier estimates that, using conventional economic criteria, the scale of the so-called 'depression' of the 1930s has been substantially exaggerated, at least from about 1933, although evidence was gathering from c. 1937 about renewed economic problems.

Page 37	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 38	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

36 'Britain went to war in 1939 both reluctantly and unprepared.' Discuss.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of events leading up to the Second World War. The focus will be on the extent of Britain's willingness and preparedness to fight another world war. On '**reluctantly**', candidates should know about: Britain's long-term commitment to appeasement and negotiation with Fascist powers; the diplomatic situation in 1937–8 and the importance of the Munich agreement; the changing situation from the occupation of Czechoslovakia to the invasion of Poland. On '**unprepared**', candidates should know about: the establishment of a rearmament programme – new battleships and a modernisation programme – the development of spitfires and new aircraft carriers; establishment of munitions factories to equip the army with howitzers etc.; the overall size of the forces; extent of commitment to rearmament in the 1930s and particularly from 1937; extent of anti-invasion preparations; preparations to withstand a gas attack; Air Raid precautions and the development of a Home Guard.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about Britain's preparedness for war and the extent of its willingness to fight a world war. Good candidates will see that this question has two foci: *reluctance* and *preparedness* and that they should attempt a reasonable balance between the two. Candidates may argue that the British public did not anticipate imminent world war until well into 1939 since the Munich agreement was initially considered to be a great success and did not relish the fighting of another world war. Winston Churchill led the group which argued that appeasement would only delay the inevitable. This group was not reluctant but wished to tackle Hitler before it was too late. On the other hand, Chamberlain was concerned that Britain had insufficient resources to enable Britain to resist a full-scale German military invasion force. On 'preparedness', see the debate which is summarised briefly below. It is possible to argue that Britain was partially prepared and, for the most part, reluctant but it is possible to argue for a greater degree of preparation and far from universal reluctance. Weaker candidates are likely to produce a description of the diplomacy which failed and led to war. Most will produce unbalanced answers, stronger on 'reluctance' than 'unprepared' or *vice versa*. Although the question suggests that the answer should end in 1939, some weaker candidates may produce material beyond 1939 of partial relevance at best.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware of lively debate recent work which has, on the one hand, emphasized the heavy expenditure on, and speed of, rearmament in 1937–9 challenging the idea that Britain was 'unprepared' and, on the other, recent work by Christopher Price which argues that Britain could afford much more extensive rearmament than it actually achieved and that it depended for too long on the assumption that the USA would eventually join the war against Hitler.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 39	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – October/November 2013	9769	13

37 Assess the achievements of Clement Attlee as Prime Minister.

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge of the later stages of Attlee’s political career. The focus will be on his achievements. Candidates should have knowledge of: Attlee’s leadership from 1945–51; the key policies which were put in place during his prime ministership, particularly perhaps commitment to full employment to the nationalisation of many basic resources and to a genuinely National Health Service providing equality of entitlement to treatment and free at the point of use. It is also legitimate to discuss foreign and imperial policy, with some concentration, perhaps, on the independence of India and Ceylon, the creation of a Muslim-majority Pakistan and on Britain’s involvement, as ally of the USA, in the early phase of the Cold War. Candidates may also wish to include material on the nature of Attlee’s leadership in terms of his relations with Cabinet colleagues and his effectiveness as spokesman for his party’s policy and record in government.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and of arriving at a well-considered judgement. Here the focus is on reaching a judgement about the achievements of Attlee. Good candidates will attempt to judge the overall achievement of the Labour governments in domestic, foreign and imperial policy in the context of a judgement on how far the record of the post-war Labour governments should be ascribed to Attlee. Good candidates may argue that Labour’s record was good, especially perhaps in domestic affairs, although the whole of this period has been considered by many historians as ‘an age of austerity’ which disappointed many people hoping for speedier improvements. As voters, they expressed their reservations in the general elections of 1950 and 1951. Some will argue that a more effective leader would have given more time to party organisation so that the government’s record could be presented in a more sympathetic light. On the personal credit Attlee should be able to claim, some good candidates may argue that Attlee had an extremely talented, if opinionated, cabinet to lead and that the personal contributions of men like Cripps, Bevin and Bevan were at least the equal of Attlee’s. On the other hand, other good candidates might argue that keeping together such able but ambitious colleagues, each with different views on socialist principles and priorities, in one Cabinet until 1950 was a mark of exceptional powers of leadership. Some will be more sympathetic to Attlee’s leadership style. What is laconic efficiency for some is the work of ‘a modest little man with much to be modest about’ for others. Either way, good candidates need to present a reasoned judgement. Weaker candidates are likely to present a general account of Labour’s most prominent policies with limited concentration on the specific focus relating to the extent of Attlee’s achievements. These treatments may well be unbalanced in terms of both what is included and in terms of detailed presentation.

Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. In this question, some candidates may be aware that recent work has continued to present Attlee in a favourable light, often more so than more obviously flamboyant or extrovert characters in his Cabinet. Some writing on Attlee also argues that his reputation remains considerably, and some would say obstinately, higher in retrospect than it was in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

AO3 – [not applicable to Outlines]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.